

# MINUTES OF FACULTY COUNCIL

Time: April 11, 1974, 2:00 p.m., Rare Books Room

Members Present: Darrel E. Bigham, Chairman; Professors Barnes, Eichman, Frost, Kinzie, Kirsch, and H. Sands

Ex-officio Present: Present Rice, Vice-President Wright, Dean Bennett

Others Present: Professors DeVries, Ferrell, Kent, Lonnberg, Straeffer, Willett

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

## 1. Minutes of March 14 and 28 Meetings.

The minutes of the meeting of March 14 were approved with minor changes. Those from March 28 were approved as amended.

## 2. a. Curricular Committee Recommendation on CLEP Scores.

The Chairman called attention to a recommendation contained in a memo from the Curricular Committee dated January 17, 1974, which recommended adjusting the score level acceptable for credit with the College Level Examination Program (CLEP). He apologized for the delay in considering this recommendation and called on Professor Straeffer, the Director of Admissions, in charge of administering the Credit by Exam Program, to explain the recommendation.

Professor Straeffer recalled that the credit by exam program had been initiated in December, 1972, with the understanding that it would be re-studied to see if the program as then put forth was adequate. In a memo to the Curricular Committee on December 14, 1973, he had presented an analysis of the use of the CLEP tests on this campus. He had stated the number of students who had taken the tests and the percentage who had passed. He had identified the type of student and the performance of ISUE students on the tests. The CLEP exams were of two types, the general exams in five areas, English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences - History, for which a student could receive up to thirty hours of credit, and the subject exams in which a student could attempt to establish credit by examination in more than twenty different courses. The experience on this campus was that not enough students had taken the CLEP subject exams to make an analysis. However, an adequate number had taken the general exams to provide a basis for analysis. With the cutoff score for the five general exams set at 25 per cent, the percentage of students taking the tests and receiving credit was as follows:

English -----	64%
Natural Sciences ---	86%
Mathematics -----	83%
Humanities -----	71%
Social Sciences ----	77%

Professor Straeffer pointed out that the type of student taking the CLEP general exams was above the average at ISUE, the comparison having been

Approved June 17, 1974

made on the basis of College Entrance SAT scores and high school grade average. It was difficult to determine if the cutoff scores were set at an adequate level; the best information to make such a judgment would be a study on how students perform in advanced level courses after having tested out of the lower or freshman level courses. The Curricular Committee had felt that the cutoff level should be raised to 50 per cent. If the cutoff score had been set at that level for those who received credit at the 25 per cent level, the percentages receiving credit would have been as follows:

English -----	29%
Natural Sciences --	45%
Mathematics -----	62%
Humanities -----	28%
Social Sciences ---	48%

In reply to a question from Professor Frost, Professor Straeffer commented that each university sets its own standards, some were lower, some were higher, that 50 per cent would be the average and that he did not know the basis for the original level being set at 50 per cent. President Rice commented that it was hazardous to generalize about the practices and cited the fact that his son had taken the CLEP general exams, had forwarded his scores to Ball State University, and had received an offer of identical credit as at ISUE.

Professor Frost commented that she thought it was important to know what other universities were doing. She said further that she could not understand why anyone would want to change the level from 25 per cent to 50 per cent on the basis of only 50 students who had taken the test and who were above average. President Rice felt that one of the reasons that students had not taken advantage of the CLEP tests was that the program had not been in operation long enough for the students to know about it.

Professor H. Sands asked whether every student who had taken the test was above average, to which Professor Straeffer replied in the negative, adding that the determination average was based on SAT scores and high school grades for the total group of CLEP users. There had been some below average students, but they were offset by the number of above average users. The high school grade point average for all those entering ISUE was 2.34, whereas for those taking the CLEP exams the average was 2.76. The ISUE average on SAT was 401 for the verbal portion and 440 for the Math, 450 and 482 respectively being the national averages. For those having taken the CLEP exams at ISUE the averages were 459 verbal and 501 Math. Professor Straeffer said his main concern was that the scores were not set so low that students receiving credit did not have adequate knowledge but that he also saw a danger in setting them too high in that it could discourage students from trying.

The Chairman pointed out that when Faculty Council had approved the credit by exam program the percentages had not been set. Professor Frost said she thought it was to be set at whatever would be the end of the freshman year. Professor Straeffer stated that the national scale for CLEP was established as a result of the administration of the tests to the 1963 college sophomore norming population. Professor DeVries said that he thought the previous Director of Admissions had contacted several of the other schools in the state to determine the 25 per cent level.

Approved June 17, 1974

Professor Frost asked whether it was fair to treat a person as an average sophomore if he were qualified as an above average freshman. Professor DeVries suggested having students on campus take the test at the end of the year in order to arrive at valid statements. Professor Ferrell commented that he had given the CLEP accounting test to around 150 students in his classes and compared their scores and credit possibilities with their actual grades. On the basis of this study he felt that that program was not giving away credit.

Professor H. Sands asked whether the CLEP scale that was based on sophomores in 1963 was for the beginning of the sophomore year or the end of the year. Professor Straeffer answered that the report said only that it was based on 2582 sophomores in 1963. Professor DeVries cautioned against using out of date norming, pointing out that students coming from high school today are not doing as well on SAT scores.

President Rice reported that Indiana University had a proposal before the Commission for Higher Education seeking statewide authorization for an external degree program. He warned against the possible loss of students if ISUE were out of line with its credit by exam program. He suggested that ISUE needed more data. The Chairman stated that he shared the concern for lack of data and pointed out the lack of information about how the 25 per cent figure was arrived at for the CLEP general tests and asserted that it was not arrived at in Faculty Council and that Faculty Council had not been informed of it.

Professor Frost moved, seconded by Kinzie,

Motion: That the change in the test score for the CLEP general exams as recommended by the Curricular Committee be denied and that data be collected for another year before further changes are made.

The motion failed to carry.

Professor Eichman then moved, seconded by Kinzie,

Motion: That the recommendation of the Curricular Committee not be approved until more information about method of setting the CLEP general exam score cutoff at the 25 per cent level be obtained.

The motion carried.

2. b. Discussion of and Action on Recommendation of the 1973-1974 Economic Benefits Committee.

The Chairman called attention to the April 1974 report of the Economic Benefits Committee which had been distributed the previous week and noted the presence of one member of that committee.

Professor Kirsch moved, seconded by H. Sands,

Motion: That Faculty Council endorse the report of the Economics Benefits Committee.

Approved June 19, 1974



Professor Frost asked whether the recommendation of an increase in travel allowance from \$100 to \$200 was meant to be for each faculty member, to which the answer was that presently money is allotted to each division to be divided up there.

Professor Ferrell pointed out that the report was made up of two types of recommendations, those for the coming year and others for a longer range.

Professor Frost asked whether there would be consideration of the recommendations on feedback. President Rice stated that the feedback would be in the form of the action the administration took. The Chairman stated that a form of operation could be to approve the report of the committee, and send it to the administration for response. He noted that the discussion of this committee has been open to dialogue with the administration on every question. He noted that the committee was asking for a response on each point.

President Rice asked for a clarification of the recommendations for the biennium 75-77. The recommendation called for 15 per cent increase for the two years. He wondered if this were a total of 15 per cent to be split up 10 and 5 or some such arrangement.

The Chairman remarked that he was gratified with the high quality of the report, both in form and in tone. He wished to express his appreciation to the committee and hoped the administration recognized the quality of the report. President Rice remarked that he had forwarded the report to President Rankin and had remarked to him on the high quality of it.

Professor Kinzie asked whether the administration usually asked for more from the legislature than it got. President Rice responded that the university was usually given guidelines within which the budget was established. Those guidelines placed an upper limit on the budget.

The Chairman noted that one point the report raised which he felt was important was the recommendation regarding communication with the legislature. He felt this might imply that future Economic Benefits Committee might contact their counterparts at other state campuses for public relations work with the legislature on the importance of higher education.

President Rice remarked that one thing not included in the report was a priority in the allegation of moneys. He asked the question, if one has a non-performing professor does one give that professor an increase. He asserted that this question was side-stepped in the report. In the legislature when this question is asked the answer usually given by Purdue University and Indiana University is that they have persons who have not received salary increases for years.

Professor Frost stated that this was the first campus where she had experienced across the board increases. She maintained that such a practice of giving increases equally to everyone could be discouraging to those who worked harder.

The Chairman professed to two objections to merit increases. First, promotion had been viewed on this campus primarily as a way to save oneself from inflation, as a way of solving economic problems, not of seeking

status. Second, the proposal contained a recommendation that there be continued adjustment of salary. Thus merit awards could be made under either promotion or adjustment.

President Rice stated that one argument faced in the cost of living dialogue with the legislature was the cost of being a good professor and whether that should be spread equally among professors. He maintained that it wasn't so hard to overcome this argument before reapportionment, but that the ability to get reelected was now greater and that now a turnover of legislatures could not be counted on, so that the same legislators had to be faced every year.

Professor Barnes asked if the legislative task would be easier with a merit raise system. Vice President Wright said he thought it would be good to reconsider the whole salary situation. He saw the possibility of losing good people if the small amount of increase was continually spread out. Such considerations had even been written into the legislation for Ball State University.

Professor Ferrell commented that the committee had refrained from recommending a merit increase because the cost of living was rising so fast. He maintained that if a merit increase were used with the amount of money available, it would amount to a pay cut for others. President Rice stated that the sentiment among some legislators was that maybe that is the way the situation should be. Professor Eichman asserted that it would be contradictory for Faculty Council to recommend a merit system of salary increases when it was currently fostering an investigation by an ad hoc committee into the evaluation of faculty and administrators. The Chairman suggested that it might be important to make the point to the legislature that Faculty Council was currently studying evaluation which could possibly contribute to a merit system.

The motion to endorse the report of the Economic Benefits Committee carried.

Professor Frost moved, seconded by Barnes,

Motion: That the Economic Benefits Committee of 1974-1975 be charged with the duty of constructing documentation for developing a merit system for faculty salary increases.

The motion carried.

### 3. New business.

#### A. Reports from President Rice and Dean Bennett

Dean Bennett reported that he had received a letter from a senior student senator with suggestions regarding graduation honors and the Dean's list. Though the letter contained some errors, he thought the suggestions should be considered. One change which the Dean could make with no further action necessary was to include a certificate with the graduate's diploma showing the number of times the graduate had been on the Dean's list. Suggested changes in the standards for honors were within the prerogative of the faculty.

Approved June 19, 1974

After discussion the matter was assigned to the Committee on Academic Standards.

B. Chairman's Report.

The Chairman noted that a meeting of the conference committee to discuss the proposal on academic freedom and tenure was scheduled.

4. Adjournment.

Faculty Council adjourned at 3:48 p.m. to meet next on April 25, 1974, at 2:00 p.m. in the Rare Books Room.



Thomas Eichman, Secretary

TE/sg