

Julie

March 1, 1974

To: Members of the ISSUE FACULTY
From: Darrel E. Bigham
Chairman, Faculty Council
Subject: Faculty Council meeting of March 7, 1974 .

The Faculty Council will meet on Thursday, March 7, 1974, from 2:00 to 3:30 pm. The session will be held in the Rare Books Room. Members of the faculty, administration, and student body are welcome.

AGENDA

1. Minutes of February 28 meeting.
2. Vote on proposed amendments to the Faculty Council Constitution (Article II: 1 A; III: 1, 3 A-B; IV: 1 A, 1 F) and By-laws (Article V: 2, 9, 10).
3. Progress report on Revision of Faculty Handbook.
4. Introduction of Kest-Macy Commission recommendations on institutional staffing plans.
5. Preparation of Fall 1974 schedules and faculty assignments.
6. New Business.
 - a. Reports from President Rice and Dean Bennett.
 - b. Future agenda items.

File
MINUTES OF FACULTY COUNCIL

Time: March 7, 1974, at 2:00 p.m. in the Rare Books Room

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

Others Present: Professors Alstadt, Bertram, Deem, M. Denner, Ferrell, Marr, D. Miller, Stanonis, Venatta; Students L. Alvey, D. Gray, R. Schuttler

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. He noted the presence of a number of people with common interests and stated that they could present their concerns at this meeting under future agenda items. Faculty Council would then be able to decide what to do with any requests that might be forthcoming.

1. Minutes of February 28 Meeting.

Minutes were unavailable for distribution.

2. Vote on Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Council Constitution (Article II: 1 A, III: 1, 3 A-B - IV: 1 A, 1 F) and By-laws (Article V: 2, a, 10).

The Chairman recalled that copies of the proposed amendments had been presented to Faculty Council some time previously and that action on them had been deferred from the previous week because of the absence from Council of some of the members. He noted that there were four different amendments to be considered and proposed taking them up in the order listed on the agenda.

The first proposal called for changes in Articles II and III of the Faculty Constitution and would establish alternates to Faculty Council to serve in the absence of representatives. Professor Frost, who had initiated the proposal, described various instances in the past two years when represented. Discussion of the need for an alternate for at-large representatives and the method for choosing such alternates followed.

Professor Eichman moved, seconded by Kinzie,

Motion: That Faculty Council accept as its proposal the amended form of Article II, section 1.A. and Article III, sections 1 and 3 A and B as presented by Professor Frost in her memorandum dated December 14, 1973.

After further discussion of at-large alternates Professor Kirsch moved, seconded by H. Sands,

Motion: That one sentence in section 3B of Article be changed to read "the nominee who receives the highest number of votes will be elected representative." After which be added the sentence "The runner-up will be elected alternate."

Motion carried.

Motion to accept the proposal, as amended, then carried with the necessary two-thirds vote of the elected membership. (See attachment for the complete form of the accepted, amended proposal.)

The Chairman noted that the proposal would need approval by a vote of the general faculty and by the Board of Trustees to become effective as an amendment to the constitution.

The next amendment considered was to the By-laws, Article IV, Sections 1.A. and F., which would have the effect of changing the method of selection of chairmen of standing committees as follows:

- A. (Delete the first sentence--then "A" will appear as:) The Faculty Council will nominate candidates for the Committee and they will be interviewed by the Faculty Council or a member of the Faculty Council. Following the completion of the interviews, the Faculty Council will elect the members of the Committee.
- F. Each Committee will elect its own Chairperson and Secretary from among its voting members, (merely adding Chairperson and).

Professor Kirsch moved, seconded by H. Sands,

Motion: That Faculty Council accept the Proposed Amendment to Article IV of the By-laws to the Constitution.

Professor Eichman stated that he saw the existing method of selection and the proposed method as representing different philosophies of legislative organization. The existing method held that the committees were sub-organs of the Council and actively responsible in make-up and action to Faculty Council.

The proposed method viewed the committees as separate, democratic entities. He maintained that it was necessary for Faculty Council to maintain a means of control over the committees as part of the Council and viewed the appointment of chairman by the Council as the only, although nonetheless vague, means of control. Professor H. Sands pointed out that there were other means of control in that committees would still have to report to Faculty Council even with a change in the method of selecting chairmen. Professor M. Denner stated that he saw problems in getting a committee together and running a meeting to elect a chairman. The Chairman reminded the Council of its concerns with continuity on committees and asserted that Faculty Council was in good position to know who would be the best candidate for the Chairmanship from among committee members it had nominated and selected. Professor Eichman maintained that a reason put forth in the memo supporting the change to the effect that election of a committee head would make a committee more cohesive and productive was not necessarily valid, since a committee could be badly split in electing a leader and bad feelings could result in incohesiveness and unproductiveness.

The motion to accept the amendment to Article IV of the By-laws to the Faculty Constitution failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority vote.

The next amendment considered was to Article V, section 2, of the By-laws.

The proposal would effect a portion of the preamble to that section as follows:

Present wording: It is composed of one faculty member from each of the Academic Divisions. The Director of Teacher Education shall serve as the non-voting Chairman. Other Ex-officio members may be appointed by the President of the Campus.

Proposed wording: It is composed of one faculty representative from each of the Academic Divisions. Ex-officio members may be appointed by the President of the campus.

Professor Kirsch moved, seconded by H. Sands,

Motion: That the proposed changes in a portion of Article V, section 2 of the By-laws to the Constitution be accepted.

In a memo dated November 15, 1973, Professor Eichman had pointed out that the change in wording in the first sentence would bring the wording describing the Teacher Education Committee membership into line with other Standing Committees and that it was important to have the Director of Education sit with this committee, but which could be accomplished through an ex-officio appointment by the President, the same as with other committees where administrative representation was felt to be important.

Professor Kinzie suggested that the Director of Teacher Education should be asked to confirm that it was not legally necessary for him to be Chairman of the committee as a part of the curricular process. The Chairman reminded the Council that it had changed the Director's and the committee's roles in that process.

The motion to accept the amendment to Article V, section 2, of the By-laws received the necessary two-thirds majority approval.

The next change in By-laws considered was a proposal to add a sentence each to Sections 9 and 10 of Article V as follows:

1. As a part of Article V, Section 9 in the preamble after the first full sentence add the following sentence:

"All faculty representatives shall be chosen from among the tenured faculty."

2. As a part of Article V, Section 10, in the preamble after the second full sentence add the following sentence:

"All faculty representatives and alternates shall be chosen from among the tenured faculty."

Professor Kirsch moved, seconded by Barnes,

Motion: That the proposed amendments to Article V, sections 9 and 10, of the By-laws be accepted.

Professor Frost recalled previous discussion about the hardships imposed on small divisions when committee structure was limited. The Chairman recalled the statement of guidelines on committee structure that had been inserted into the record the previous week. Professor Eichman reminded that there were various kinds of committees and that the guidelines as accepted already made exception for the Promotions Committee. He further recalled the desire that the two committees concerned in this proposal would have to meet rarely if at all, but that stability was desirable if service was necessary. Professor Frost felt it would be wrong to say a person who had ten years of experience was ineligible if not tenured, as could happen with a person newly appointed to campus with prior service elsewhere. Professor Eichman pointed out that persons hired at the Professor rank can gain immediate tenure, though normally they serve a one-year probationary period. Professor Frost pointed out that many people are hired at the Associate Professor Rank with prior experience and would have to wait three years to be eligible for service.

Professor Eichman stated that he felt the nature of the committees called for familiarity with campus procedure. Professor Frost stated that even though it was hoped that these committees would not meet, the hours of the Faculty Council's service as a grievance committee in January and February 1973 had led several of the members then to consider resigning. Professor Eichman stated that he hoped that if such burdens became necessary they would fall on people who had weathered burdens generally. Professor Kinzie emphasized the desirability of having tenure when serving in such proceedings, referring also to the January and February 1973 actions of Faculty Council. Discussion followed in which there was not general agreement on the necessity of being tenured.

The motion to accept the proposed amendments to sections 9 and 10 of Article V of the By-laws received the necessary two-thirds majority approval.

3. Progress Report on Revision of Faculty Handbook.

The Chairman noted that he was collecting changes in the Constitution and the By-laws to be distributed. He recalled that there had been discussions in several meetings of Faculty Council, beginning in August and September of 1973, of the needs to distribute changes to the Handbooks as they developed. He felt however that adequate discussion could not proceed in the absence of the ex-officio members, whose absence was beyond their control. Discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

4. Introduction of Keast-Macy Commission Recommendations on Institutional Staffing Plans.

The Chairman noted that attention to this item was first drawn by the distribution the past fall by President Rice of a communication. Subsequently a closer analysis of the Keast-Macy Commission report on tenure had re-emphasized the need for staff planning. Recently Professor Eichman had presented the Chairman with a detailed memo regarding staff planning for one of the areas. As the problems presented there were complicated, the Chairman had arranged for an informal meeting with President Rice of some of the faculty members concerned in the matter.

There was a lot of behind the scenes action which the Chairman would report on more fully later. He reported that President Rice was fully eager to cooperate with Faculty Council in its endeavors. The agenda item would subsequently re-appear in a different form.

5. Preparation of Fall 1974 Schedules and Faculty Assignments.

The Chairman suggested that perhaps Dean Bennett should be present to explain this item more fully. He noted that Professor D. Miller was present and might respond from a position of knowing what was said at a staff meeting of Division Chairmen. The Chairman went on to explain that he had understood that Dean had announced that persons without "permanent" contracts, later described as "valid" contracts, would not have their names listed on the printed schedule.

Professor D. Miller responded that the reason that this policy was promulgated was to prevent misconceptions about contractual status among persons who had not received from appointments for the next year. He relayed the fear of Dean Bennett that the appearance of names on a schedule would imply the holding of a contract.

Professor Eichman maintained that such issues should be brought out in the open and discussed even more inasmuch as there were other possible misinterpretations of the appearance or non-appearance of names on schedules. He cited the possibility that a person whose name did not appear could also be presumed not to have a firm appointment, whereas, the non-appearance of names on schedules, as in the past, had other meanings. He referred specifically to the schedule of German courses for fall 1973.

Professor Frost said that she thought that it was especially true in the case of part-time and adjunct faculty that their names should not be listed. She asked whether such misinterpretation as implied had occurred.

Professor D. Miller responded in the affirmative, citing such an occurrence in his division. Professor Barnes thought that students preferred to know who was teaching.

Professor Eichman said that he thought there were special problems in scheduling with the use of special term appointments which added to the negative value of such appointments. Professor Frost suggested that further discussion of this issue should wait until Dean Bennett was able to be present. Professor Eichman agreed that there was a good reason to wait but asserted that schedules were very important to the lives of faculty and students and hoped delay would not cause difficulties. Professor Barnes felt this issue was a good example of the way the threat of law suits could bog things down by the administration being afraid to print the schedule.

The Chairman stated that he agreed with many of the concerns expressed and asserted that administrators should know what a contract was. Professor H. Sands warned against the negative effect on students of an uninformative schedule.

Professor Eichman stated that he currently felt aggrieved about some problems he was having in the schedule making process and which he was pursuing through administrative channels. He stated further that he might need to

use the grievance appeal procedure established in the Faculty Constitution and By-laws.

The Chairman concluded that there was a need to communicate to Dean Bennett, a concern for the existence of a statement clarifying the issue.

6. New Business

a. Neither the President nor the Dean was present to present a report.

b. Future Agenda Items.

(1) The Chairman noted that he had received copies of requests by memo from Linda Alvey and Robert Schuttler, representing the Student Senate and the Student Government Association respectively, to the Chairman of the Select Committee on Academic Standards to join that committee as consultants. The Chairman felt that such requests were in order and that no further action was necessary. Those persons should consider themselves consultants to that committee. The Chairman indicated that he had discussed this matter with Professor Eichman, the committee chairman, who in turn had had a lengthy discussion with the two students.

(2) The Chairman noted that by the next session of Faculty Council the visit of the North Central Association accreditation team would be history. He reminded faculty members of the previous week's discussion concerning availability for discussion with the team. He noted that Faculty Council would not be officially involved. Professor Eichman recalled President Rice's remarks about a Sunday meeting and wondered whether that was just for the NCA team or whether Faculty Council should remain available for service on Sunday. The general consensus was that the team would be organizing by itself on Sunday in preparation for contact on campus starting Monday.

(3) The Chairman noted the presence of several faculty members who seemed to have a series of concerns with a common base of interest. He asked whether there was one who could speak to a point or whether there was a request or requests to make. Professor Ferrell stated that he had a personal statement to make that expressed concern about the operation of the Promotions Committee. He wanted to know what criteria the committee used and what procedures for evaluation were established. He was concerned that the committee had all the input it needed, whether proper avenues for appeal from action were provided, whether due process was allowed. He felt that Faculty Council should take a very close look at what the Promotions Committee had done.

The Chairman remarked that Faculty Council the previous week in executive session had only received a report from the Promotions committee without any comment on recommendations.

Faculty Council had pledged itself not to discuss any person or specific action. No further information had been forwarded from the committee since that time.

Professor Bertram stated that he was concerned about the setting of standards after the promotions actions were in progress. He thought it was wrong for the application to pass through the Division Committee, the Division Chairman, and reach the University level committee where guidelines would then be decided. He asserted that that committee was not a policy making group. As an example of how such procedure could cause problems he cited an apparently new criterion concerning necessary years in rank.

Professor Frost recalled the establishment of an application form and guidelines in December 1972. She felt, however, that some actions by the committee, such as the return to the applicant for further information could lead to irregularities. Professor Bertram asserted that the committee's procedures were highly irregular and advised Faculty Council to either remove the committee or change it.

The Chairman remarked that he felt one irregularity that needed straightening out was shown in the rumors that had been circulating about what was supposed to be a confidential action of the Promotions Committee. He felt Faculty Council should discourage such rumors and encourage anyone with a grievance in the matter to appeal formally to the committee for a hearing.

Professor Eichman called attention to the formal procedures for appeal contained in sections 2 and 3 of Article III of the By-laws to the Faculty Constitution and suggested that the appropriate action would be to file a written appeal with the Promotions Committee.

Professor Ferrell stated that he had approached the Chairman of the Promotions Committee about appearing before the committee and had been turned down with the statement that the committee's work was finished. He said that response was the reason for his presence at Faculty Council.

Professor Barnes said he was concerned that this committee had no criteria with which it worked.

The Chairman responded that the committee minutes from September, October, and February reflected investigation into criteria.

Professor Stanonis stated that as a Division Chairman he was presently counselling persons about applying for promotions in the future.

In such a role he needed to know whether, over and above what was contained in the constitution and Handbook whether there was any other written or unwritten criteria which he should know about as he was now considering persons for future promotions.

Professor Frost responded that she felt such should be an outgrowth of the committee's action and recalled that the December 1972 document was the latest statement.

Professor Stanonis stated that he needed to know immediately and felt that Faculty Council should be able to give an immediate answer.

Professor Eichman stated that he felt that the request for an immediate response about a complex procedure was unreasonable especially insofar as the discussion was being taken up under the Future items portion of the agenda.

The Chairman commented that he felt Professor Barnes concerns about criteria were well taken and assured him that the item was being pursued in an expeditious manner. He also felt that there were definite answers to Professor Stanonis demands if formal request were made and if time were allowed for an answer. He felt further that any aggrieved individuals should make formal request to the committee immediately.

Professor Stanonis restated the urgency with which he felt the requests should be answered and reassured that he was concerned with operations for the next year.

The Chairman recalled that he had read the statement on criteria (Faculty Council minutes of December 11, 1972) that supplemented the other documents already in existence and readily available. He recalled that the criteria only set up general guidelines which are to be applied by each committee.

Professor Stanonis asserted that it was important to have specifics such as the type of degree needed firmly in mind so that they could not be changed unless notification was forthcoming. The Chairman stated his position that the criteria needed were contained in the provisions dated December 11, 1972, and that Dr. Stanonis was actually requesting an answer on how those criteria were applied in Faculty Evaluation. This question cannot be dealt with in this meeting and was actually the concern of the Ad Hoc Committee on faculty evaluation. Professor Eichman stated that he too was concerned that things got changed without notification too often and lamented such ad hoc procedure. He claimed that an attempt by Faculty Council to answer definitely such an urgent request under such stringent time restrictions would only contribute to such lamentable ad hocness.

Professor Stanonis repeated his request for a statement of the criteria. Professor Frost asserted that an answer could not come out of this meeting.

Professor Bertram expressed concern over the fleeting time in pursuing an appeal.

Professor Eichman asserted that Professor Stanonis request for information was understandable but reaffirmed the belief that an answer must come later. The Chairman noted that the present discussion underlined the concern raised many times in the past about the statement in the front of the Handbook that it should not be considered the prime reference.

Professor Marr asked whether the Promotions Committee was responsible to Faculty Council as one of its sub-bodies. The Chairman responded recalling the Council Meeting in September when a number of people insisted that the Faculty Council should be only a bookkeeper in the promotions process. Faculty Council only was to make sure that the committee had functioned. Faculty Council had not acted as a personnel committee. The Chairman noted, moreover, that under the By-laws (A-3 section 2) those denied promotions could sign a request for a hearing before the Promotions Committee which might grant such a hearing.

7. Adjournment.

Faculty Council adjourned at 3:50 p.m. to meet next at 2:00 p.m. March 14, 1974, in the Rare Books Room.



Thomas Eichman, Secretary

TE/sg

On March 7, 1974, Faculty Council proposed the following constitutional amendment by the necessary two-thirds vote of its elected membership as provided for in Article VII, section 1, of the Faculty Constitution, p. 2-3 of the ISUE Handbook:

ARTICLE II - AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONS OF THE FACULTY

Section 1. Meetings.

A. Regular Meeting. The Faculty Council will call a regular meeting of the Faculty each April to give its annual report and to receive nominations for representatives and alternates to the Faculty Council.

ARTICLE III - ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Section 1. Membership. Each academic division will be represented by one member, the elected representative or the alternate. Two members and their alternates will be elected from the Faculty at large. In the absence of the representative, the elected alternate will be a voting member. Exofficio, non-voting members will include the President of the Evansville Campus and any other persons so designated by him.

Section 3. Formula for Representation. The elected members of the Faculty Council will be chosen as follows:

A. Divisional Representatives. Before the regular Spring Faculty Meeting, the Division Chairmen of the divisions with forthcoming vacancies on the Faculty Council will conduct an election to fill the vacancies of representatives and their alternates and will report the result of the election at the Spring Faculty Meeting.

If a seat filled by a Divisional Representative becomes vacant during the regular academic year, the Division alternate will fill the seat. The alternate shall serve out the unexpired term of the person whom he is replacing.

He shall then be eligible for election to a regular two-year term.

B. At Large Representatives. At the Spring Faculty Meeting the Chairman of the Faculty Council will call for nominations to fill the forthcoming vacancies for the Faculty at large representative and alternate to the Faculty Council.

The Chairman of the Faculty Council will prepare ballots of those nominated and distribute them to the Voting Members of the Faculty.

Each Voting Member will be entitled to one vote for each vacancy to be filled.

The Ballots will be returned within one week to the place designated by the Faculty Council. The nominee who receives the highest number of votes will be elected representative. The runner-up will be elected alternate.

If two or more candidates are tied, the tie will be broken by the tied candidates drawing lots.

A memorandum will be distributed by the Chairman of the Faculty Council to each of the Faculty members stating the names of those elected.

If a seat filled by an At Large Representative becomes vacant, the seat will be filled by the alternate until the Spring election. The alternate will serve the unexpired term if one exists. He will then be eligible for election to a regular two-year term.

Section 2 of Article VII of the Constitution calls for a general vote of the Faculty. Two weeks notification is required before a faculty vote can be held. You are thus hereby notified that the vote on the proposed constitutional amendment will take place on Friday, March 29, 1974. To vote, mark the attached sheet, enclose it in the envelope supplied, and return it to me in the Humanities Division offices on Friday, March 29, 1974 between the hours of 9:00 am. and 5:00 p.m. If you are unable to be on campus on that date or at those times, you may return your ballot to me previous to that date.

TE/sg