

file

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY EVANSVILLE

8600 University Boulevard
EVANSVILLE, INDIANA 47712

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: ALL FACULTY MEMBERS

DATE: October 8, 1979

FROM: Richard Mussard, Chairman, Faculty Council

SUBJECT: Agenda Items

AGENDA #4

1. Approval of the minutes of September 28, 1979.
2. Counting of the ballots on the Constitutional Question
3. Remarks of the Chairman in response to Dr. Edwards' comments regarding the Chairman's Memorandum to President Rice concerning the pending dispensation of the 1978-79 Council's recommendation of a change in class withdrawal policy.
4. Announcements and Questions.
5. Election of a new Chairman for the Economic Benefits Committee
6. Request that the Economic Benefits Committee consider the invitation of the Vanderburgh County Medical Association to submit letters in support of studies of a complete health benefits package. (cf. the minutes of 1978-79, Session #16, Item 2).
7. New Business

RM/bac

SESSION #4
MINUTES OF THE 1979-80
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS

Time: October 12, 1979; 2:00 P.M., Library - 100

Members Present: Richard Mussard, Chairman; Professors Bennett, Edwards, Gehring, Kinsey, Robinson, Shaw, Waitman, Kinzie (for J. A. Davis)

Ex-officio Present: President Rice, Vice President Bennett, Vice President Reid

Others Present: Dr. Jones, Dr. Dunn, Dr. Sands, Ms. Weinzapfel, Mr. Deem, Dr. Rivers, Dr. Blevins, Mr. Sclarencio

1. Minutes of September 28, 1979, were approved as amended.
2. Counting of the ballots regarding the constitutional question of whether Faculty Council representatives may run for two consecutive terms.

The ballots were counted, resulting in this final tally:
YES - 50 votes NO - 20 votes

Professor Mussard stated that the next step was for President Rice to inform the Board of Trustees of the faculty's decision, and to ask the Board to ratify the constitutional change.

3. Professor Mussard announced that John Ficks, whom the Council had elected as chairman of the Economic Benefits Committee, has resigned from the chairmanship and the committee. Nominations were therefore opened for the election of a new chairman for this committee. Professor Shaw nominated Andy Jorgensen; it was moved and seconded that nominations be closed; the motion carried.
4. Professor Mussard asked for the committee's thoughts about having the Economic Benefits Committee look into the invitation given by the Vanderburgh County Medical Association to submit letters supporting studies of a complete health benefits package. (cf. the Faculty Council minutes of May 2, 1979, Session #16, Item 2). After some explanation by President Rice, Professor Mussard said that with the Council's approval he would ask the Economic Benefits Committee to inquire into the matter.
5. Professor Mussard then responded to Professor Edwards' remarks made regarding Professor Mussard's memo of October 3, 1979, to President Rice, which memo Professor Mussard requested be made part of these October 12, 1979, minutes. (See attached sheets for the memo from Professor Mussard to President Rice, and for Professor Mussard's complete response to Professor Edwards.)

President Rice responded with two brief observations: (1) recently the College Guidance Counselor at North High School had told him that he had heard nothing but praise from two campuses in the state--Purdue University at West Lafayette and ISUE--because at both schools students were given the chance to work out their problems; (2) that a student needed to receive feedback from his professor before the deadline for withdrawal occurred, a consideration he found absent from the Faculty Council's resolution on withdrawal; (3) that during the past 20 years he knew of two institutions which shortened their withdrawal deadlines and suffered consequences that they took years to overcome, the University of Illinois, two years, and Franklin College, four years.

Professor Mussard replied that the 1978-79 Faculty Council had indeed considered the need for students to find out how they were doing in a course before the withdrawal deadline is passed. He added that the Council certainly expected some student criticism, but that the faculty believed it should bear its appropriate, primary responsibility in this matter, and thus take action to ensure earlier and more genuine student commitment to their courses.

Professor Edwards suggested that the Faculty Council address the issue of agenda item #3 rather than the issue of withdrawal which was handled during the 1978-79 Faculty Council year.

Professor Mussard concurred and passed the Chairmanship to Professor Gehring in order that he, Professor Mussard, might enter into the debate on withdrawal policy, and the role of the Council.

Professor Edwards stated that the purpose of the Faculty Council is to improve various aspects of communicating faculty needs to the administration. Professor Edwards suggested that the role of the Council should be that of a Management Committee--we have to consider and recommend. He also felt that the Council should set up a system in which the administration responds to their requests within 60 or 90-day period. If an issue has not been acted upon during this time, an interim report should be sent to the Council indicating the status of the issue.

Professor Gehring stated his concern about Professor Edwards' protests raised during the previous Council meeting against what Professor Edwards termed the "adversarial" nature of Professor Mussard's October 3, 1979, memo to President Rice. Professor Gehring feared that Professor Edwards' complaints might in turn initiate an adversarial situation within the Council itself.

President Rice said that he saw a financial danger in Professor Mussard's sending to President Landini a copy of the October 3rd memo. He explained that Purdue and Indiana University branch campuses usually refer important issues to the main campuses for resolution, and pay a 5% tax on their total budgets for this service. President Rice asserted that the ISUE administration has effectively argued that most of the significant problems arising on the Evansville campus can be solved without recourse to Terre Haute, thereby holding ISUE's fee for consulting with the main campus to about \$20,000.

Professor Mussard answered that he saw financial danger lying elsewhere--one legal settlement already made by the university and another perhaps in the offing, because of the administration's failure to follow faculty advice.

Professor Howard Dunn stated that he favored keeping ISUE problems on our own campus, that everyone--students, faculty, and administrators--would benefit if they could be resolved here. He added, however, that during his years at ISUE the administration's responses had been terribly slow, so that after a while a person feels that he has to go off campus to get satisfactory answers.

Professor Robinson then posed a series of questions to Professor Mussard and the Council. First Professor Robinson asked Professor Mussard why he had sent a copy of his October 3rd memo to an "outside source", President Landini. Professor Mussard said that he had been angered by Dr. Reid's delay in responding, and had mentioned his frustration to President Landini when he had invited the President to give his State of the University Address on the Evansville campus. So he sent a copy of the memo to President Landini to keep him informed of the situation's progress.

Professor Robinson then inquired of Professor Mussard whether it would be the Council's future policy to send all or any of our internal communications to President Landini. Professor Mussard answered that he was not recommending that we send all of our messages to President Landini. Professor Mussard added that President Landini told him that he, President Landini, would be obliged to mention to the ISUE administration that the issue had been raised with him. Professor Mussard replied to President Landini that he would be addressing the issue on the Evansville campus, and that he would send President Landini a copy of his statement.

Then Professor Robinson asked whether or not the Council thought it appropriate to address an outside source with our internal communications. Professor Mussard stated that he would consider it most dangerous to restrict Council messages.

Dr. Reid stated that responses were repeatedly made to the Faculty Council regarding the grading system. Dr. Reid also reminded the Faculty Council that during the 1978-79 session, the Faculty and Academic Affairs Committee took it upon themselves as a charge from the Faculty Council to make a study of the grading system, including the plus-minus aspects. Dr. Reid felt that we need to involve the student body in the decision about the withdrawal deadline. And Dr. Reid added that the Council had not given him sufficient rationale and data to support its resolution about withdrawal.

To this assertion Professor Thomas Rivers responded that the Council had studied the withdrawal issue from varied perspectives, finding that the main argument against shortening the deadline derived from students' wishes to preserve their grade point averages, thus having little to do with the standard reasons usually given for opposing a change in the withdrawal period. He explained that the Council had found the most significant evidence in favor of reducing the withdrawal time to be professors' year-in, year-out experience with the motivational effect of the 12-week deadline on their students. And he contended that professors' perceptions of this effect in their classrooms does constitute significant rationale and data.

Professor Edwards moved that the Council: (1) take exception to Professor Mussard's October 3rd memo, that is, to declare that the memo does not represent the views of the Faculty Council; (2) define its role to ensure that this Council functions in the interest of the faculty it represents; and (3) instruct the chairman that in speaking for the Faculty Council, he must do so within the parameters and spirit of the Council's defined role.

Professor Robinson seconded the motion's first point. Professor Gehring, acting Council chairman, determined that a consensus existed within the Council that Professor Mussard's October 3rd memo did not speak for the Council, instead representing Professor Mussard's own view. Lacking a second for the rest of his motion, Professor Edwards withdrew it.

Professor Robinson moved that the Council direct Professor Mussard that when he is addressing an outside source, and is expressing views that may not reflect those of a consensus or a majority of the Council, that he refrain from using his title, Chairman of the Faculty Council. Professor Edwards seconded.

Acting Council Chairman Gehring reacted by stating that he considered Professor Robinson's motion to be illegal, and therefore null and void, and so he could not recognize it as being legitimate.

But extensive discussion ensued anyway, including the following statements:

- (1) Professor Edwards urged several times that the Council suspend discussion of Professor Robinson's motion until Robert's Rules of Order could be consulted to determine whether Acting Chairman Gehring was ruling properly in refusing to recognize Professor Robinson's motion.
- (2) Professor Carl Sclarencio pointed out that defining an external source was very difficult, since, for instance, President Rice's position as a vice-president of the whole university might conceivably designate him to be a source outside the ISUE structure.

Professor Sclarencio also remarked that in view of the fact that ISU and ISUE share a common Board of Trustees and a common set of university-wide officers, it seemed questionable whether ISUE could be regarded as a separate entity in relation to which a Terre Haute official could be considered an "outside source."

- (3) President Rice stated that Professor Mussard should examine past minutes of the Council to find a basis for the initiative he took in the October 3rd memo.
- (4) Professor Waitman commented that precedent constituted binding authority only in legal matters, and did not represent absolute authority in non-legal contexts. He contended that precedent was continuously being set, and that the Council was attempting to do so at the present.
- (5) Professor Shaw admitted that she held reservations about the adversarial tone of Professor Mussard's October 3rd memo, though she stated that she had no wish to censure Professor Mussard, or to try to keep him from using his title, Chairman of the Faculty Council.
- (6) Professor David Kinsey asserted that he disagreed with Professor Robinson's motion, because he did not want to sit in judgment on Professor Mussard, and would not be able to control Professor Mussard or his written expression even if he wanted to.
- (7) Responding to Professor Dunn's observation that Dr. Reid and Professor Mussard had both been adequately reprimanded in the course of this Faculty Council meeting, Professor Robinson withdrew his motion.

Professor Glenn Kinzie moved that the meeting be adjourned at 4:17 p.m.; Professor Robinson seconded; meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael D. Waitman

Michael D. Waitman
Faculty Council Secretary
11/2/79