

Indiana State University Evansville

8600 University Boulevard
Evansville, Indiana 47712

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: ALL FACULTY MEMBERS
FROM: John Gottcent
Chairperson, Faculty Council
SUBJECT: Meeting

DATE: 1-17-83

SESSION #10

The next meeting of the Faculty Council will be held on Friday, January 21, from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m., in Room L-100.

AGENDA

1. Minutes from January 7 (Bigham)
2. Announcements
3. Remaining Items in Package of Curricular Petitions dated 12-3-82
4. Report from Grievance Committee dated 12-16-82
(Council members see related attachment)
5. Concerns Regarding Remedial Instruction (Gottcent)
6. Reports
7. New Business
8. Adjournment

SESSION #10
MINUTES OF THE 1982-83
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS

Time: Friday, January 21, 1983; 3:00 P.M. in L-100

Members Present: John Gottcent, Chairman; Professors D. Bigham,
L. Goss, A. Jorgensen, K. Kim, C. Petranek,
B. Thayer

Ex-Officio Present: Vice President Reid

Others Present: Professor Hopkins

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 P.M., after which the minutes of the January 7 (Session #9) meeting were approved as amended.
2. Announcements
 - a. The next meeting will be February 11, from 3:00 to 4:30 P.M. in L-100.
 - b. The chair noted the holding of a conference on urban universities in the twenty-first century, to be held the first week of March at the University of Akron. Professors Petranek and Bigham had expressed interest in attending. Other interested faculty were urged to contact Professor Gottcent.
 - c. Dr. Reid indicated no further developments on the proposed change in the university calendar. Professor Jorgensen added that such information would be more readily available if Academic Notes from ISU, as opposed to ISU's University Notes, were more widely distributed.
 - d. Dr. Reid stated that the Governor's Budget agency had recommended a flat percentage increase (5 percent) for all public universities, as opposed to the more flexible approach suggested by the Commission on Higher Education.
3. Curricular Petitions of December 3, 1982
 - a. The new and modified courses in English and Business had not yet been received. Professor Gottcent added that he had discussed the relationship between approval of programs and receipt of petitions for courses in those programs with Professor Pohl, who had commented that it was the practice of the Curricular Committee (see Handbook, 3-20, part III, last sentence) to approve programs even if course petitions had not been received. Such approval authorized proceeding with the planning of programs, but not the actual implementation of the programs. All new and modified courses had to be approved before a new or modified program could be offered to students.
 - b. On that basis, members of the Council moved to take off the table the new program in Computer Information Systems. After brief discussion, a motion to approve the program was passed, with two negative votes.

- c. The Council subsequently took off the table the proposed M.S. in Industrial Management. In the discussion which followed the motion to approve the program, Professor Jorgensen urged caution in the offering of graduate programs, noting that in this particular program persons with only master's degrees would be teaching master's degree candidates. Professor Gottcent inquired if the faculties of Business and Engineering Technology were not already overburdened. Dr. Reid responded that the degree was designed for employed professionals, that it was logical, given the mission of ISUE, to design a program using Business and Technology personnel, that the program competed with neither the MBA nor the Industrial Technology degree, and that faculty for the program would comprise staff from the Evansville and Terre Haute campuses and adjuncts from industries in the Evansville area. Professor Goss thought the addition of new faculty via the program would relieve the present work load of the Technology faculty. Dr. Reid added that the program was currently in a state of hold with the Commission for Higher Education, and responded to Professor Petranek's question about the need for graduate courses at ISUE by stating that the Board had urged greater cooperation between the two campuses in this regard, and encouraged the Evansville campus to develop courses and programs where the Terre Haute campus did not have the resources to do so. Approval of the M.S. in Industrial Management program by the Commission this spring might allow its implementation in the fall of 1983. Professor Goss added that the Engineering Technology faculty supported the proposed program.

After Professor Jorgensen's motion to table discussion died for lack of a second, the motion to approve the program was passed, with one dissenting vote.

4. Report from the Grievance Committee (December 16, 1982)

Professor Gottcent noted that all members of the Council had received copies of the minutes of the Grievance Committee meetings of December 8, 13, and 16, 1982, as well as a cover memo from Professor Dyer, the committee chair, dated December 16. The Grievance Committee had been requested to investigate the complaint of Professor Hopkins that his removal from the acting chair of the Sociology Department had been unjustified. On the basis of its discussions in three meetings and its meeting with Professor Hopkins, it had voted to deny the petition for a grievance. Professor Gottcent also noted that Professor Hopkins had sent a memo to the Council on January 7 in which he appealed the decision of the Committee, alleging procedural and substantive violations.


After Professor Gottcent ruled that removal of members of the Council was out of order, a motion to accept the Committee report was introduced and seconded. The chair ruled that discussion be limited to thirty-five minutes. In the discussion which followed, several members expressed confusion about the precise nature of the grievance. It was also noted that according to the By-laws (Article III, Section 3), a faculty member could file an appeal of a committee decision with the Council within two weeks of the committee's report being filed with the Council. (One school of thought was that the report was filed when it was forwarded to the Council chair and secretary, and hence Professor Hopkins's memo of January 7 constituted the appeal, which was being considered during the January 21 meeting. Another school of thought was that the filing of the report did not occur until the Council formally acknowledged receipt of the report. The Council chair promised a clarification by the next meeting.) In response to Professor Hopkins's allegations about what he considered the "chaotic" state of the Grievance Committee, Professor Bigham reviewed the origins of the committee and the procedures outlined in the By-laws, and Professor Gottcent noted that because of the wide variety of potential grievances, the Grievance Committee needed to utilize a flexible approach, and consider each case individually rather than imposing a rigid set of rules. In

response to Hopkins's complaint that the Grievance Committee had examined only the evidence which he had introduced, several members of the Council stated that further investigation would have occurred if he had convinced the Grievance Committee that the grounds for a grievance existed. Professor Goss and several others commented that the Grievance Committee had done a thorough job, and Professor Jorgensen inquired whether a faculty member had the right to retain a position which lacked official status. (See Handbook, page 3-22, parts IV and VI.)

After debate was extended for five minutes, the Council voted to accept the report of the Committee, with one abstention.

The remainder of the agenda was postponed until the next meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Darrel Bigham
Secretary, Faculty Council
February 11, 1983