

Spring 2-22-1984

Senate Meeting February 22, 1984

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting February 22, 1984" (1984). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 411.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/411>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

February 22, 1984

Volume XV, No. ¹¹~~10~~

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of February 8, 1984

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEMS

Temporary Faculty Proposal (2.17.84.1)

Doctoral Proposal in School Psychology (2.22.84.1)

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee

Report on Academic Planning Process (2.10.84.1)

Faculty Affairs Committee

Policy for Employment After Retirement (2.15.84.2)

Communications

Adjournment

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

February 22, 1984

Volume XV, No. 9

Call to Order

Chairperson Ritt called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:02 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Gowdy called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of the Minutes of February 8, 1984

Mr. Eimermann mentioned that page 14, second paragraph under Faculty Affairs Committee should refer to the report distributed by the Faculty Affairs Committee on compensation arrangements for summer teaching. A further correction was, "Mr. Eimermann asked for clarification and was told by the Provost there was flexibility at the present time for such an arrangement."

XV-74

Ms. Crafts moved acceptance of the minutes of February 8, 1984, with corrections (Second, Pontius). The motion passed on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Ritt announced that the action (2/8/84) on the Academic Calendar, 1984-85 had brought forth requests from a college council and a department council that the action be rescinded. He said a motion for an action to rescind must be made by a member of the prevailing side, is debatable, and requires a two-thirds majority for passage. If he paraphrased these requests correctly, the substantive complaint was that the action of the Senate, in reducing the number of calendar days allocated for the normal conduct of classes, was an unacceptable compromise of academic standards for the sake of what might be characterized as "administrative convenience." Mr. Ritt said in his lexicon, "administrative convenience" would have been for the matter to have been kept under wraps, not to have been brought to the Senate, for the Provost to have told Admissions and Records to spend whatever was necessary to get the job done, and to take the money out of graduate assistantships. That would have constituted administrative convenience. He thought at least in this circumstance, the academic community would be well advised to count its blessings. Under present circumstances the response of the university to almost any problem had academic consequences. Every dollar spent for energy is a dollar that must be taken away from maintenance of equipment or something of that sort. Every dollar of personnel expense by Admissions and Records reduces the number of dollars to spend for graduate assistants or organized research. The shared governance process was never intended to be confrontational, but rather a means of reaching consensus and taking a wide variety of competing objectives into account. He thought that was what had happened at the February 8th meeting, that consideration had been given to all relevant factors, and that it had been done with a modicum of efficiency.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Quick had no remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Bedingfield introduced the new student body president, Jeff Charnogorsky, junior political science major, and student body vice president, Jeff Ferry, a sophomore political science major, who were elected February 21.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins announced a meeting at 3:00 p.m. Thursday, February 23, in Hayden Auditorium for the purpose of introducing the new vice president and provost. He planned also to comment on budget figures from Springfield. He asked Senate members to reserve April 14, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., for a reception of present Senate members at the President's Home. He noted that this gathering would likely assure us of a snowstorm, a high wind, or a driving rain.

Mr. Strand commented on five items: 1.) The President had accepted the report of the committee on Academic Personnel Record Keeping. Mr. Tuttle had represented the Senate on this committee. 2.) The provost's office had developed a proposal on temporary faculty which for the most part was similar to the report of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The proposal had been distributed to senate members this evening. 3.) He was reporting for senate information a change in admission requirements, that students in the second quartile of class rank (50th to 74th percentile) would need an ACT score of 14 rather than 12 to be admitted in the 1985-1986 calendar year. This change was related to admissions criteria adopted by the Academic Senate in 1979 and was based on four years of data. 4.) President Watkins and he were very supportive of the new approach to the academic planning process which would be explained by the Academic Affairs Committee during committee reports. The new approach would involve the president and the provost much earlier and more heavily in the planning process. It would streamline the process. It would clarify the relationship of planning in the Academic Senate. It would allow for the reconstitution of an Academic Planning Staff to work with the provost. Proposed members would include: the provost, the associate provost, dean of the graduate school, immediate past chairperson of the Academic Senate, a student member of the Academic Affairs Committee, and the student regent. 5.) He announced there would be appointed within the week an ad hoc committee to respond to the Board of Higher Education mandate that all public universities examine their admission requirements and turn in a status report by July 1, 1984, with a final report due July, 1985, about needed changes. Jeff Chinn would chair the committee of eight people, including representatives from the Academic Senate.

Mr. Gamsky noted that fees at the golf course had not been raised for the past seven years (Family fees had been increased four years ago) and would remain the same this year for faculty, students, and staff. Rates for the public use of the golf course would be raised.

He commented that electrical utility rates on residence halls for August were from \$23,000 to \$30,000 per week, 75% of which was for air conditioning.

Mr. Ritt pointed out that even though the March meeting might be moved up because of a Board of Regents meeting there should still be ample time for the budget committee to study the proposals presented as information items tonight and give a report at the next meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Temporary Faculty Proposal

Mr. Friedhoff said the Faculty Affairs Committee had been dealing with the issue of temporary faculty for about a year. The hearing on February 13 on the issue became somewhat muddled by the fact that there were two proposals circulating in the University. It was difficult in discussing the matter to know where people were "coming from". He questioned Mr. Strand if the proposal from the Provost's office was a working paper. Mr. Strand replied that was true with regard to the narrative, but the definitions and three sub-sections were fairly precise.

Mr. Friedhoff then deferred to Mr. Rosenbaum, who pointed out that in a clerical error in the report on page 6 and thereafter, the figure 35% should be changed to 26%. Mr. Rosenbaum said that essentially the document would allow departments greater flexibility, by allowing temporary positions. Problems in implementation would be lessened by not converting all positions in one year. A second point was that it did not specify how the administration would administer the proposal.

Mr. Ritt asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee intended to bring the item for action at the next Academic Senate meeting. Mr. Rosenbaum replied that it would not be offered in precisely the present form, but would be brought for action, although the committee had not yet taken a vote.

Mr. Strand wanted to clarify the two major differences in the proposals. First, the FAC document allowed latitude for people with terminal degrees to be employed in temporary positions if such employment could be negotiated in the department and the provost's office. He believed that was an unwise option, for it might hold out false hope. Recent history of litigation showed it was perhaps not wise to have that option available.

Second, the current practice of recommending 90% or more for tenure would have to be changed. Much more rigorous standards would have to be established.

Mr. Ritt asked if either the provost's office or the Faculty Affairs Committee had analyzed what implementation would cost in terms of converting the salaries of temporary positions into salaries for tenured positions. Neither had. Mr. Ritt suggested the Budget Committee study these concerns.

Ms. Crafts said there seemed to be a lot of loose ends and wondered if it would be wise to make this an action item at the next meeting. Mr. Ritt said ordinarily an item submitted for information at one session was

placed on the agenda as an action item at the next meeting. The Faculty Affairs Committee had the prerogative to ask the Executive Committee not to bring it to action. Or the Executive Committee could decide this on its own accord, although this would be a fairly unprecedented situation. If the proposal did appear as an action item, a motion to table was always appropriate.

Rosenbaum said the FAC proposal did not entail budgetary concerns, although implementation would be a budgetary consideration.

Mr. Mohr asked whether the proposal from the provost's office might appear as a substitute motion. Mr. Strand said he hoped that they could negotiate with the FAC, who would see the wisdom of accepting proposal from the provost's office. If that did not happen, then it would be offered as a substitution. He foresaw serious consequences in acceptance of the FAC proposal. The FAC proposal answered the hue and cry to address problems of temporary faculty, but would bring another series of actions some found unacceptable.

Mr. Eimermann asked if it was anticipated that implementation would take place with reallocation of current faculty funds or with new monies. Mr. Friedhoff responded that anytime a temporary spot was moved to a permanent or continuing line it required in almost all cases a national search with attendant costs. There was the additional problem of handling costs since the temporary faculty by and large were hired at lower salaries than those on continuing lines. It would be a matter by college as opposed to departments whether the assumption would be that a position changed from temporary to a continuing line would come in at a figure consistent with that of other faculty lines in the department. The FAC would assume no new money, although there might be variance money in departments.

If a department under the FAC proposal had people retiring--assuming that the money did not go back to the provost's office--that money could be used in the department.

Mr. Watkins explained and reiterated there was no new money! There never had been for this type of thing. What we've had for seven years had been a personnel budget that was escalated and multiplied precisely by a percentage term. There was an insufficient amount to give the raises that the Board of Regents or the governor had said would be the percentage of increase. Illinois State University and Northern Illinois University operated under different sets of rules. Temporaries did not get the same kind of raises as continuing faculty; that was how faculty got the raises as advertised by the governor. There was no new money. Only New and Expanded Program Requests (NEPR's) or Special Analytical Studies (SAS's) provided new money; there was no other way. The 7% raise was set on a 95% base.

Mr. Harden said the variance dollar was a concept used internally for "short-run" dollars. It was a percentage turnover factor--perhaps 5 or 10%--taken away before allocations for salary increases. Last year only twelve faculty positions were vacated; the others were retirements. Variance dollars were ephemeral. For example, a full professor on leave might be replaced with an assistant professor at a lesser salary. Or a continuing line might not be filled when expected and the position filled with a nine-month temporary. Variance dollars didn't last.

Mr. Strand expected the proposal to be clarified during the fall semester with policy implementation by July, 1985. Assessment of staffing plans and consideration of financial implications would have to be explored with college deans.

Questions from Mr. Reitan brought out that the FAC proposal meant the departments would decide whether a line was temporary or continuing. He further questioned how the Budget Committee could estimate costs when departmental decisions were not known. Mr. Eimermann pointed out that if he understood the Provost, leaving options to the departments was not a viable solution. Mr. Strand agreed that was correct and that the problem expressed by Senator Reitan could not be resolved.

Mr. Pritner asked which piece of paper we should be studying. We had a formal proposal from FAC committee, presented as an information item, and another statement from the provost's office, informally laid before us, with significant differences between them. Mr. Ritt said that the original proposal should be regarded as a potential action item. The Provost had made it perfectly clear that if a revision of the FAC proposal was not negotiated then he would probably submit the proposal that had been distributed as a substitute motion. Senators had the whole bag in front of them and could pick from it as they chose.

Mr. Piland had several questions about the FAC proposal: What was the proportion of temporaries in departments that had experienced enrollment growth? The first paragraph of the introduction described the problem as a series of problems. Did the committee discuss which of the proposals gave the latitude to the departments not to go along with this? Would some still exist because of differences among departments in treating the temporary situation? Mr. Rosenbaum noted the discussion of the problems on pages 2 and 3 and said some problems would remain.

Mr. Piland asked about question 9 on the last page. How would this affect the university's tenure ratio? Wouldn't we be substituting one set of problems for another? Would there be tenure caps or would there be faculty who came for six years and didn't achieve tenure? Mr. Rosenbaum said the committee had discussed the question, but thought the problems would not be quite the same nor quite as severe. Perhaps quotas were too low.

Mr. Eimermann said potentially one proposal could be read in the light of concern for use of temporary faculty. If we were going to make significant changes, this was the essential way to go. Did it necessarily imply that the provost's office believed we should change the current temporary arrangement? Alternatively, had the provost's office determined the status quo was not good and saw this as an improvement? Mr. Strand said that the provost's office had decided that the question of temporary faculty had to be addressed with substantive changes. These substantive changes proposed by the provost's office should bring us to where we should be. He did not feel that the FAC went far enough in their proposal. He believed it necessary to close out the option of employing temporary faculty with a terminal degree.

Mr. Eimmermann asked if Mr. Strand felt that the present system with cases of Ph.D.'s employed with three year caps on employment was unacceptable. Mr. Strand said that was correct for legal, educational, and other reasons.

Mr. Friedhoff also commented that most people who came up for tenure did in fact get it. The situation raised a question about shared governance, since each department, college, and URC had its own procedures and bylaws about membership on committees. If Mr. Rosenbaum's proposal were carried to the extreme of everybody on a continuing line, we could be confronted with a situation in which non-tenured faculty might well be sitting on personnel committees making decisions about tenure that could have a negative impact upon the persons sitting on the committee. Mr. Friedhoff believed there was potentially a conflict of interest.

Mr. Watkins addressed two problems. First, he didn't believe the proposal from the provost's office was in any way attempting to put the people on a probationary line. Secondly, he pointed out our propensity for tenuring people. No other institution in the regency system tenured more people than ISU. It had never in his time here been less than 88%; last spring it was 100%. If faculty attrition remained constant, departments granted tenure at the very high rate that they did now, and the ratio of temporaries went down, then it was a mathematical certainty the tenure ratio would likely rise. If that was the case, then we would solve our own problem internally or the BOR would solve it for us through imposition of some sort of tenure quota. Under either proposal we would have to bite some bullets or face the absolute certainty that there would be tenure quotas.

Mr. Rosenbaum said the revised copy of the proposal had incorporated these ideas which had been received in a letter from President Watkins. The committee thought a formal tenure quota was not the only way this could be done; departments could be encouraged toward rigorous tenure decisions.

Mr. Pazmino suggested adopting ideas from both proposals. The Faculty Affairs proposal left it up to the department to decide tenure. If a person did not make tenure, make him a lecturer rather than give him tenure. Mr. Friedhoff said a lecturer was defined as a person who did not hold a terminal degree, and asked if the term lecturer would be redefined.

Doctor of Philosophy in School Psychology (2.22.84.1)

Mr. Taylor of the Academic Affairs Committee presented the doctoral proposal in school psychology, which had previously appeared in the NEPR's in the academic plan. Copies of a synopsis had been distributed to senators; full proposals were available in the senate office, provost's office, and graduate school office. He introduced Dr. Robert

Fisher, representing the graduate schools; and from the Department of Psychology, Dr. Mark Swerdlik, Dr. Audrey Grupe, and Dr. Larry Alferink, chair. Dr. Fisher said the Psychology Department had first proposed this program to the Graduate Curriculum Committee last February. After nine meetings the Graduate Curriculum Committee had recommended it to the Graduate Council. Two outside consultants reviewed the document. Their statements were included with the full proposal.

Mr. Ritt pointed out that the consultant's report raised the question that the department did not have persons who were experienced in directing doctoral theses. In what way did the department intend to meet this problem? Dr. Alferink said several aspects needed to be understood. The proposal had not been written for distribution to external consultants but prepared as part of the academic plan. The questions raised were relevant to an accreditation process. A number of faculty members had experience with dissertations. It had been part of the NEPR proposal to seek another senior faculty member to help out in this area.

Mr. Ritt asked whether a practitioner who came out of this program would be sufficiently familiar with subject matter disciplines in the schools to be able to write IEP's--Individual Education Plans. The students should also learn something about the subject matter being taught in the schools. Had that question been addressed? Dr. Grupe answered that entrance requirements for the program meant those admitted would already be school psychologists well acquainted with school curriculum matters.

Mr. Reitan asked about the program requirement of ninety semester hours beyond the masters degree (p.2). How was it derived? Dr. Grupe answered that a person coming into the program with a master's degree might have sixty hours that could be counted toward the degree. The summary on page 28 of additional program requirements showed eighteen hours of core courses: two skill sequences totaling eighteen hours, one cognate of nine hours, and fifteen hours for the dissertation, a total of sixty hours; thirty hours beyond the master's, ninety hours beyond the bachelor's. It was a very stringent program. Among those sixty hours for the master's degree, twelve hours were allowed for internship at the master's level.

Mr. Bedingfield asked for a clarification of the budget figures on page 5. He came up with a total of \$ 169,778 rather than the \$ 177,000 that was shown. Dr. Grupe replied that changes in the budget had been made after this printing:

Commodities:	\$7,000 rather than \$2,000
Travel	\$5,913 rather than \$3,913
Telecommunications	\$11,713 rather then \$2,000

Mr. Rosenbaum asked what sort of positions required a doctoral degree. Dr. Grupe answered that we were reaching out to people in the state to upgrade their skills in school psychology and return to jobs they held. Graduates could also serve in private practice examining school age children for special placement. They would be equipped to take other positions as well. The program would meet state certification requirements. The department was getting from the field a cry to upgrade skills. Mr. Pazmino asked how much demand there was. Dr. Swerdlik said according to a needs assessment, 74% were interested in pursuing a higher degree, many specifically at this university. Dr. Alferink stated that school psychology was changing tremendously. There was a question whether

the master's degree would be replaced by the Ph.D. as the expected level of preparation.

Dr. Grupe replied to Mr. Reitan that it was really both a research degree and a practitioner degree.

Mr. Lovell said he was curious about the budget--telecommunications and contractual and implications for additional faculty lines. Dr. Grupe referred to the rationale for expenditures on page 54 through 56 of the full proposal.

Committee Reports.

Mr. Ritt deferred to Mr. Watkins, who spoke about Wayne Weber, director of TV 10 Workshop, who had died the previous day. Wayne Weber taught a practicum in TV production in which one of Mr. Watkins' sons had been a student. Although Mr. Watkins heard complaints about how tough a teacher Mr. Weber was, he soon learned that Wayne Weber was preparing his students for the real world. Wayne "adopted" his students into his family and was more than a teacher to them--he stayed with them after graduation and alerted them to job opportunities. He spent evenings with them. His students had the experience of working with a great teacher. He was a remarkable man; we shall miss him very much.

Academic Affairs

Mr. Taylor called an Academic Affairs meeting to be held after adjournment. He then noted a proposed University Policy statement distributed to senators tonight--REQUIREMENTS FOR DEGREE PROGRAMS, MAJOR, MINORS, AND SEMESTER HOURS MANDATED BY A MAJOR DEPARTMENT--and said that Professor Dammers was present to answer questions on this policy, which was formulated after the report on the baccalaureate degree was approved. Senator Miller had requested such a change so that the policy statement would conform to the statement "The Baccalaureate Degree at Illinois State University." Items A, B, C, and D were drawn from the new document on the baccalaureate degree. Items E, F, and G were taken from the old policy statement. It was moved by Miller (second, Crafts) that the date of approval of the University Policy ["Requirements for Degree Programs, Majors, Minors, and Semester Hours Mandated by a Major Department"] would be February 8, 1984 [date on which the Academic Senate approved the document "The Baccalaureate Degree at I.S.U.]. The motion passed on a voice vote. Mr. Ritt noted for the record that the Chair would insert that date.

XV-75

Mr. Taylor then called attention to the blue booklet (Abbreviated Academic Plan, 1984-89, distributed this night) and said it should give us an example of what we would have next year.

Dr. Jabker then spoke about the booklet and the memorandum from AAC about the 1985-90 academic plan. Section I would be reduced to keep the basic essence of mission statements. Section II, much like the original Section II, would be a major part of the new presentation. Section III would contain essence without excess. Section IV would contain reduced recommendations (summarized) from the program reviews. He said the abbreviated booklet would be distributed to all faculty members on Friday, February 24.

Mr. Taylor commented the briefer document would have the essence of the plan without all the chaff. It would summarize important issues. Secondly, the intention of this new process was to have both the president and the provost actively involved in the academic planning process. Also, designated staff would spearhead efforts and take care of logistical problems. This staff would replace the Academic Planning Committee who worked pretty much as an independent planning committee, without direct line responsibility to the provost or anyone else. The Academic Planning Committee would remain inactive for this year. The schedule would provide for earlier starts. The full document would be available in the office of the provost and in the Academic Senate office.

Mr. Rosenbaum questioned the meaning of the objectives, specifically "to increase the ownership of the president" and suggested an editorial change to involvement. Mr. Watkins interposed "and longevity, also."

Mr. Eimermann strongly urged that a copy of the full academic plan be deposited in departmental files as well as in the provost's and Senate offices and asked about the involvement of the Senate in this new planning process. Mr. Taylor answered that the plan would be brought to the Senate as an information item in the fall. The Senate would not be asked to vote on the plan.

Dr. Jabker noted another substantive change (time table, page 3) in that the final draft of the plan was scheduled to go to the Academic Affairs Committee on October 1 and to the Senate on December 12. Mr. Taylor pointed out that the AAC would have the responsibility for review and investigation of the document for two and a half months, and the opportunity to be more active than the Academic Planning Committee ever was. Dr. Jabker said the time schedule provided for distribution of the final discussion draft of the plan on September 1 to deans, departments, and the Academic Senate for reactions and revisions. Mr. Eimermann said the process statement and the discussion were confusing him. Previously the Senate needed to give formal approval to the entire document. Now the Senate would let the administration know only if there were strong feelings about the document. Would it be looked at solely for purposes of suggesting change? Dr. Jabker said the distribution of the final discussion draft on September 1 would provide a chance for the entire university community to have a say. As he interpreted the constitution, Senate approval of the academic plan was not required.

Mr. Eimermann said the implication seemed to be that the plan would be an administration document, with administration analyses, and administration recommendations. It would come to the Senate so that senators might be alert to anything on which they might wish to try to change the administration's mind. Dr. Jabker thought that implied an adversarial tone. The process began as Mr. Eimermann described, but was clearly more than that and reflected the honesty of the process. Mr. Eimermann recalled how the Senate struggled over precise wording for part IV of the 1984-89 plan. He failed to see any reflection of compromise wording in the abbreviated version that went to our colleagues. Mr. Strand said the presentation of the final

draft to the Senate in December was intended as an information item for dissemination only with no vote.

Mr. Ritt said he would not be chair on September 1, but would strongly recommend getting Senate consensus on the proposed changes to avoid constitutional crisis. He said the constitution clearly stated there were certain areas in which the Senate had determinate powers. Recommendations from the President were best approved by the Senate before transmittal to the Board of Regents. Dr. Jabker said he did not remember policy changes responsive to Mr. Ritt's particular concern. Mr. Ritt replied the policy changes were from a period for which there was no policy. Mr. Taylor said AAC _____ would bring this to the Senate as information, without a vote. He was aware it might be controversial. The Senate has the power to move, second, and vote if they so choose. Mr. Ritt stated the document had its origin from Provost Strand's letter about improving procedures for the academic plan. It had been in process less than a month and was a good cooperative example of streamlining something which caused no end of agony last semester.

Ms. Crafts suggested earlier dates for submission of the academic plan to the Senate. Often in the past when substantive changes were suggested, it was said to be too late to make them. Changes should be made before the December deadline when it would be too late to make such big changes. There should be time for feed-in and feed-back based on full information. Why couldn't the Senate have the final draft of the plan October 1? On a shared governance basis, the Senate could make recommendations that could be incorporated before the final document was issued on December 12, when it would be too late to change anything. Mr. Strand said there would be an attempt to confer with the Senate after September 1 on major program changes.

Mr. Eimermann noted the item had been received as a committee report, wondered what was the significance of the discussion, and questioned if there was intent to follow the time table with the first Senate discussion scheduled for December 12. Dr. Jabker answered yes. Mr. Strand said major program or policy changes would be brought to the Senate in September. Mr. Ritt thought the time table was a description of how the provost's office was going to go about the academic planning process during this coming year. Since there was generally no interaction with the Senate before fall, it was the prerogative of the provost's office to go about this as they wished. At some time between now and September 1, the Senate might want to take the Academic Affairs Committee proposal and consider it as a formal Senate item. Mr. Reitan thought it fitting that the Academic Senate review the academic plan. Since the Senate executive committee sets the agenda, the executive committee could bring the item before the Senate. Mr. Ritt pointed out that generally would not be done if the AAC did not concur.

Ms. Crafts said after the final draft was completed, the Senate should have the opportunity to review the document if we were on a shared governance basis. The administration had the right to reject Senate action, but the Senate had the responsibility to look at the academic plan very carefully. Mr. Strand pointed out that a person from the Academic Affairs Committee would serve on the Academic Planning Staff and that recent academic plans had been bigger documents than most wanted to read.

Dr. Jabker's answers to a number of questions from Ms. Balbach were that the current plan was written by staff from the provost's office; that Sections I and II were seen by the Academic Planning Committee; that Sections III and IV were presented essentially without review. The proposed procedure would give the process more visibility, with the Academic Affairs Committee responsible for screening the document and making sure the university community knew about it. The President and the Provost would have direct participation much earlier in the process.

Several senators commended and thanked the committee. The streamlined, revised process was seen as a step in the right direction.

Mr. Eimermann said the Senate clearly needed to short circuit a laborious process but was very concerned that the Senate discuss the document before December 12. He hoped the Academic Affairs Committee would study the plan more thoroughly than had been possible in the past and bring selective parts to the Senate in October and November when appropriate.

Administrative Affairs Committee. No report. Ms. Crafts announced a meeting after Senate adjournment.

Budget Committee. No report. Mr. Eimermann announced a brief meeting after Senate adjournment.

Rules Committee. No report.

Student Affairs Committee. No report.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Suggested Policy for the Employment of Faculty Following Retirement

Mr. Friedhoff reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee that the President's Committee on Faculty Development had suggested the possibility of part-time employment of faculty following their retirement. He stressed that the report needed review by the university attorney, the Provost, and the BOR and asked for ideas and criticisms. Mr. Gamsky asked about Item 7, the work load formula, which had no equal sign anywhere.

Mr. Watkins said the President has the right to reject recommendations. He had read this document as carefully as it could be read, and there was no way he could approve it. It was an absolute entitlement. As a result of that he considered it an encroachment on the management prerogatives of departments, colleges, and the university. It would entitle individuals to retire with what would be guaranteed

further employment. Item 11 guaranteed that "faculty members encompassed in this policy will not be affected by provisions in the present Financial Exigency Policy." He saw no rationale; the university should protect its active faculty, not its retirees. Item 12 on page 2 attempted to define a position on collective bargaining before collective bargaining exists. Item 3, page 3, would provide no flexibility regarding personnel money. Item 5 would expose younger faculty to the dangers of financial exigency. It would have a negative effect on active faculty. He would not approve this document.

Mr. Piland had serious reservations about items 2,3,7,8,11 and 12.

Mr. Mohr said that with compulsory retirement at age seventy, the individual had the protection of tenure until age seventy. The proposal was an attempt to get people to retire earlier than seventy.

Mr. Watkins said he could understand and applaud the intent, but when a person retired, he should retire. Very few were working beyond sixty-five, and many people were electing early retirement. He thought it would have minimal effect. Mr. Mohr said there had been a reversal of the trend to early retirement in business as inflation warmed up in the '70's'. Mr. Harden said the average retirement age at ISU is sixty-three.

Mr. Lovell asked if we could applaud the concept and encourage the committee to come back to the Senate with revised recommendations.

Ms. Crafts said at Ohio the faculty could take the option of early retirement and teach part-time until age seventy. She saw need for further investigation. Mr. Reitan said real entitlement was the entitlement to teach full-time until seventy. Could we make it possible for a person to taper off and retire gradually?

Mr. Watkins said he was not unsympathetic with Mr. Mohr's comments, but there was not a department that wouldn't have young faculty affected. Such employment ought to be a matter of judgement between the department and the individual.

Communications

Mr. Eimermann said members of the political science department had received anti-Semitic literature in their mailboxes and wondered if any other people had received such material.

XV-76 Mr. Pazmino moved to adjourn (second, Gowdy). The motion passed on a voice vote. The Senate adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Laura E. Gowdy

Illinois State University

The Graduate School

February 6, 1984

TO: Dr. Robert Ritt
Chairperson of the Academic Senate

FROM: Charles A. White *Charles A. White*

RE: Doctoral proposal in School Psychology

The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit to the Academic Senate the proposal for a doctoral degree program in School Psychology and to seek the Senate's approval.

The proposal has been under consideration by the Graduate Council since February, 1983. There have been several substantive discussions between the Curriculum Committee of the Graduate Council and members of the faculty of the Psychology Department. The proposal has been revised extensively and several times since it was placed on the Curriculum Committee agenda. The proposal was considered twice by the Graduate Council following a favorable recommendation by the Curriculum Committee, once as an information item and once as an action item. The Council approved the proposal at its January 19, 1984 meeting. Your attention is particularly directed to the two "outside" consultants' reports and their recommendations which are in the Appendix of the proposal.

Please call upon me and members of the Department of Psychology for any assistance that we might provide. Copies of the proposal are available in the Graduate School, Provost's office, and the Senate office. Nine copies are for the members of the Academic Affairs Committee.

CAW/gc

xc - Attached to each copy of the proposal

COLLEGE: Arts and Sciences

TITLE: Doctor of Philosophy in School Psychology

TOTAL NEW STATE RESOURCES REQUESTED: \$177,000

The Department of Psychology requests new state resources to offer a Ph.D. in School Psychology. In this proposed program, the historical importance of Illinois State University's leadership in preparing school psychologists at the master's level is naturally extended to assure doctoral proficiency to such practitioners. Currently, no other university in Illinois offers the doctorate in school psychology. This program will emphasize the breadth of education necessary to prepare school psychologists for the range of demands made in the schools. The request is for new faculty, graduate assistants, and support services.

Proposed Budget:

Personnel	\$111,195
Equipment	42,930
Commodities	2,000
Travel	3,913
Contractual Services	7,740
Telecommunications	2,000
Total	\$177,000

Historically, Illinois has been a leader in the practice of school psychology; moreover, Illinois State University has been a leader in the training of school psychologists at the master's degree level. However, despite the state's record of leadership in recognizing the importance of school psychologists, Illinois is one of only two of the eight surrounding states which does not have a doctoral program in school psychology. As a consequence, many Illinois residents who desire advanced preparation must attend a program in a neighboring state.

Over the past five years, an increasing percentage of professionals have been prepared at the doctoral rather than at the master's level. By 1987, the ratio is expected to reach 40 percent. This level of preparation has become increasingly important because the knowledge and skills required for effective practice of school psychology are increasing steadily. The field has undergone tremendous change over the last 15 years; scientific and technological advances have occurred in many different aspects of school psychology. Whereas the traditional role of the school psychologist has been to assess children for special education placement, there is an increasing demand for the school psychologist to serve as a consultant to teachers, administrators and parents, and to serve as a therapist, researcher, program developer, and evaluator in the schools. The school psychologist is expected to improve the educational experience and meet the mental health needs of all school children, not just evaluate the 10 to 15 percent who are suspected of having special needs.

Further need for doctoral-level training is suggested in the Standards for Providers of Psychological Services promulgated by the American Psychological Association (APA), the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), and the Illinois Department of Registration and Education. The APA standards advocate recognition of the doctoral degree as the minimum credential needed for recognition as a Professional Psychologist. Although NASP currently recognizes the 60-hour specialist degree for an entry-level position in school psychology, the Association also has developed doctoral-training standards and advocates pursuing this degree.

The Illinois School Psychologists Association (ISPA) distributed a needs assessment survey to approximately 600 practicing school psychologists in Illinois. Of the 343 respondents who were practicing school psychologists without a doctoral degree and who were not enrolled in a doctoral degree program, 150 indicated they would apply now for a doctoral program in school psychology if one were available in Illinois, 105 said they would apply to such a program at some future date. The obvious implication of such data is that many practicing school psychologists feel a need for advanced training and would like to pursue it in Illinois.

Structurally, the doctoral program will be built upon the scientist-practitioner model. The primary goal will be to provide an opportunity for further development of the ability of the students to apply scientific methods toward the resolution of professional problems. The proposed program will provide both a theoretical and applied focus stressing the development of research skills and providing better skills for clinical and educational practice.

Only applicants with a master's degree or equivalent preparation in school psychology will be admitted to the program, and each must have completed an internship or a similar experience. The program will require a minimum of 90 semester hours; however credit may be given for a maximum of 60 semester hours of coursework completed at the master's or specialist level, where such courses are the equivalent of courses required of all students. It is highly likely that most students will take approximately 60 hours to complete the doctoral program requirements including the dissertation over two years of full-time or four years of part-time study. The hour requirements of the program are consistent with the standards of the accrediting agencies and school psychology doctoral programs at other universities.

Requirements for the program include required courses totalling 48 hours spread across the following foundation areas: biological, cognitive, social and individual behavior; scientific and professional ethics and standards; measurement; statistics; research design; and program evaluation. Advanced coursework in selected skill sequences such as assessment, intervention, program evaluation, and supervision will provide graduates with a breadth of training necessary to function effectively in a wide range of school psychology conditions. In addition, students will be expected to select cognate areas of study in other departments, such as, special education, and curriculum and instruction. This will provide an interdisciplinary perspective and increase the range of knowledge which is applicable to the profession.

A written comprehensive preliminary exam covering the basic required courses, cognate areas, and skill sequences of the student's program will be required. A dissertation, an oral exam and a language or research requirement beyond the statistics core and dissertation are also required. To fulfill the language or research requirement, a student may choose the mastery of a foreign language or the completion of a computer or advanced research and statistics sequence. Residency requirements will be established in accord with the Graduate School requirements for other Ph.D. programs, emphasizing flexibility to meet the needs of individual students.

The new funds will include \$111,195 for personnel, including a senior-level faculty member with dissertation experience (\$36,325) to meet accreditation standards. An additional junior faculty member with a doctorate in school psychology and experience in the public schools will be needed to staff new courses and supervise dissertations. New personnel will include a half-time Secretary II position to staff the expanded psychological services center, and will include five doctoral-level graduate assistants. Other new monies will be expended for equipment (\$42,930) to purchase a data/word processor with hard disk drive for the records keeping and report typing functions of the psychological services center; commodities (\$2,000), travel (\$3,913), contractual services (\$7,740), and telecommunications (\$2,000). Some additional funds will also be needed in the remaining years to cover such costs as commodities.