

Fall 11-17-1982

Senate Meeting, November 17, 1982

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, November 17, 1982" (1982). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 531.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/531>

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)

November 17, 1982

Volume XIV, No. 5

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of November 3, 1982

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Search Committee Election - Dean of the College of Applied Science and
Technology - two students (11.3.82.1)

Committee Nominations

Sequence in Industrial Accounting (10.26.82.1)

Scope and Mission Statements - University and College - ISU 1983-1988
Academic Plan (10.28.82.1)

Academic Planning Priorities - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (10.28.82.2)

Changes Proposed by the University Review Committee for Inclusion in the
1983 ASPT Document (3.31.82.1)

Financial Exigency Procedures (10.12.82.1)

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University
community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion
with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do
so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

November 17, 1982

Volume XIV, No. 5

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tuttle at 7 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Varner called the roll and announced that a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of November 3, 1982

XIV-27

On page 8, paragraph 3, Ms. Gowdy said DFSC should be CFSC. On page 9, paragraph 3, Mr. Ritt asked to have the word "asking" deleted from his response in the second sentence. On a motion by Mr. Bruin (seconded by Ms. Pager) the minutes of the November 3, 1982, meeting were approved, as corrected, on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Tuttle reminded members of the Senate that forms were available to be used for any motions or amendments members might wish to make.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Bruin had no remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins said that he, Provost Boothe, Vice President Strand, and Assistant Vice President Harden had attended the annual session, November 8, with the staff of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, for a hearing on the University's request for funding for FY-84. There was very little reaction by the BHE staff to the presentation--either negative or positive. At the BHE meeting on November 9, seven segments of higher education presented budget requirements for the coming year. The mood was much the same. There were no questions and no reactions. Dr. Frank Matsler had made a good presentation on behalf of the Regency Universities.

Mr. Gamsky detailed for the Senate the process by which student fees are determined. Student groups, such as the Association of Residence Halls and the Black Student Union, make recommendations to the Vice President for Student Affairs who then makes recommendations to the President. The only increase proposed for next year is a \$1.50 Health Service fee to purchase an X-ray machine. There will be no change in the activity, athletic, or recreation fee. For the third year in a row ISU has had the lowest increase in student fees and, at the same time, has been able to enhance such things as housing facilities. The matter of an increase in tuition was a separate issue and that decision would be made by the Board of Regents.

Mr. Strand presented information on the FY-83 operating budget. Tables provided information on the total operating funds by source of income, appropriated funds

by object class, and appropriated funds by functional classification. Each chart was accompanied by a page of definitions.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Kroner was absent.

ACTION ITEMS:

Search Committee Election - Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology - two students (11.3.82.1)

On the first ballot, Robert Anliker, a junior in Industrial Education, and Kathy McClure, a senior in Criminal Justice Sciences, were elected.

Committee Nominations

- XIV-28 Mr. Brickell, Rules Committee Chairperson, moved approval of the nominations for the SCERB University Hearing Panel: Robert Bradley, Political Science; Don Samdahl, Industrial Technology; and William Morgan, English. All are nominated for terms that end in 1984. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frahm and passed on a voice vote. The nominations will be forwarded to President Watkins for his appointment.

Sequence in Industrial Accounting (10.26.82.1)

Dr. James Hallam, Accounting Department Chairperson, and Dr. Everett Israel, Industrial Technology Department Chairperson, were invited to the table.

- XIV-29 Mr. Eggan, Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson, moved that the Senate approve the Sequence in Industrial Accounting (seconded by Ms. Andrejek).

Mr. Eggan explained that a draft of the 1983-1984 catalog copy had been distributed. It would replace item 7 on the request for approval form distributed before the November 3 meeting. The catalog draft delineates three sequences available under the accounting major (no longer a comprehensive major). The proposal is now much cleaner.

Mr. Friedhoff said that it was refreshing to note the inter-collegiate cooperation represented in the development of this sequence. However, he noted the following concerns. Very few students could go into Math 121 without taking Math 120. Many students would need an additional seven hours over those required which would mean taking more than 120 hours to graduate. The physics course required had been selected because it was four hours even though a more advanced course might be more appropriate. This one was a high school level course. This would be a disservice to students going into it under the impression that the course would enable them to interact with engineers. While it had been reported that students and parents like a highly structured program, the University was not educating parents but students. One of the things in being a university student is learning to make decisions. The program lacks flexibility. Technical education should begin at the graduate level. The undergraduate program should be broader. The Board of Regents has stated that no major should take more than 120 hours. This would fly in the face of that position. The program was available now without the approval of the sequence except it would not be indicated as a degree on the student's transcript.

XIV-30 In view of all these factors, Mr. Friedhoff moved to table the proposal (seconded by Ms. Landre). Mr. Tuttle noted that this motion was not debatable. As a point of order, Mr. Eggan asked if it was in order to have presented such a long preamble to the motion to table. Mr. Tuttle said it was in order. On a roll call vote, the motion to table was defeated on a vote of 8:33:4.

XIV-31 Mr. Ritt moved that the transfer of credit hour production from the Department of Accounting to the Department of Industrial Technology, as a result of this sequence, shall be segregated; this data shall be available to the Provost and to the Needs and Priorities Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Allen.

Mr. Ritt said the Budget Committee had given him approval to present this motion for the committee for the following reason: There is no way to determine in advance what implication this sequence will have on resources because we do not know what the enrollment in this sequence will be. Flow-over credit hour production from Accounting to Industrial Technology would result in more courses in IT. Where the resources will come from would have to be decided at a later date. There is a need for accurate record keeping to help in making that decision. The work could be done without difficulty or much cost. Mr. Eggan said he was unclear as to how this program will cause transfer of hours from Accounting to Industrial Technology. There will be 48 hours in the College of Business in this program; in the other accounting sequences there were 54 and 55. The College of Business would give up 6 credit hours. Did Mr. Ritt want to keep track of six hours? Mr. Taylor pointed out that the mechanism for analyzing the cost factors did exist now. The hours could be accounted for without a motion from the Senate. Mr. Ritt said he had not realized it would be only six hours.

The motion was defeated on a voice vote.

In further discussion, Mr. Eggan pointed out that while some students would take Math 121 (and the required prerequisite Math 120) better students could take Math 115 and be able to complete the requirements for this sequence in four years. Other students will know ahead of time that it will take longer. With the proposed sequence students would be able to take courses in the proper sequence. The University Studies requirements provided for a liberal arts background and the motivation to continue one's education.

Mr. Wright said he applauded Dr. Hallam and Dr. Israel for developing this program. He was concerned that there were only two hours of electives. Mr. Hallam said that he did not expect a flock of students to enroll in the sequence, perhaps because there was not enough freedom. He further pointed out that in all departments in the College of Business students could elect either Math 115 or Math 121. This program was consistent with the current math requirement.

Mr. Frahm noted that Physics 105 had been underrated by Mr. Friedhoff. The course was not a high school course. It would not prepare students to interface with engineers as well as Physics 110/111 would. It would be difficult to properly prepare someone for these competencies within the 120 hours of this sequence. Was there any reason why this program could not be done in an informal way?

Dr. Hallam said that in order for the program to appear on a student's transcript, it had to be approved by the Senate and the Board of Regents.

Dr. Israel pointed out that Physics 105 provided a sufficient overview. It was not designed to prepare engineers but to prepare students to communicate with engineers.

Mr. Brickell felt that students should have the expectation to have a reasonable chance of finishing a program in four years. There was very little flexibility in the program; students would need more than 120 to be able to take the CPA examination; he would like to see the program reworked to include more electives.

- XIV-32 Mr. Watkins noted that the subject had been well covered and moved the previous question. The motion to close debate was seconded by Mr. White and passed on a voice vote.

On a roll call vote, the Sequence in Industrial Accounting was approved 31:13:1.

Scope and Mission Statements - University and College - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (10.28.82.1)

Chairperson Tuttle invited Dr. Gene Jabker, Associate Provost, to the table for the debate on this business item and the next business item.

- XIV-33 Mr. Eggan moved the Senate accept Section I of the Academic Plan for 1983-1988, dated November 12, 1982, as distributed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. Eggan said the Senate had received Sections I, II, and V (section V, Statistical Data, did not require Senate approval). The draft of Section I, dated November 12, 1982, was much cleaner than the previous draft. Some sections had been rewritten to incorporate changes recommended by the Senate at the November 3 meeting. Someone from the English department would edit the document following Senate approval.

Mr. Friedhoff asked how the data in Section V was looked at, particularly the figures showing how many major were in a department and the number who were graduated. Dr. Jabker responded that they were looked at very carefully, particularly with reference to the program reviews which were part of Section IV.

The motion to approve Section I, Scope and Mission Statements, passed on a voice vote.

Academic Planning Priorities - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (10.28.82.2)

- XIV-34 Mr. Eggan moved the Senate approve the November 12, 1982, draft of Section II, Academic Planning Priorities, as distributed. Mr. Hobbs seconded the motion.

Mr. Eggan said some minor changes incorporated in this draft tried to address the concerns expressed two weeks ago.

Mr. Friedhoff felt that with a heavy teaching load, high student/faculty ratio, and service commitments, it would be difficult for faculty to keep up with their field, not even to mention a move to another area, to be responsible for their own development (page 13). Dr. Jabker pointed out that this section should be read in conjunction with the Problems section. The priorities were intended as responses to the problems delineated.

Mr. Reitan questioned a statement on page 11, and asked whether the University really expects a larger share of the students entering the university to be at the senior college level. Dr. Jabker said it was difficult to accurately predict numbers, but older students were coming back and problems were beginning to occur. These trends are noted under "Profile Trends" on page 4. Mr. Reitan felt this section could be made more explicit.

Mr. Mohr felt "professional obsolescence" was a better term than "greying of the professoriate" (page 13). Mr. Jabker said the phrase was used as a citation. Mr. Mohr said he would like to see a different phrase used.

The motion to approve Section II passed on a voice vote.

Changes Proposed by the University Review Committee for Inclusion in the 1983 ASPT Document (3.31.82.1)

Mr. Tuttle invited Dr. Stephen E. Meckstroth, Chair of the University Review Committee (URC) to the table.

Mr. Schmaltz, Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson, said it was his intention to present this item in six (6) parts, as outlined in the summary prepared by the URC and appended to the November 3 Senate minutes, then present the entire document which contained other minor revisions. In response to a question by Mr. McCracken, proposed changes relating to the document itself could be considered.

XIV-35 Mr. Schmaltz moved approval of change 1: University Review Committee, University Appeals Committee, and College Faculty Status Committees should be elected by April 15 (Section I-C), and the Department Faculty Status Committee by May 1 (Section I-C). The motion was seconded by Mr. Weegar.

Mr. Schmaltz said the only concern raised about this change was that the departments would be electing members to the DFSC before new faculty would be on campus and they would not have a chance to vote. However, new faculty would not know anyone anyway at the beginning of the Fall semester. The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) unanimously supported this change. In response to a question, Mr. Schmaltz said the changes would be in effect for the upcoming ASPT deliberations.

Mr. Egan asked if faculty on sabbatical in the Spring would not be disenfranchised. Mr. Schmaltz noted that it would not be worse than for faculty on leave in the Fall under the current policy.

Mr. Pritner asked if the DFSC could be elected prior to May 1. They could. Mr. Egan asked if faculty on leave in the Spring could be elected. They could be if they were eligible for election.

The motion passed on a voice vote with several abstentions noted.

XIV-36 Mr. Schmaltz moved approval of 2: to increase the term of office for the University Review Committee to three years (II-A) and the term of University Appeals Review Committee to three years (III-A). In section III-A a fourth sentence following ".....for three-year staggered terms," the following should be added: "Members shall continue on a particular case until that case is resolved." The motion was seconded by Mr. Woodson, and supported by the FAC.

In response to a question by Mr. McCracken, Dr. Meckstroth said those currently serving would complete their terms, but all the logistics have not been worked out. The URC would work on this once the changes were approved by the Senate. Mr. Tuttle asked Dr. Meckstroth to provide the Senate with a copy of the plan worked out by the URC.

The motion passed on a voice vote with several abstentions noted.

XIV-37 Mr. Schmaltz moved approval of 3: Equity reviews will normally be conducted by the CFSC in cooperation with the DFSC. These reviews shall take place when

the CFSC determines that such a review would be appropriate (II-D/IV-E/V-F). Each CFSC may allow a department to use up to 10% of regular line raise money for equity adjustments if the department shows justification for this need (IV-E-5/X-A-3). The URC reserves the right to conduct a University wide equity review whenever it determines that such a review would be appropriate (II-D). Reserves may be held back in years in which a University faculty salary equity review is conducted by the URC (X-A-3). The motion was seconded by Mr. Sickel.

Mr. Schmaltz said the FAC recommended approval of this section.

Mr. Frahm clarified that under the present policy only the URC does equity reviews. Mr. Frahm felt there would be difficulty with the proposal because there was no common definition of what equity was. Dr. Meckstroth said the URC hopes to coordinate some sort of basic guidelines. Mr. Frahm asked if a department could do its own equity review. Dr. Meckstroth said the intention was that the CFSC would do a college-wide equity review at the request of a department. Mr. Friedhoff asked what the need would be for the URC to conduct an equity review university wide if the CFSC can do them. Dr. Meckstroth said that equity matters occurred on three levels--department, college, and university. The URC was retaining the right to conduct reviews at the university level. In response to Mr. Friedhoff's concern that departments could play games with the process, that is, create inequities to make it necessary to conduct an equity review, Dr. Meckstroth said it was a wrong assumption that money would go from one college to another to fund inequities that might be created.

Mr. Brickell felt the current system had resulted in associate professors in some departments earning more than full professors in another department. Dr. Meckstroth said individuals could petition through CFSC/DFSC with this proposal. Mr. Frahm felt that without a definition of what constitutes equity, the URC should retain exclusively the equity review process.

XIV-38 Mr. McCracken moved to amend IV-E-3: Add to the beginning of the first sentence, "Upon the request of the affected individual or on its own initiative," the CFSC may also recommend an equity adjustment for a faculty member if the DFSC fails to do so and such an adjustment can be justified. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brickell.

Mr. McCracken said this would allow the faculty member to formally have the opportunity to ask the DFSC for an equity review.

Mr. Schmaltz felt this might be overused, particularly if a faculty member went this route and was successful. Mr. McCracken said the intent was to let the individual get more involved. Some faculty feel they have no input.

Mr. Reitan said people on the DFSC have to make hard decisions and they should be backed up in these decisions. There would be too many ways to undercut these people and to run around departmental committees.

Mr. Brickell supported the amendment because in some departments there was virtually no way to make any gains. With everyone getting the same percentage increase, the gap in salaries would get wider.

The amendment (XIV-38) passed on a voice vote with some negative votes and some abstentions.

XIV-39 Mr. Watkins moved to add point 7., Section IV-E: Nothing herein shall be

construed to affect or negate processes of affirmative action equity reviews.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Reitan.

Mr. Watkins pointed out that affirmative action is not addressed in this document. The law says it must be addressed.

In answer to Mr. Eggan's question, Mr. Watkins said the Affirmative Action Office carries out affirmative action equity reviews. An amount is set aside on a year-to-year basis by the Budget Team for this purpose. For FY-83 the amount is \$10,000. There is a formal process in which there is a statistical review conducted in administrative units.

Mr. Friedhoff felt that because affirmative action is so much a part of our society that it was implied in the ASPT document. The amendment would focus on one kind of discrimination.

Mr. Ritt said affirmative action procedures come from outside the will of the institution and are required as a matter of federal law. He felt it was useful to disassociate this process as an administrative function from the normal process of faculty equity reviews. It is a different process. The proposed amendment makes this clear.

Mr. Eggan did not like the word "affect" and felt the word "preclude" was better. Mr. Watkins agreed to this change.

Mr. Woodson was wondering whether we were suggesting other criteria than those set forth in this document if affirmative action reviews were disassociated from the ASPT equity review. Mr. Watkins said there are well developed criteria for the affirmative action equity reviews.

On a voice vote the motion carried.

XIV-40 Mr. Schmaltz did not like the terminology used in motion 38 and moved to strike "the affected" and replace with "an" individual. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eggan. This change would allow someone else to speak for the "affected" individual as well as the individual. The motion passed on a voice vote with some negative votes and some abstentions.

Following a 10-minute recess at 9:35 p.m., the motion (37), as amended, passed on a voice vote with some negative votes.

XIV-41 Mr. Schmaltz introduced change 4, dealing with appeals. The FAC had no recommendation on this section. As an individual, on behalf of the work done by the URC, Mr. Schmaltz moved approval of the items contained in 4:

An appeal of a merit decision must be made to the CFSC (III-C/IV-C/XI). The CFSC will no longer be required to review department decisions on merit ratings. The CFSC will serve as the appellate body for an appeal of a merit decision.

The UAC will consider appeals of promotion and tenure decisions only. The entire committee, excluding members from an appellant's department, will hear the appeal (III-C).

Membership: Each college shall have a minimum of one member on the UAC. Any college with more than one hundred faculty members shall have one additional member for every one hundred faculty members (or major

fraction thereof). This is the same procedure used to determine URC membership (III-A).

Mr. Schmaltz yielded to Mr. Mohr who spoke in opposition to this section. Mr. Mohr was opposed to the change that resulted in the UAC no longer entertaining merit appeals. These appeals would stop at the college level. Tenure and promotion appeals would still be handled by the UAC. This change would infringe on the right of appeal of faculty. It would be inequitable with no appeal for merit beyond the college.

Mr. Schmaltz then yielded to Dr. Meckstroth who spoke on behalf of the URC in favor of the motion. The URC felt the CFSC could make a distinction between tenure and promotion and appeals of merit. The section was formulated to keep them separated.

Mr. Mohr felt that tenure and promotion decisions could not be divorced from merit decisions. Dr. Meckstroth said the URC's recommendation was intended to improve the process. The UAC guidelines were loose and outside the discipline and the college. The CFSC would hear only merit decisions that were appealed.

Mr. Slan said the CFSC would look at the DFSC recommendation and that would color that group's decision on promotion and tenure. He felt the current system does not do what it does as well as we might like; however, the proposed change does not bring a solution. The promotion and tenure appeals to the UAC could not be completed until after an appeal on merit had been completed by the CFSC.

Mr. Eimermann felt that tenure and promotion decisions and merit decisions should be separate. The former were long term decisions and the latter concerned with performance in a given year. The former were university decisions and the latter judged against certain standards established by the college. The proposed change would not make the situation any easier. A different kind of change was needed.

Mr. Mohr felt that with the UAC hearing merit appeals, the faculty member would be able to appeal to an independent group. Dr. Meckstroth said that with the change the faculty member would still have an appeal to another level, it would be to the CFSC instead of the UAC.

Mr. Reitan felt there was a need to support the departmental committee. The college committee would be the best place for an appeal. That group is closest to the subject matter area to be concerned with. Promotion and tenure appeals should be made at the university level.

XIV-42 Ms. Landre moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. White). The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote with some negative votes.

On a roll call vote, motion 41 passed 25:15:2.

XIV-43 Mr. Schmaltz said the FAC did not support the proposed changes in 5, but, as an individual, Mr. Schmaltz moved approval, on behalf of the URC, the changes in 5: No department shall assign more than 40% of its faculty to the exceptional merit category (X-B-4). Each DFSC shall assign not less than 10% nor more than 40% of its salary allocation to the exceptional merit category (X-B-11). The motion was seconded by Mr. Allen.

Mr. Schmaltz yielded to Mr. Woodson who spoke against the proposed changes.

Mr. Woodson reported that all deans and departments chairs who attended the retreats on this system over the past two years expressed the opinion that this policy would be impossible to accept. There are differences from college to college, and from department to department. The suggested system was opposed on a pragmatic basis. On a philosophical level, the laissez-faire stance in other aspects of the document should be extended to this section.

Dr. Meckstroth responded for the URC. The laissez-faire philosophy does not always work. The principle of "balance" may be a better philosophy for this section of the document. Sub-systems balance faculty and university-wide perspectives. There has been a serious imbalance throughout the university. There is statistical data to back up the need for a Senate approved ceiling. Laissez-faire without balance is anarchy.

Mr. Frahm spoke against the proposed policy change. Such limitations were absurd. In small departments some who should have exceptional merit ratings could not be given them with a percentage limitation. Large departments need different formulas.

Mr. Brickell was against the 40% limit. With this ceiling the system should not be called a merit system. Merit was not a ranking order but based on a given level of performance.

Mr. Slan said departments have to have standards and criteria. He did not want to go back to a ranking system in departments.

-44 Mr. Wright moved the previous question. The motion was seconded by Mr. White. On a show of hands (21:15) the motion failed to receive the necessary 2/3 vote.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if the two subjects in 5 could be separated. Mr. Schmaltz responded that the two categories were tied together.

Mr. Eggan spoke against the motion. Departments with strong ASPT guidelines should be allowed to use them in the best way they saw fit. Mr. Petrossian was also against the motion. Departments with excessive numbers of merit ratings should be looked at, but the departments should still make the decision as to how many would receive exceptional merit ratings. Mr. Brickell said the proposed change implied that those departments that go over the 40% limit were cheating the system and more money would be brought into the department. That was not true. Mr. Ritt said if problems are identified by the URC, that group should go to individual departments and determine whether procedures were reasonable. Mr. Pritner felt that obvious errors could be specifically addressed and corrected. Mr. Woodson said it would be difficult to accept this kind of percentage recommendation because styles of administration would be hampered.

Dr. Meckstroth said the URC's basic concern was that people in department A work hard to get exceptional merit and get it occasionally. In department C, 75% consistently receive merit and expect to receive it. When 50% or more receive it, it goes against the meaning of exceptional merit; it undercuts the whole system and is unfair to those who are trying to make the system work. The URC was looking at it from a university-wide perspective.

Mr. Woodson said department chairpersons were concerned about building good departments, and it was difficult to do this without the right to give a good deal of exceptional merit. Deans have always had the right to approve or reject departmental criteria. The 25% limit has been enforced by many college deans. The URC can oversee the issue of guidelines. The dean can enforce some balance.

XIV-45 Mr. White moved the previous question. Mr. Watkins ~~seconded~~ the motion to close debate and it carried on a voice vote.

Motion 43 failed on a voice vote. There were some yes votes and some abstentions.

XIV-46 Mr. Schmaltz moved approval of item 6, to read as follows: CFSC members shall not participate in or be present at ASPT deliberations involving their home departments. Mr. Pontius seconded the motion. This item was supported by the FAC.

Mr. Eimermann said there was the need for consistency that would come if everyone was aware of the nature of decisions made and the criteria used. He supported the first part of the statement.

Mr. Frahm spoke against the proposed change. It implied that we prefer to operate in ignorance and would act unethically. Individuals need to make judgments and this is best done by someone from the same department.

Mr. Watkins suggested inserting the word "personnel" before deliberations. At Mr. Tuttle's suggestion, Mr. Schmaltz agreed to insert the words "individuals from" their home departments.

Mr. Eimermann did not want to exclude people from deliberations. Mr. Petrossian said they should be present but not vote.

Mr. Schmaltz said it would exclude those who know the most--the person may have an axe to grind. He felt it was not fair to have a representative from one department and not from another, as would be the case in a large college.

XIV-47 Mr. Eimermann moved the following amendment: CFSC members shall not vote in ASPT deliberations involving their own departments (seconded by Mr. Allen).

Mr. Pontius said cases have to be decided by documentation that depends on someone who knows the situation.

Mr. Schmaltz spoke against the amendment because it would deprive departments that do not have someone on the CFSC.

Several others spoke against the amendment and it failed on a voice vote with some abstentions noted.

XIV-48 Mr. White moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. Bedingfield). The motion to close debate carried on a voice vote.

Motion 46 passed on a voice vote with some nay votes and some abstentions.

Mr. Plummer asked if there would be discussion of X-B-5 in the ASPT policies concerning the conduct of DFSC matters. Mr. Pritner felt any changes should come from the FAC with recommendations. He suggested that any changes go to the FAC, in writing, and come to the Senate with the committee's recommendation. Mr. McCracken said he had several changes to suggest. Mr. Schmaltz said the ASPT materials had been distributed to the Senate last July. No members of the Senate had testified at the open hearings. No input had come from members of the Senate until tonight.

XIV-49 Mr. Pritner moved that the completion of this item be delayed until the December 1

meeting and that all suggestions for amendments be sent, in writing, to the FAC and the members of the Senate. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eggan and passed on a voice vote with some negative votes and some abstentions.

In response to a question by Mr. Schmaltz, Mr. Tuttle said the action taken at this meeting on the ASPT policies would stand.

Financial Exigency Procedures (10.12.82.1)

XIV-50 Mr. Ritt, Ad Hoc Committee on Financial Exigency Chairperson, said the Senate had the October 11 report of the committee and the November 15 memorandum to the Senate which spelled out two changes in the report. Mr. Ritt moved that the Senate accept this report and forward it to the President for his approval and submission to the Board of Regents. Mr. Bruin seconded the motion.

Mr. Ritt said the report, in its entirety, would be forwarded. If the Board of Regents approved the entire report, then the procedures would become the procedures of ISU. Any changes made or suggested by the Board staff would come back to the Senate.

XIV-51 Mr. Eimermann moved the following amendment: Insert in Section 3.1, Allocation Criteria, at the end of the first sentence (line 8 or that section): The University shall take all reasonable steps to avoid the cancellation of on-going classes. Also add to end of 3.1 on page 8: Cancellation refers to dropping of all sections of a particular course and not to the consolidation of several sections of the same course. On-going classes are those for which instruction has proceeded beyond the 10th day enrollment point. Nothing in this provision prohibits the substitution of instructors during the course of the semester.

Mr. Eggan seconded the motion.

Mr. Eimermann said the Board staff opposed the restrictive wording proposed by JUAC for the Board's policy. The University administration was comfortable with the proposed wording in this amendment.

XIV-52 Due to the lateness of the hour and due to the fact that this document would not be sent to the Board of Regents staff until January, Mr. Reitan moved that this item be postponed until the December 1 meeting of the Senate. The motion was seconded by Ms. Landre and passed on a voice vote.

Adjournment

XIV-53 Mr. Frahm moved that the Senate adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reitan and passed on a voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 11:47 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Iris Varner, Secretary

IV:pch

NAME	ATTEN-DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion # 29	Motion # 30	Motion # 41	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Y	N
Allen	P	Y	abstain	N					27	x	
Andrejek	P	Y	N	**					28	x	
Bedingfield	P	Y	N	N					29	31	13
Boothe	EX.								30	8	33
Bowen	P	Y	N	N					31	x	
Brickell	P	N	Y	Y					32	x	
Bruin	P	N	abstain	Y					33	x	
Campbell	EX.								34	x	
Corra	P	Y	N	**					35	x	
Crafts	P	Y	N	N					36	x	
Eggan	P	Y	N	Y					37	x	
Eimermann	P	Y	N	Y					38	x	
Frahm	P	N	Y	Y					39	x	
Friedhoff	P	N	Y	Y					40	x	
Gamsky	P	Y	N	Y					41	25	15
Goodwin	P	Y	N	**					42	x	
Gowdy	P	Y	N	Y					43	x	
Hobbs	P	Y	N	Y					44	x	
Houghton	EX.								45	x	
Korchak	P	N	N	Y					46	x	
Kroner	EX.								47		x
Landre	P	Y	Y	Y					48	x	
Livesay	P	Y	N	Y					49	x	
McCracken	P	Y	N	N					50		
Miller	P	Y	N	N					51		
Mohr	P	Y	N	N					52	x	
Pager	P	Y	N	Y					53	x	
Petrossian	P	N	Y	N							
Plummer	P	*	*	Y							
Pontius	P	Y	N	N							
Pritner	P	Y	N	Y							
Reitan	P	Y	N	Y							
Ritt	P	N	Y	Y							
Romani	P	Y	N	N							
Rosenbaum	P	N	N	Y							
Santiago	P	Y	N	N							
Schmaltz	P	N	Y	Y							
Sickel	P	N	N	N							
Slan	P	N	N	N							
Strand	P	Y	N	Y							
Taylor	P	Y	N	N							
Tuttle	P	Y	N	Y							
Varner	P	Y	N	Y							
Voy	P	N	N	Y							
Waites	P	Y	abstain	Y							
Watkins	P	Y	N	Y							
Weegar	P	Y	N	**							
White	P	Y	N	abstain							
Woodson	P	abstain	abstain	N							
Wright	P	N	Y	abstain							

abstain

1

4

2

*arrived after vote was taken
 **left before the vote was taken