

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT 512
COUNTIES OF COOK, KANE, LAKE, AND MCHENRY, STATE OF ILLINOIS

Minutes of the Adjourned Board Meeting of Thursday, June 22, 1972

CALL TO ORDER: The adjourned meeting of the Board of Trustees of Junior College District No. 512 was called to order at 8:45 p.m., Thursday, June 22, 1972, by Chairman Nicklas, pursuant to adjournment from the regular meeting of Thursday, June 8, 1972, in the Board Room of the Administration Building, Algonquin and Roselle Roads, Palatine.

ROLL CALL: Present: Members Milton Hansen, Marilyn Marier, Ross Miller, Lawrence Moats, Joseph Morton, Jessalyn Nicklas
Absent: Member Eugene Nugent

Also present: Robert E. Lahti, M. Bartos, John Birkholz, R. B. Cormack, Anton Dolejs, C. Falk, Guerin Fischer, Fred Inden, George Makas, W.J.Mann, Thomas McCabe, Liz McKay, Robert Moriarty, Gary Rankin, Marc Savard, C. Schauer, D. Stansbury, Urban Thobe, Fred Vaisvil, G.H.Voegel, W.E.Von Mayr--Harper College; Betsy Brooker--Paddock Publications; and Jane Murphy--League of Women Voters, Schaumburg-Hoffman.

MINUTES: Member Morton moved, and Member Miller seconded the motion, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 8, 1972.

Chairman Nicklas stated that on page 3--in the last paragraph, the statement "Part of the purpose of the Faculty Evaluation System was to aid development and growth," had been omitted. Also, on page 6, paragraph 3, the third sentence should be corrected to read, "Chairman Nicklas stated she felt it was an assumption that the Faculty Senate would be consulted," deleting the word "not." With this addition and correction, the motion was unanimous.

COMMUNICATIONS: None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: Chairman Nicklas asked for the report of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Dr. Lahti stated that as Mr. McCabe was teaching a class he had asked that the Board defer this discussion until he arrived. The Board agreed to wait.

NEW BUSINESS:
Honorarium for
faculty members
participating
in Danforth
Foundation
Institute

Dr. Schauer informed the Board that several months ago Harper College was very honored to be invited to participate, along with 19 other community colleges, in some institutes sponsored by the Danforth Foundation. The purpose of the institutes is to provide each participating college with an opportunity to engage in concentrated study to better define its role in service to its community. The colleges have been asked to select one major area of study which will be examined at the institute. The Danforth Foundation specified three teaching faculty and two administrators from each college. Dr. Schauer presented a recommendation for authorization of an honorarium for the three faculty members to attend the institute to be held August 11-21, inclusive.

Dr. Lahti stated it was an honor to be asked to participate. The Danforth Foundation funds the travel, lodging, and meals for the institutes. He informed the Board that the key factor that influenced the administration's thinking on the honorarium was the length of time involved, almost a two week period that they were being asked to participate.

Member Moats stated he was a little skeptical. He wondered if the college pays people to go to school. He asked what kinds of implications this had. Dr. Lahti stated that was why the administration was suggesting an honorarium. He stated they did not mean to be precedent setting in any way, in terms of pro-rating salaries for this kind of service.

Member Moats moved to table this recommendation until the next meeting. He stated he would like to study it more and asked if it were common practice in higher education to compensate for this type of thing.

Mr. Savard stated it involved more than the development of the three faculty members, it involved the development of the institution.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Member Hansen moved, and Member Morton seconded the motion, to authorize a total honorarium of \$1,950.00 for three faculty members (Mrs. Leota Prokop, Dr. Michael Oester, and Dr. Joann Powell) in recognition

NEW BUSINESS:
Honorarium for
faculty members
participating
in Danforth
Foundation
Institute (cont.)

of the additional effort to be expended in representing Harper College at the Danforth Institute August 11-21, 1972 (inclusive), further study, and future benefits to the college.

Member Moats asked if there were any other institutions that do this sort of thing. Dr. Lahti stated a poll would be made and the Board would receive a report.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Morton
and Hansen

Nays: None

Abstained: Member Moats

Staffing--Faculty

Dr. Schauer presented a recommendation for employment of Mr. Thomas O. Stanley as Assistant Professor of Economics and Business Administration for one year. He stated this recommendation was for only one year because of shifting enrollment patterns in the Business Division. Mr. Falk discussed the responsibilities Mr. Stanley would have for the next year.

Member Hansen moved, and Member Moats seconded the motion, to approve the appointment of Mr. Thomas O. Stanley as an Assistant Professor of Economics and Business Administration for the 1972-73 academic year only, effective September 5, 1972, at a salary of \$12,000.00

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas

Nays: None

Dr. Schauer presented the recommendation for employment of Miss Janice Ellen Howard as an Instructor of Art.

Member Moats moved, and Member Marier seconded the motion, to approve the employment of Janice Ellen Howard as an Instructor of Art for the 1972-73 academic year at a salary of \$9,000.00, effective September 5, 1972, pending receipt of the Master's Degree in August, 1972.

NEW BUSINESS:
Staffing--Faculty
(cont.)

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas
Nays: None

Dr. Schauer presented the recommendation for employment of Mrs. Patricia Ruth Daly as a teacher of Interior Design.

Member Marier moved, and Member Moats seconded the motion, to approve the employment of Patricia Ruth Daly as a teacher of Interior Design, at a salary of \$9,800.00 for the 1972-73 academic year effective September 5, 1972.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas
Nays: None

Dr. Schauer presented the recommendation for employment of Mrs. Catherine Kalbacher as a teacher of English, to fill the position created by the long-term leave of absence of Mrs. Carol Hildebrand approved by the Board of Trustees.

Member Moats moved, and Member Hansen seconded the motion, to approve the employment of Mrs. Catherine Kalbacher as Instructor of English at a salary of \$10,150.00 for the academic year, effective Sept. 5, 1972. It is further understood that this appointment is for one year only during the leave of absence of Mrs. Carol Hildebrand.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas
Nays: None

Staffing--
Administrative

Dr. Fischer presented the recommendation for appointment of Mr. William Nelson as Acting Dean of Guidance for the fiscal year 1972-73. He stated this recommendation was being made after discussion with the administration and the counselors William Nelson had worked with during the last three years. Dr. Fischer stated the recommendation was for an Acting Dean for

NEW BUSINESS:
Staffing--
Administrative
(cont.)

one year because of the lateness of Dr. Field's resignation and the need to provide continuity in the program. He stated the job market is also stronger at the end of the year than in mid-year. Dr. Lahti added he felt July 1 is absolutely essential for this person to be in any way effective in evaluating his people.

Member Hansen moved, and Member Miller seconded the motion, to approve the appointment of Mr. William Nelson as Acting Dean of Guidance, with the academic rank of Assistant Professor, effective July 1, 1972, at a salary of \$19,800.00 for the period July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas

Nays: None

Staffing--Faculty

Dr. Fischer presented the recommendation for appointment of Dr. Marguerite Ewald as a counselor. He stated this recommendation was being made after discussion with Dr. Schauer, Dr. Groth and Dr. Rankin. Dr. Ewald would be working in a variety of situations including the Counseling Center and the Program of Expanding Horizons for Women. Dr. Fischer discussed Dr. Ewald's background and experience.

Member Moats moved, and Member Hansen seconded the motion, to approve the employment of Dr. Marguerite Ewald as a counselor at a salary of \$14,500.00 for 39 weeks, effective September 5, 1972, with the academic rank of Associate Professor.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas

Nays: None

Staffing--
Administrative

Dr. Schauer stated after review of the candidates for the position of Chairman of the Mathematics and Physical Science Division, the administration was recommending the employment of George C. Dorner. He discussed his background and experience and stated the people involved have agreed to work with this gentleman.

NEW BUSINESS:
Staffing--
Administrative
(cont.)

Member Moats moved, and Member Hansen seconded the motion, to approve the appointment of George C. Dorner as Chairman of the Mathematics and Physical Science Division, with the academic rank of Associate Professor, effective August 1, 1972, at a salary of \$16,592.00 with the understanding that this salary be for services rendered from August 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973; and with the further understanding that this salary is pro-rated from the annual base of \$18,100.00.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas

Nays: None

Resignation--
Director of
Accounting

Mr. Mann presented the resignation of Theodore J. Meyers, Director of Accounting Systems, stating that Mr. Meyers had accepted a position as Comptroller of Urbana College in Urbana, Ohio. He stated Mr. Meyers had been with Harper for about a year and a half and will be missed.

Member Morton moved, and Member Moats seconded the motion, to accept with regret the resignation of Theodore J. Meyers, effective as of July 15, 1972.

Member Miller asked if the college was competitive on salary. Mr. Mann explained that at the particular time Mr. Meyers was employed, it was competitive; he had just graduated with an MS and knew the salary range and knew there was an adjustment in order to bring him along a little faster. Mr. Mann stated the position Mr. Meyers had accepted at Urbana reports directly to the president. He stated this was a step up, and he happens also to be from Ohio.

Motion was unanimous.

Bid Award--Spirit,
Mimeo and Offset
Paper

Mr. Inden stated the recommended bid award was for spirit, mimeo and offset paper. He stated the bid was sent out to establish a price per ream and the bidders were guaranteed a purchase of 10,000 reams by June 30, 1973. The administration was recommending the award of bid to Inlander Steindler Paper Co., on the basis of the lowest price per ream. Mr. Inden stated the administration was not recommending the awarding of items in Section B, so these items can be weighed as per need.

NEW BUSINESS:
Bid Award--Spirit,
Mimeo and Offset
Paper (cont.)

Member Moats moved, and Member Hansen seconded the motion, to approve the award of bid for spirit, mimeo and offset paper (items 1-9 in Bid Q#3009) to the Inlander Steindler Paper Company on the basis of the lowest price per ream. (Exhibit C attached to the Minutes in the Board of Trustees Official Book of Minutes.)

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Moats,
Morton and Nicklas

Nays: None

PRESIDENT'S
REPORT:

Dr. Lahti distributed a report on Summer School Enrollment prepared by Mr. Stansbury.

Dr. Lahti reported on the progress of the Appropriations Bill, stating it is making its way through the Legislature. Mr. Savard reported it is in its second reading on the Senate side, has passed the House, and is still at \$16.50.

Dr. Lahti referred to the Capital Funding Act. Mr. Savard reported all four have been passed in the House; in the Senate went directly to the amendment stage. Member Marier reported she had heard that day that the Democratic side had offered an amendment to the bill to put it to a referendum in the fall.

UNFINISHED
BUSINESS:
Report of
Faculty
Evaluation
Committee

At this point, Chairman Nicklas referred back to the Report of the Faculty Evaluation Committee under Unfinished Business. Dr. Lahti stated Mr. McCabe would give the report to the Board.

Mr. McCabe referred to the Faculty Senate Minutes of June 15, 1972, noting there was a motion that the Faculty Senate maintain its position of May 25, 1972 regarding the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee. Mr. McCabe pointed out this was the original position he brought to the Board on June 8, 1972. Mr. McCabe reported Dr. Lahti then spoke to the Senate and his comments were included in the Senate minutes. After Dr. Lahti's comments, the following motion was made: In keeping with the mutual interest of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate on the evaluation of the instructional system, Dr. Makas moved that the Senate recommend for the Board's consideration the following proposal:

UNFINISHEDBUSINESS:

Report of Faculty
Evaluation
Committee (cont.)

The Faculty shall select one consultant and the Administration shall select another consultant to evaluate the total instructional system in force and present a fact-finding report to all parties. The earliest date for this report can be set after an agreement with each of the consultants has been reached.

Mr. McCabe stated in effect what the Faculty Senate was saying was that they are interested in getting on with reviewing the system, and, in keeping with the custom of external audits when they are appropriate, involve outside experts in the field of faculty evaluation to look at the program. He stated the Faculty Senate would be willing to give them the necessary feedback. Mr. McCabe stated a date had not been set for the report because they did not know who is available and what their time schedules would be.

Member Morton asked about the term "instructional system." Dr. Makas explained it is a broader term than evaluation. He stated there are so many variables that the faculty would like to look at those aspects of instruction that would affect the evaluation of individual instructors, such as class load, use of resources, etc.

A lengthy discussion followed. Dr. Makas discussed the faculty concerns, the various factors affecting the instructional program. He stated when talking about evaluation of a single aspect of instruction, one does not see the whole system. He suggested finding three, four or five areas critical to instruction in the classroom and working with these collectively.

Chairman Nicklas stated she felt in studying and evaluating the evaluation system these variables would be brought into the instrument and be a part of the discussion. Member Morton stated he felt the instrument or system would take into account these other variables. Member Moats commented he did not see that there is necessarily a conflict. Member Miller stated he felt the goal was to create a constant evaluation of the instructional system

UNFINISHED

BUSINESS:

Report of Faculty
Evaluation
Committee (cont.)

so that people will improve, the instructional program will improve, and the goals can be evaluated as well. Member Marier added, as a Board member, she would not select a system that is too narrow.

Member Morton asked if the committee's recommendation envisioned one consultant selected by faculty and one by the Board, which he felt would be almost a "we-they" situation rather than working together.

Mr. McCabe stated it was the feeling of the faculty that the consultants should be selected separately and instructed separately.

Dr. Makas stated if he were engaged as an expert to evaluate the faculty evaluation system, he would look at the instrument. He would question: if the criteria were related to the instruction that takes place in the classroom, or based on peoples reaction to individual personalities; in what kind of classroom situation was this instrument applied; was the same instrument used for everyone, regardless of size of class; was it used by division chairman and his colleagues; the student evaluation form--single set of questions, regardless of class size; etc.

Chairman Nicklas reviewed the Board's reason and interest in having the study accomplished. She stated it was the Board's hope that the people called in would be of help to all in the institution--a combined group working together, not separately. The Board desires input from all sides, rather than a two-sided approach. The Board is more interested in an overall good kind of instrument.

Member Moats stated this would come through differing opinions.

Mr. McCabe stated this was consistent with their proposal.

Chairman Nicklas expressed surprise on the recommendation to direct the consultants. She suggested giving them the instrument and letting them ask the questions.

Mr. McCabe stated the faculty felt one consultant should be instructed of their concerns.

UNFINISHED

BUSINESS:

Report of Faculty
Evaluation
Committee (cont.)

Dr. Lahti stated he did not think either side should be instructed. He did agree, if there were differing opinions, these should be made known to the consultants.

Dr. Makas pointed out the faculty felt the statement previously issued by the Board was too narrow.

Member Morton moved for an executive session, but after discussion it was agreed this was out of order, and the motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. McCabe requested the Board hear the comments of Dr. Moriarty. Dr. Moriarty stated he felt people were saying the same things in different ways. He stated the Faculty Senate envisioned the faculty member and the student at the core of the instructional and learning process. Their concern was based on accountability; the faculty member wants to be accountable for that over which he has control, but there are matters over which a faculty member does not have control. Relative to the instrument employed, they are concerned that the focus of evaluation can become myopic. The faculty member fears the narrow view because of other variables involved. He stated their concern was to try to expand that process.

Chairman Nicklas commented that she felt the discussion had been helpful. The charge now was to look at the present system which has been inadequate. All variables should be part of the discussion and made known to the experts. She stated it would be the particular responsibility of the committee to make this known to the consultants. This committee, composed of faculty and administration, would meet in the summer with the consultants and make their recommendation to the Board in the fall.

Member Moats asked Mr. McCabe about the time frame. Mr. McCabe stated the faculty felt it should be left open, consistent with the availability of the consultants. He stated he did not see how a date could be set because of this, but they would be willing to put a time frame on it as soon as they knew the availability of the consultants.

Member Marier stated she felt the problem was in semantics, but she felt the Board and faculty were really not far apart in terms of philosophy.

UNFINISHEDBUSINESS:

Report of Faculty
Evaluation
Committee (cont.)

Chairman Nicklas thanked Mr. McCabe, Dr. Makas, and Dr. Moriarty for their report and comments.

Member Miller reminded the Board of Member Nugent's motion, which had been tabled at the June 8, 1972, Board meeting.

Member Moats moved that the motion made by Member Nugent at the June 8, 1972, Board meeting, and tabled at that time, be tabled until the next meeting because of the absence of Member Nugent. Member Morton seconded the motion.

Member Miller stated, in view of the extremely definite language of the Faculty Senate, he failed to see why this motion should be tabled.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Moats and Morton

Nays: Members Miller and Nicklas

Dr. Lahti stated he would like to make a suggestion to the Board. He stated in his opinion if the Board desired more information, they should authorize the commissioning of two consultants to proceed with the review of the present evaluation system; and that they be given a charge that would not be necessarily too limiting, but give them full freedom to look at what is in operation at the college. He suggested the administration, consulting with members of the faculty or Faculty Senate, develop this charge; that these consultants be commissioned with the idea they could complete the mission by September 1 or September 15. Dr. Lahti stated otherwise he saw no reason to commission them, if they could not meet the deadline the Board wished. He stated it was his recommendation to work with the representatives of the Faculty Senate to agree on two consultants and move forward. Dr. Lahti stated he in no way could see any harm being done to the institution by hiring two consultants to do a hard analysis.

Chairman Nicklas expressed her agreement with this recommendation.

Member Miller moved, and Member Morton seconded, the following resolution:

UNFINISHEDBUSINESS:

Report of Faculty
Evaluation
Committee (cont.)

RESOLUTION

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT THE Board of Trustees of William Rainey Harper College assures the continued commitment to the development of a superior faculty aspiring to higher levels of excellence, instruction, and service to their profession, the students, and the College, and to insure an improved means of equitably evaluating teaching faculty development and effort,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE Board of Trustees authorizes and directs the commission of two (2) consultants, selected immediately by the administration and Faculty Senate, to work in concert with faculty and administrative representatives during the summer, 1972, to:

1. Review the pertinent literature, studies, other evaluation systems, the Harper College Faculty Evaluation System, and its results.
2. Summarize the review and present a report, with suggestions (including student appraisal of teaching faculty, refinement of levels of achievement by individual faculty members, service, etc., in concert with the long-range plan of Harper College) to the Faculty Senate, the administration, and the Review Committee on the Faculty Evaluation System by Sept. 1, 1972.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE Faculty Evaluation System will be appropriately modified and adopted prior to March 15, 1973.

BE IT UNDERSTOOD THAT any matters or materials not an integral part of the Faculty Evaluation System will be reviewed by other committees as established by the College.

In the discussion which followed, Member Miller pointed out the chain of organization is from the Board of Trustees to the administration, and then to the faculty, and stated hopefully the faculty and administration will always work together.

Member Hansen asked for Mr. McCabe's reaction.

UNFINISHEDBUSINESS:

Report of Faculty
Evaluation
Committee (cont.)

Mr. McCabe stated he felt the motion sounded a lot like Member Nugent's motion.

Member Miller stated that all that is intended is that two consultants will be retained. He stated he envisioned two consultants with an objective view--not faculty view, not administrative view, but honest, in-depth, and critical analysis. This is meant only as input.

Mr. McCabe asked if it will be a fact-finding group.

Member Miller emphasized they will summarize, review, and present a report with suggestions to the Faculty Senate and Administration Review Committee.

Mr. McCabe pointed out this has been the concern of the Faculty Senate and their position all along. He stated the committee will reconvene the second week in September. If these people are fact-finders, he added, and if he understood the motion, it may be consistent with the Faculty's proposal. He felt, however, it was essentially Mr. Nugent's motion in disguised form.

Chairman Nicklas stated it would be fine if the committee wanted to meet in the fall. However, the faculty, administration and consultants would be working this summer. She added there should certainly be faculty input to the consultants.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Hansen, Marier, Miller, Morton
and Nicklas

Nays: None

Abstained: Member Moats

Chairman Nicklas stated there was need for an executive session to discuss matters of personnel and site and construction. The meeting was recessed at 10:40 p.m. to executive session.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Nicklas reconvened the meeting at midnight. Member Moats moved, and Member Marier seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:01 a.m. Motion unanimous.

Chairman Nicklas

Secretary Miller