

Fall 10-29-1980

Senate Meeting October 29, 1980

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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



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

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting October 29, 1980" (1980). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 394.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/394>

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)

October 29, 1980

Volume XII, No. 5

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Change in Policy for Academic Good Standing (10.9.80.1)

Committee Appointments

Student Input on Teaching Effectiveness* (5.3.79.1)

Committee Reports

Adjournment

*Appendix

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)

October 29, 1980

Volume XII, No. 5

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Vice Chairperson Barton in the absence of Mr. Cohen.

Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes of October 15, 1980

XII-19 On a motion by Mr. Madore (seconded Mr. Slotter) the minutes of the October 15, 1980, meeting of the Academic Senate were approved on a voice vote.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Barton announced that Mr. Cohen was in Texas attending an Honors Seminar.

Administrators' Remarks

President Watkins said the University had received notice from the Board of Higher Education that the Doctor of Arts programs had been approved for continuation following the five-year trial period.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Henriksen was not present (excused absence).

ACTION ITEM

Change in Policy for Academic Good Standing (10.9.80.1)

XII-20 Mr. Schmaltz, Chairperson of the Academic Affairs Committee, introduced the action item for the committee. While the committee had not made a recommendation on the policy when it came before the Senate as an information item, it was now prepared to support the change based on a 5:1 (with one abstention) vote of the committee. Mr. Schmaltz moved (seconded by Ms. Crafts) that the Senate approve that in order to be in academic good standing a student must have achieved a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0 (to be effective with the 1982-83 catalog).

Mr. Quane was again present to answer questions. Mr. Polan, while acknowledging the inadequate current standards and the need for a change, felt that the study presented to the Senate lacked the vital information concerning the impact that the new standards would have. The questions raised by faculty and students at the last Senate meeting about the effect on minority students, the economic impact, a better image attracting better students, and grade inflation, had not been answered by the advocates of the new policy.

XI- 21 He thought it was better to spend more time and effort on further study than to vote hastily now and have to rescind later and moved to refer the matter back to the Academic Affairs Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sam. Mr. Tom Todd, President of the ISU Chapter of the N.A.A.C.P. was given the floor and argued that the present policy needed changing but that the 2.0 was too stringent. The report had not examined the impact on minority and disadvantaged students to whom the University had a commitment. Mr. Sam also felt that this important step needed further study. Mr. Holmes stated that increasing the grade point average was good for the University but wanted more information on how the policy was working at institutions where it was in effect. Mr. David Cain, Vice President of the Student Association, was given the floor and spoke in support of the motion to return the item to committee. Mr. Quane said that racial data was collected during the registration process, but on a voluntary basis and, therefore, not altogether accurate. Mr. Schmaltz noted that in the committee's view the requested data just was not available. Mr. Lee Blackwell, Affirmative Action Officer for the Student Association, pointed out that if the proposed policy were ratified, 660 additional students would be on probation, raising to 10% the number of students in that category. He felt that our programs to help ill-prepared students should be studied, keeping in mind some students' language problems, cultural problems, and environmental problems.

XII-22 Mr. Hicklin moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. Tuttle). The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote. On a role call vote on motion XII-21, the results were 13 yes; 33 no. The motion failed.

XI- 23 Mr. Hirt moved (seconded Mr. Friedberg) to amend the main motion to read: To be in academic good standing a student must have achieved a minimum cumulative grade point average of 1.8 during the first 30 hours and a 2.0 thereafter. This proposal was based on these reasons: Being on probation doesn't merit dismissal from the University as long as improvements come in subsequent semesters (under the proposed policy a student could be on probation for at least two semesters before having to leave the University); the present standards were much too low and allowed students to trap themselves by low expectations; the State of Illinois had an extensive junior college system which could and should be used by students unable to perform at the "C" grade level.

Tony Chambers, President of the Association of Black Academic Employees, was introduced and said that academic standards should be improved but that 1.8 was not in accordance with the data available and that the Senate should not discount the negative effect of such a policy. Ms. Lucille Holcomb, of the same organization, also warned of an adverse effect of the proposed policy on students. She felt that the skills centers had not been evaluated and their future was uncertain and that some financial assistance was tied to the student's satisfactory academic progress.

Mr. Hicklin said a 2.0 grade point had been ISU policy in the past and that minority students did not need protection. Ms. Zunker urged the Senate to look at the positive effects of the proposed change. Ms. Julia Visor, Acting Director of Special Services Program noted that a program existed for students with an ACT score of 15 or below and with a taxable family income of \$9,000/year or below. The program was in its first year and data on its accomplishments were not yet available. Mr. Young spoke in support of the amendment because it provided a reasonable standard, gave students an adequate warning, and allowed for some slippage. In answer to a question by Mr. Spoor, Mr.

- XII-24 Quane stated that if the original 2.0 proposal were adopted, it would not become effective until 1982-83; if the 1.8 for the first 30 hours were adopted it could go into effect next year. Mr. Maurice Tate, a Coordinator of Academic Advisement, spoke in favor of higher standards but questioned if they should be lower for incoming freshmen. He noted that 70-80% of the students he had contact with through ISU Preview reported that staffing in the service centers was inadequate. Mr. Sam supported the need for higher academic standards but was critical of the 30 hours of 1.8 GPA proposed by Mr. Hirt's amendment. Stressing the need to consider differences in the backgrounds of students resulting in different levels of accomplishments, he moved to amend the proposed policy change (seconded by Mr. Holmes) to read: 1.6 GPA for 1-15 hours; 1.8 GPA for 16-30 hours; 1.95 GPA for 31-45 hours; and 2.0 GPA for 46 hours and above. Ms. Varner spoke against the motion pointing out that it did not warn the student soon enough and would, therefore, be a disservice to students. Dr. Carmen Richardson, Director of Student Academic Services, noted that the State of Illinois had mandated the phase-out of remedial programs at public 4-year institutions of higher education. Special assistance programs such as High Potential Students and Special Services Program would continue. She agreed with Mr. Tate's statement that the Reading and Writing Centers were not adequately staffed and one should not assume that special assistance centers would be available to meet the needs of the students. Mr. Hirt and Ms. Anderson felt that 1.8 was providing enough flexibility. Mr. Holmes suggested that motion XII-24 be changed, by dropping the 1.95 GPA for 31-45 hours, so the 2.0 GPA would apply to anything over 30 hours. This was agreeable to Mr. Sam. Ms. Rosalyn Green, Director of the High Potential Students Program, reported that studies had shown that it took some disadvantaged students five semesters to get on track. She urged adoption of a system that would warn students that being in academic good standing might not, in itself, qualify them for graduation. Ms. Wolak reported expressed student concern for the image of the University and hope for improvement.
- XII-25 Mr. Hicklin moved the previous question (seconded by Ms. Zunker). The motion passed without dissension on a voice vote.
- On a roll call vote, motion XII-24 was defeated, 11:35.
- XII-26 Mr. Young moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. Madore). This motion passed on a voice vote.
- XII-27 After clarifying that the policy would be in effect the Fall of 1981, on a roll call vote, motion XII-23 passed, 42:4. This was interpreted as having amended the original motion. Mr. Watkins moved the previous question (seconded by Ms. Zunker) and this motion passed. On a voice vote, the original motion (XII-20), as amended, was agreed to with no negative votes and two abstentions.
- Ms. Visor expressed the hope that the Senate would now take the responsibility for supporting its decision by urging future reallocation of resources to provide academic support for students outside the Special Services and High Potential Students Programs.

Committee Appointments

- XI. 28 Mr. Young moved the appointment of two students, Mike Prombo and Suzie Lambert, to the Library Committee. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderson and passed on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEM

Student Input on Teaching Effectiveness (5.3.79.1)*

Mr. Schmaltz introduced the proposed policy (copy appended to these minutes) with the unanimous support of the Academic Affairs Committee. He mentioned that this matter had been before the Senate last year after it had been reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee. At that time no action was proposed. Mr. Hicklin noted that student teachers in the laboratory schools were not covered by the proposed policy and was informed by Mr. Schmaltz that the committee wanted to leave specifics to departments and that the appropriate College Faculty Status Committee should have jurisdiction in the area of Mr. Hicklin's concern. Mr. Watkins hoped this matter could be clarified in conference before the next Senate meeting. Mr. Friedberg asked if the Department Faculty Status Committee rather than the Department as a whole would determine the content of the instrument to be used. The answer was in the affirmative. The procedures would have to be approved by the College Faculty Status Committee. The committee felt that administering the instrument should not be undertaken by the professor teaching the class. Mr. Young reminded the Senate that it had supported the concept of anonymity in its policy for evaluating department chairpersons. Mr. Kohn wanted clarification on who might administer the questionnaire and urged that the results of such student input should be seen only by the faculty member and the Department Faculty Status Committee. It was noted that materials go to the College Faculty Status Committee when decisions are appealed, and that process is initiated by the faculty member. Mr. Madore felt strongly that faculty members must be protected from capricious acts. Ms. Wiczorek was concerned that there was not always a provision allowing students to make additional comments. Asked by Mr. Gamsky if there should be student input in every course every semester, Mr. Schmaltz noted that this would be a Department Faculty Status Committee decision. Mr. Watkins noted that the Board of Regents Policy made it clear that student input was required in the evaluative process. Mr. Hirt spoke against the College Faculty Status Committee determining content. Ms. Ritch said the policy proposed by the committee was minimally prescriptive to cover divergent departments. Mr. Steve Riddle, President of the Student Association Assembly, was given the floor to speak of his concern that the proposed policy didn't deal with the problem of inconsistency among departments and the content of the evaluation instrument. He urged the Senate to look at the policy being used successfully at Northern Illinois University. Mr. Woodson questioned whether there could be a standardized instrument and wondered if the committee had considered the distinction between teaching and learning. Mr. Grever spoke of the need for flexibility allowing for the special problems of large departments. Mr. Watkins urged the Senators to read Paul Baker's article, "Faculty Evaluation and Academic Workstyles: Preliminary Thoughts and Exploratory Data," circulated to all Senators.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs. The next meeting will be in room 118, CVA, on November 5, at 8:00 p.m. Discussion will continue on Student Input on Teaching Effectiveness.

Administrative Affairs. The next meeting will be a 4:00 p.m., November 11, in Hovey 308. Discussion on the 5-year academic calendar will continue.

Budget Committee. Mr. Hirt called for a brief meeting following adjournment.

Faculty Affairs. The committee will be meeting November 3 to continue discussion of the proposed retreat to deal with ASPT problems and procedures.

Rules Committee. The next meeting will be October 31 at 3:30 in Moulton 311C.

Joint University Advisory Committee. Ms. Crafts reported on the recent Faculty/Board of Regents Retreat which was a great success.

Executive Committee. The next meeting will be November 5 at 8:15 a.m. in Hovey 308.

Adjournment

XII-29 On a motion by Ms. Anderson (seconded by Mr. Spoor) the meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Walter Kohn, Secretary

WK:pch

NAME	ATTEN-DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion # 21	Motion # 23	Motion # 24	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Y	N
Anderson	P	N	Y	N					19	x	
Balbach	P	N	Y	N					20	x	2 absten
Barton	P	Y	Y	Y					21	13	33
Boothe	P	N	Y	N					22	x	
Bowen	P	N	Y	N					23	42	4
Brickell	P	N	Y	N					24	11	35
Brown	excused								25	x	
Cohen	excused								26	x	
Crafts	P	N	Y	N					27	x	
Fernandes	P	Y	Y	N					28	x	
Friedberg	P	N	Y	N					29	x	
Friedhoff	excused										
Gamsky	P	Y	Y	Y							
Goodin	P	Y	Y	N							
Gowen	P	N	Y	N							
Grever	P	N	Y	N							
Hemenway	P	N	Y	N							
Henriksen	excused										
Hicklin	P	N	Y	N							
Hirt	P	N	Y	N							
Holmes	P	Y	N	Y							
Koerselman	P	N	Y	N							
Kohn	P	N	Y	N							
Lab	P	Y	Y	N							
Madore	P	N	Y	Y							
Metcalf	P	Y	Y	N							
Miller	P	N	N	N							
Murphy	P	Y	N	Y							
Nelson	P	N	Y	Y							
Newby	P	N	Y	N							
Polan	P	Y	Y	N							
Ritch	P	N	Y	N							
Rosebery	P	Y	Y	Y							
Sam	P	Y	N	Y							
Schmaltz	P	N	Y	N							
Schoenbein	P	Y	Y	N							
Schwalm	P	N	Y	N							
Shulman	P	N	Y	N							
Sloter	P	Y	Y	N							
Spoor	P	N	Y	Y							
Strand	P	N	Y	N							
Tuttle	P	N	Y	N							
Varner	P	N	Y	N							
Watkins	P	N	Y	N							
Weller	P	N	Y	N							
Wieczorek	P	N	Y	Y							
Wolak	P	N	Y	N							
Woodson	P	N	Y	Y							
Young	P	N	Y	N							
Zunker	P	N	Y	N							

Proposed Policy: Student Input on Teaching Effectiveness

Student input shall be one of several factors considered when a Department Faculty Status Committee makes decisions regarding faculty members' professional performance. Each department shall devise an instrument for providing student input on teaching effectiveness. The form of the input and the actual questions asked shall be determined by the individual DFSC.

The instrument is to be administered during the last quarter of the course by someone other than the person regularly teaching the course. The instrument must protect the anonymity of students as far as possible. The faculty member and the DFSC shall have access to the results only after the final grades have been handed in. Students must be informed of these two safeguards at the time of administration.

Either in the administrative procedures or on the actual form itself, it must be made clear to students that they may report any irregularities in administration or attempts to influence their responses on the form to the relevant department chairperson.

Each DFSC shall provide a copy of the instrument and a complete description of the administrative procedures to the College Faculty Status Committee. The CFSC shall determine the following three matters: (1) whether the anonymity of students is protected as far as possible (2) whether students are adequately informed at the time of administration that access to results will not occur until after the final grades have been handed in (3) whether it is made clear to students that they may report irregularities in administration or attempts to influence their responses to the relevant department chairperson.

INFORMATION ITEM: October 29, 1980
Academic Senate Business Item 5.3.79.1