

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 3-23-1983

Senate Meeting, March 23, 1983

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, March 23, 1983" (1983). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 537.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/537>

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)

March 23, 1983

Volume XIV, No. 12

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of February 23, 1983

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Constitutional Amendment, Article V Section 3, Joint University Advisory
Committee to the Board of Regents (1.31.83.2)

Committee Appointments

University Writing Examination (8.25.82.2)

Committee Reports

Communications

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)

March 23, 1983

Volume XIV, No. 12

Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Tuttle in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center at 7:08 p.m.

Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes of February 23, 1983

XIV-114 On a motion by Mr. Sickel (seconded by Ms. Landre) the minutes of the February 23 meeting were approved on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Tuttle had several remarks regarding the Retreat. For purposes of the Retreat, to be held March 30, re-elected Senators were considered "returning" Senators. Reservations for the Retreat were due March 25. The purpose and function of the Retreat was to provide an orientation for new Senators to what the Senate does, how it functions, and what some of the issues before it are. It was a time when faculty and students met in an unofficial capacity and agreed among themselves which persons they would like to see filling the elected slots. This allowed for a smooth beginning for the new Senate.

On a personal note, at the end of his second term, Mr. Tuttle expressed appreciation to the members of this and the previous Senate. He appreciated the support of the faculty, administrators and students. He was particularly appreciative of the part played by John Boaz who served as Parliamentarian. He had depended on him for sound parliamentary ruling and his assistance. He also appreciated the assistance given him by Pat Helme whose contributions and initiative had been very helpful to him.

Some people feel the Senate works too slow; others think it works too fast. He saw the Senate as a place for reflection of views and issues in an open way which existed in no other place on campus or at other Regency schools. Accountability for all issues represents what we are all about as a university. Even with another year on his Senate term, Mr. Tuttle said there were two reasons he had been adamant about not serving another term as chairperson. There was need for change, both for the benefit of the Senate and from a personal perspective. He would be on sabbatical leave beginning in January, 1984.

Mr. Tuttle then noted that the Executive Committee had been requested by the Academic Affairs Committee to add an item to the Agenda, Academic Bankruptcy for Undergraduate Students, as an information item.

Mr. Bruin explained that the Executive Committee met prior to the meeting tonight and decided that it would not be good to have an information session at this time, this late in the year. If the item became an information item, a second information session would be necessary. Mr. Tuttle said that he had told Mr. Egan, Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson, that should that be the turn of

events he would recognize him during Chairperson's remarks.

X1 115 Mr. Eggan moved that the Senate place on tonight's agenda the Academic Bankruptcy for Undergraduate Students business item for information after the University Writing Examination item. The motion was seconded by Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Eggan said the Academic Affairs Committee had worked fairly hard this academic year. There were several reasons for placing this item on the agenda. Mr. Eggan explained that the promulgation stage can be fulfilled if an item appears on a Senate agenda, or copies are distributed to members of the Senate on or before a meeting at which it may be moved to promulgation stage by 2/3 vote, or it could be a report of a standing committee, introduced at the time of committee reports. The Academic Affairs Committee had worked to bring two proposals to the Senate before the change in constituency. He understood that the Executive Committee felt the Academic Affairs Committee had not spent enough time on the proposal. The Academic Standards Committee had spent several months on the proposal, and the Academic Affairs Committee spent six weeks to two months. This was sufficient time. By saying it was too near the end of the year, the Executive Committee, in effect, was limiting the work of internal committees from September to January. He felt the current constituency should have the opportunity to present their views on this item. It might require another information session. It was up to the Executive Committee to put it on the calendar. This was an important policy that warranted consideration.

Mr. Eimermann wondered if the item would have to go through the Academic Affairs Committee again in the new Senate or if the Executive Committee could put it on as an action item if requested by Academic Affairs. In response to a question by Mr. Friedhoff, Mr. Tuttle noted that last week the Executive Committee decided not to add it to the agenda. The Committee had been asked to reconsider that decision and decided again not to place it on the agenda.

Mr. Reitan spoke against the motion. He felt it should carry over to the next Senate. Mr. Waites felt it should be saved for the new Senate when there would be both information and action sessions. Mr. Eimermann asked why one carry-over item had been put on tonight's agenda and not the other. Mr. Tuttle explained the reasoning of the Executive Committee. It had appeared that one item had had extensive review by the Academic Affairs Committee over a long period of time and the other had not.

Mr. Eggan said the perception of time spent was incorrect. Mr. Taylor said the Writing Examination item seemed like a much more complex item and it took some time and several revisions for the committee to come to a decision. The Academic Affairs Committee had come to an agreement on the Academic Bankruptcy item much more easily. He felt the experienced Senate members should get questions out so the new Senate had something to work with.

At that time, Mr. Tuttle relinquished the chair to Mr. Bruin.

Mr. Tuttle argued in favor of placing the item on the agenda, for one main reason. The committee system had been operating. The committee said it was ready to have this item on the agenda. He might take issue with the content, but the committee system had functioned, and he urged the Senate to vote to place this on the agenda.

Mr. Strand opposed the motion. He did not feel it was fair to the majority of the Senate members who were seeing the proposed policy for the first time

tonight. It could not be mastered by a brief reading. It would be an injustice to the topic and to the Senate to put it on the agenda tonight.

Mr. Slan asked whether the item, if it were put on the agenda, and if it were tabled, would automatically be a discussion item at the next meeting or whether it would have to go back through the committee again. It was determined that if the item were postponed to a definite time, it would automatically be on the agenda. Mr. Ritt commented that the Academic Affairs Committee had already requested that it be placed on the agenda and, therefore, it would not be necessary for the new committee to make the request again. Mr. Egan felt that because the request had been denied it would have to be requested again. The chair ruled that the original request did not remain on the Executive Committee's agenda.

Mr. Ritt said the purpose for the request was that present members of the Academic Affairs Committee who had studied the proposal were present at the information session. That was counterbalanced by the fact that those asking questions did not know what questions to ask. Therefore, the item would not get the consideration it deserved at this meeting.

Mr. Miller asked how the Senate could move to table the item when there was no motion on the floor. The chair said it would be possible to move to postpone consideration of an information item.

XIV-116 Mr. White moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. Voy). The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote.

On a roll call vote, the motion to add the Academic Bankruptcy item to the agenda failed on a vote of 10:24:2.

Mr. Tuttle resumed the chair.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Bruin reported for Mr. Brooks that the Student Association and Student Association Assembly elections would be held March 30. Mr. Bedingfield and Mr. Houghton were the only candidates for Student Association President and Vice President. Mr. Bruin relinquished the floor to Mr. Bedingfield who reported on attending a meeting in Springfield with Representative James Keane. He had learned that the prospects for the tax increase did not look good. The students would need to improve their current voting record which was only 10%. Legislators did not listen to citizens who did not vote.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins read a prepared statement that was scheduled for publication in the March 25 issue of the ISU Report concerning the 1984 budget situation. He concluded his remarks by strongly urging all members of the Senate to be involved in persuading the legislature to pass a tax increase for support of higher education. The University had to report on how it would handle the 4% reduction in personnel services called for in the Governor's proposed 1984 budget.

Mr. Watkins then distributed copies of the new organizational chart for the university. He explained the various changes that would occur. Mr. Godfrey's new title would be Director of Instructional Advancement. The position of Director of Development would be held by someone with a proven track record in raising money. There were more than 55,000 ISU alumni in the state of Illinois alone

and they should be approached for money. There would be two new positions, that of Assistant Director of Planned Giving, and Assistant to Coordinator of Alumni Programs. Additional resources given to the area of development should pay off handsomely. This university deserved better than it was getting. Mr. Watkins pointed out other changes in the organizational structure. Areas currently reporting to Mr. Godfrey would be moved as follows: to Vice President for Administrative Services, printing services and mail services; to Vice President for Business and Finance, telecommunications. Electronic Services would be moved by Vice President for Business and Finance to Vice President for Administrative Services. The administration of all personnel functions would be located in Personnel Services. Campus Recreation would be moved from Vice President for Administrative Services to Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs. The Alumni Programs and Development would be moved from the President's Office to Director of Institutional Advancement, and from Vice President for Administrative Services, the Board (of Regents) liaison role would be moved to the President's Office.

Mr. Friedhoff commented that the use of the term "stepping down" to become a professor (in an article reported on a department chairperson in the ISU Report) was not appreciated. Mr. Watkins said the point was well taken.

Mr. Gamsky reported that there was an outbreak of measles in several states-- a very serious situation in some areas. He said his office was following the situation closely but had determined that it was not necessary to have an immunization program at ISU at the present time.

ACTION ITEMS

Joint University Advisory Committee Membership--Constitutional Amendment (1.31.83.2)

XIV-117 Mr. Corra, for the Rules Committee, moved approval of an amendment to Article VI, Section 3 of the Illinois State University Constitution as printed on page 15 of February 23 minutes. The motion died for lack of a second.

Committee Appointments

Mr. Corra, for the Rules Committee, said the committee had not met since the last Senate meeting and there were no committee appointments to present.

INFORMATION ITEM

University Writing Examination (8.25.82.2)

Mr. Eggan, Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson, introduced this item. He invited Dr. Charles Harris, Department of English Chairperson, and Dr. Maurice Scharton, Assistant Professor of English, to the table for the discussion.

Mr. Eggan explained that the proposal had been generated by the Academic Standards Committee. Revisions were made by the Academic Affairs Committee. The proposal had been distributed in the Senate packet for this meeting.

Mr. Petrossian noted that there were several hundred foreign students at ISU and they were not mentioned in the proposal. Would they be held to the same standards? Mr. Eggan said that question had never been raised. He presumed that if such students were earning a bachelor's degree at ISU they should have writing skills commensurate with that degree. It would be the same type of exam. Mr. Petrossian then asked what would happen if after several tries the student

still failed the examination? The student could not graduate.

Mr. Slan said he read the proposal with a great deal of satisfaction, until he realized every student in the university had to take this exam. The proposal contained no estimate of the costs. For the Budget Committee, Mr. Ritt noted that they had held a few meetings on the subject and had received some correspondence. The present status was that the English Department estimated the cost of administering the program could be absorbed easily in the department. Academic Affairs agreed that the intent and effect of section E (Students who fail the examination should seek assistance, such as through additional course work or tutorial help in the Writing Center, before retaking the examination. Counseling and suggestions will be provided to the interested student by the Writing Center.), if the proposal were passed by the Senate and approved by the President, would be that the administration would be under obligation to provide instructional services necessary to give students a reasonable chance of passing the examination. If a second English course were required, the cost to do that would be substantial, an estimated 8 FTE, between \$120,000 and \$160,000.

In response to a question by Mr. Eimmermann, Dr. Harris explained how the examination could be administered without additional staff. It would require one course reduction during the spring semester and one course reduction during the fall semester. It would require approximately 1/2 graduate assistant FTE. Graduate students, under the direction of Dr. Scharton, would grade the examinations. Dr. Scharton explained the standard practice was for three graders to do a holistic reading and arrive at an assessment of the essay's merit on a scale of 1-5. With length control of 300 words, an essay could be graded within a minute. The length of the examination would be determined by the University Writing Examination Board (UWEB). The Board would determine what to test for (i.e. language skills, useful narrative, more objective problem solving). Between June 1 and July 30, for example, 3,800 placement tests were graded by the English Department.

Mr. Waites asked if a student's GPA would be affected if he or she failed the exam. It would not. In response to a question of why other courses could not be substituted for the examination, Mr. Eggan pointed out that with transfer of courses from other schools, the courses might not be comparable; the cleanliness of the proposal required that all students sit for the exam.

Mr. Friedhoff asked if the proposal was initiated independently by the Academic Standards Committee. Mr. Eggan said it was. There was concern over the quality of writing by graduates of the University. Mr. Friedhoff thought it seemed peculiar that the department with the most experience had not been involved in the development of the proposal. Mr. Eggan responded that the expertise of the English Department had been used as much as possible. The English Department did not take a leading role because it did not want to give the impression it was empire building or that it was a self-serving proposal.

Mr. Friedhoff questioned the results of a recent survey. He had understood that while 85% of those who responded thought their students' writing skills were mediocre or bad, only 36% of those who received the survey responded. Could there not be a different definition of degree of writing skills and would it not be possible to have a different interpretation from person to person and college to college?

Dr. Scharton responded that through the survey he tried to get information to help Writing Center personnel. Mr. Friedhoff wondered if there was not the need for a more systematic survey to support this proposal. Dr. Scharton said the

Academic Standards Committee did conduct an informal survey.

Mr. Pontius asked if all students would take the same exam or would there be variations? Mr. Eggan responded that the expectation was that there would be uniformity of skills tested. In response to questions by Mr. White, Mr. Eggan said perhaps the examination would be given two times each semester and he assumed the results would be sent to the student. Mr. White then asked if any other universities had such an examination. Dr. Harris responded that it was a very old idea. The Board of Governors have re-implemented such a program or in the process of doing so. SIU-Carbondale had just started it, and other universities were talking about it. Such places as MIT and Berkley had writing examinations.

In response to another question by Mr. White, Mr. Eggan said it would apply to students who were taking a second bachelor's degree at ISU. It would affect anyone who would earn a degree from ISU.

Mr. Mohr wondered if perhaps this was the time to improve standards and to cater to better students. If a student could complete four years of study and then not pass this test and not receive a degree, it might be better to raise the standards and keep such people out rather than keep them from getting out.

Mr. Reitan wondered why all juniors would be required to take the examination. Could not those students who needed to take it be identified? Those students with A or B averages would seem to have the writing skills needed for the program in which they were enrolled. Mr. Eggan responded that looking at the GPA did not give an indication of writing skills. It was necessary for them to have a reasonable command of the English language.

Ms. Gowdy asked how remediation would take place. Mr. Eggan said his point of view was that if there were a problem with the writing skills of students in this institution, the institution should see that graduates have writing skills. An economically feasible way was through the use of a writing examination. It would have several salutary effects. Students would see before graduation that writing was important and would, of their own volition, maintain and improve skills through appropriate course selection. The University had a moral obligation to provide some means to develop those skills.

Mr. Petrossian felt the proposal had merit. Mr. Miller asked about the competency level of the exam. Should a student who passed English 101 be able to pass? Was it a high enough level to require credit generating courses? Dr. Harris responded that a student who passed 101 should be able to pass the writing examination, but a skill not exercised over a long period of time atrophied. If a student passed 101 with a D+, the skills may be lost by the junior year. In response to another question by Mr. Miller, Dr. Harris pointed out that currently the department of English offered 140 sections of 101 and 40 sections of 145. To offer 100 sections of 145 would require 8 FTE positions at approximately \$1,650 per month for 9 months.

In response to a question about the UWEB, Dr. Harris said the UWEB would develop criteria for the various disciplines. Membership on the UWEB would represent each college. It was assumed that the college dean would appoint members with expertise and interest in the area.

Mr. Slan felt that there was a real need for such an examination. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction had had to go to some type of basic examination

for its students. Mr. Pritner then asked for clarification of Dr. Scharton's comment about the 100% remission factor. If it was true that two years after taking the 101 course the skills had totally atrophied, what would be the value of giving such an examination. Dr. Scharton said the existence of the examination could cause alteration in behavior. Students would seek out courses to help them maintain writing skills. The test would improve the likelihood that that would happen. Mr. Pritner was concerned that we were putting in a test without outlining recommendations as to what remediation would take place, without analysis of administrative, educational, and fiscal implications of the various alternatives, and without really understanding the rationale behind the proposal. Mr. Eggan responded that an indepth study would not be made if nothing was pushing it along. Here was a policy. With this proposal the Senate was saying writing was important. The university would have a moral obligation to help students who failed, with plenty of lead time to bring solutions to bear.

In response to a question, Dr. Harris said the idea of basic skills courses carrying this responsibility was not working. Dr. Harris pointed out that on page 1 of the proposal, the one course required at the University of Illinois was a four-hour course, not four-year.

Mr. Watkins asked if it was not too bad and if it did not say something that the Senate was dealing with the question that graduates of the university should be able to write?

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs. Mr. Eggan, Chairperson, said the committee had two carry-over items--Academic Bankruptcy and Disestablishment of Academic Units Policy.

Administrative Affairs. Ms. Gowdy reported for the committee that there was one carry-over item--evaluation of administrators policy.

Budget Committee. Mr. Ritt, Chairperson, said he had been requested to talk about the processes the Needs and Priorities Committee used. The question of most interest to the Senate was the process by means of which the committee made recommendations to the President. It was an evolving process, with the committee learning how to do it. The effects of the part played by the university community, particularly in the hearings held by the committee, gave the committee the opportunity to hear the opinions offered and had been helpful. With the \$1.7 million reduction in personal services for FY-84, there was no choice but to make recommendations to the President which he would forward to various boards. One-third of the \$1.7 million was cut from institutional support costs; another third came from academic support areas, the the final 1/3 in fundamental instructional areas, reduction of faculty positions. In that area the value judgments would be made by the college deans to best represent academic prioritization.

Executive Committee. Mr. Bruin reported that the Executive Committee would meet March 30, 1983, at 8:15 a.m. in Hovey 308.

Faculty Affairs Committee. Mr. Schmaltz, Chairperson, said the committee met March 2. The president, the provost, current and past chairs of the Academic Freedom Committee were present. After a long discussion there was agreement that there needs to be someone to look at all grievance procedures, partly because of jurisdictional problems. It was agreed to get one person to put together a

document to regulate all appeals procedures. Mr. Ritt had agreed to be the "czar" of the appeals process. Mr. Schmaltz expressed his thanks to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Joint University Advisory Committee. Mr. Eimermann reported that JUAC met March 16-17. He knew the members of the Senate were aware that the Board approved a 3% salary increase, effective April 1, but he was not sure the members realized that this was possible because the Governor borrowed from all the state retirement funds. The State-University Retirement System was now funded below the net pay-out level. ISU's financial exigency procedures were approved by the Board. No action was taken by the board on a tuition increase. JUAC had received information about employee insurance coverage. Blue Cross/Blue Shield coverage would be the same for the individual employee. Dependent coverage through Blue Cross would be up 13% for one dependent, and down for more than one dependent. Life insurance coverage was to be rebid. Mr. Eimermann further reported that a bill was now in the State Legislature to remove the \$7 state subsidy of state employee dependent coverage. There was talk that next year there would be either a reduction in health insurance coverage for employees (paid by the state) or a reduction in what the state paid, with the employee making up the difference. JUAC had begun a study of early retirement options. The JUAC sponsored retreat for Board members was now scheduled for April 20 at ISU. This retreat would provide an opportunity for members of JUAC to get their point of view across to members of the Board. James Furman would be the main speaker.

Student Affairs Committee. No report.

Rules Committee. No report.

Communications

On behalf of the Academic Senate, Ms. Varner presented Mr. Tuttle with a plaque as an expression of appreciation for his service to the Senate as chairperson for two years. Mr. Tuttle received a round of applause.

Adjournment

XIV-118 On a motion by Mr. White (seconded by Mr. Eggan) the meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m. The motion carried.

For the Academic Senate,

Iris Varner, Secretary

IV:pch

