

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 12-4-1990

Senate Meeting, December 4, 1990

Academic Senate

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, December 4, 1990" (1990). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 574.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/574>

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

December 4, 1990

Volume XXII, No. 8

Seating of New Senator

Call to Order

Roll Call

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- Action Items:
1. Administrative Affairs Committee Proposal for Academic Calendars for 1993-1995
 2. Election of Search Committee Members for Vice President for Student Affairs Search

Information Items: Academic Plan for 1991-1996

Communications

Committee Reports

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)

December 4, 1990

Volume XXII, No. 8

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

SEATING OF NEW SENATOR

A new student senator, Laura Osten, a junior in Commercial Recreation, was seated to replace James Fornelli. Ms. Osten will serve on the Rules Committee.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Schmaltz called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of Minutes of November 28, 1990

XXII-44 Motion to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of November 28, 1990 by Moonan (Second, Hulit) carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Len Schmaltz announced that the Administrative/Professional Council had elected Dr. Larry Quane, of Industrial Technology, as the A/P Representative to the Joint University Advisory Committee. The Board of Regents added an additional seat to JUAC, and the Academic Senate voted to give that seat to the Administrative/Professional Council.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Eric Raucci wished everyone a good Christmas.

Student Body President's Remarks

Student Body President Terrence Sykes had no remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

President Wallace had an excused absence.

Provost, David A. Strand reported to the Academic Senate that the Illinois Board of Higher Education today at its meeting in Chicago approved three new Illinois State University program initiatives: the M.S. in Agribusiness; the M.S. in Geohydrology; and the Specialist in School Psychology Degrees.

Senator Tuttle: Was there any movement to include dollars in the budget for these programs?

Provost Strand: We are only at the discussion budget stage at this point in time. The Board of Higher Education staff members have said that they do intend to recommend funds for these programs consistent with Illinois State University's request.

Vice President for Student Affairs, Neal Gamsky, had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, James Alexander, had an excused absence.

Action Items

1. Election of Search Committee Members to the Vice President for Student Affairs Search Committee

Chairperson Schmaltz: Jane Liedtke of Industrial Technology has asked that her name be removed from the ballot. She will be in China in the Spring. Vote for two faculty members and four students.

Senator Sykes: I wanted to comment on the student members here. Some of the student leaders got together and had a student caucus before our last meeting, and I thought we came to a general consensus that what we were going to go with as student representatives to the Search Committee for the Vice President for Student Affairs was: the Black Student Union President; the President of ARH; the Student Regent; and the Student Body President. What you see on your ballot is Andre Lewis, the President of the Black Student Union; Tim Schurman is the Student Regent; myself, I am the Student Body President; and Kathy Touhy is President of ARH. I just wanted to explain to you who those individuals are. We also have one other nominee on there, Rob Engelhardt who is a student senator. But, from what I gathered in the caucus, we were going to go with those four individuals. You are allowed to do what you choose. Some of us felt that those are the individuals who deal directly with that position and know what would be good qualities of a Vice President for Student Affairs.

Senator Engelhardt: I would just like to comment on that. The gathering that we had last week could hardly be called a student caucus, because there were hardly any students there. I believe that the choices were a representative from the Senate, the Student Regent, the Student Body President, the ARH President, and the Black Student Union President. That was my understanding, that those would be the five candidates, and that you vote for four.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Are there additional nominations. Seeing none, we will vote for two faculty members and four students.

Senator Walker: I heard a rumor that this position has already been advertised in the Chronicle for Higher Education.

Senator Nelsen: One of the individuals in my Department came to me and said they had read the ad in the Chronicle, and were wondering about that in terms of timing. I said it couldn't be because we were just voting on the search committee members this evening.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I wonder who would have placed this ad.

Provost Strand: I have not placed any ad in the Chronicle, nor am I personally aware of any ad having been placed in the Chronicle. If it does, in fact, exist, it is without my knowledge or without any consultation with me.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I am sure we will be able to verify if the ad does run in the Chronicle, and I think this would be a good question to ask the President at the next Senate meeting.

Election Results for Search Committee Members for the Vice President for Student Affairs Search:

Susan Amster, Art
William Semlak, Communication
Robert Engelhardt, Junior, Finance
Andre Lewis, Senior, General Studies
Tim Schurman, Senior, Soc. Sci. Teacher Ed.
Kathy Touhy, Sophomore, General Studies.

2. Administrative Affairs Committee Proposal for Academic Calendars for 1993-1995

XXII-45 Senator Nelsen: I would like to move that the Academic Senate approve the Academic Calendars for the years 1993 to 1995 (Second, Tuttle). Motion carried on a voice vote.

Information Items

Academic Plan for 1991-1996

Senator Walker, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee:
The Academic Affairs Committee has reviewed the Academic Plan and made some suggestions to the Academic Planning Committee at the last two meetings. We are presenting it to the Senate. The only changes that were made were some minor changes in the ISU Mission Statement in terms of wording changes that bring the Vision Statement and the Mission Statement into closer alignment. It has also been suggested that we change the Vision Statement to come into alignment with the ISU Mission Statement. Another major change is the draft memo placed at the beginning of the Plan. It shows some exploratory program ideas that have been suggested in the next five years, which last year were part of the Academic Plan. This is where the Senate had some input. We requested that the five-year list of programs not be included as a part of the Academic Plan proper, but rather that it be an addendum to it. That is the way it was presented this year, as a separate addendum.

Dr. Catherine Batsche, Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Program Development: I would like to describe the process used in developing the Academic Plan. First of all, I would like to thank the Academic Planning Committee. The work on the 1991-96 Academic Plan actually involved two committees, last year's and this year's: Len Schmaltz, Carroll Taylor, George Tuttle, Paul Walker, Jeff Wood, Scott Williams, Tim Schurman, Clayton Thomas, Gregory Aloia, and Roy Austensen. Last spring, we sponsored hearings in conjunction with the college councils. I think those are the most beneficial hearings that we have had in the five years I have been working on the Academic Plan because we had good representation from the colleges and we received numerous comments from faculty. Those comments were received by the Academic Planning Committee, and formulated into planning priorities. The planning priorities were sent to the President and Provost in rank order and their approval was obtained. We then began to work with various members of the University in writing the planning statements.

One of the first items we dealt with as an Academic Planning Committee was to try to integrate the Academic Planning Process with the Strategic Planning Process. The Academic Planning Committee viewed the Strategic Plan as a plan for the entire University (i.e. for all the units of the University -- Student Affairs, Academic Areas, Athletic Areas, etc.). The Academic Plan focuses predominantly on the academic areas. We viewed the two processes as highly compatible. As we examined the

language and substance of the Strategic Plan and the Academic Plan, we found that they were very compatible. They had different formats, but for the most part the same substance was found in both documents. We then set out to integrate the two processes and the two documents as much as possible and appropriate while maintaining the distinctiveness of each process. We did this in several ways. First, we changed some language in the ISU Mission Statement and included some new statements from the Strategic Plan include a couple of new statements. We also made statements which we thought were better descriptions of ISU than those currently in the mission statement. We also made some recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee, asking them to consider changes in language in the Strategic Plan. We thought that some of the language that had been used in the ISU Mission Statement and academic planning documents really captured the essence of the priorities better than the language in the Strategic Plan. So we have made recommendations to Academic Affairs for their consideration as they review the Strategic Plan. Second, we related each planning statement in this year's Academic Plan to the themes identified in the Strategic Plan. Third, we worked with the Deans to integrate requests for information for future Academic Plans so that when they submit their progress reports for the Strategic Plan they will be able to simultaneously include information that we need for the Academic Plan. We should be able to reduce some of the paperwork that is involved in the planning process. Finally, we included information about both the Academic Plan and the Strategic Planning Priorities in the FY92 PIE requests for new state funds. One of our goals this past year was to integrate the Strategic Plan with the Academic Plan and I think we have made considerable progress. However, we will need to continue to review the process after the Senate reviews the Strategic Planning Document later on.

I will discuss each section of the Academic Plan very briefly. Section I contains the Mission Statement for the University and the Mission Statements for each college. Dr. Walker indicated that we had made some changes. If you have it in front of you, the changes that we made to the Mission Statement are the addition of the first two goals: to provide the premier undergraduate education in Illinois; and to provide premier graduate education in selected areas. In the past, one goal stated that ISU provided high quality graduate and undergraduate programs. We thought substantively that there was no difference in the mission statement and the Strategic Plan themes. We decided to use the Strategic Plan words in the mission, stating that the language was more appropriate. In the third goal, we changed the word "encourage" research and creative activity to the word "support" research and creative activity, feeling that "support" was a stronger word and demonstrated the need to provide resources for

research not just encouragement. The final change in the mission statement involved the second to the last goal. It used to read "provide access and services for special populations including minorities, individuals with disabilities, non-traditional students, and students with special talents." The language that you see in front of you incorporates the language that was recommended by Dr. Gloria-Jeanne Davis, ISU Affirmative Action Officer: "Provide access and services for students from under-represented groups and students with special talents." Dr. Davis indicated that preferred language to describe special populations is "under-represented groups," so we have changed that language to reflect that new phrase. As Dr. Walker indicated, we did have the Academic Affairs Committee review these changes and they approved the changes at their last meeting. In the past, there was no process established to make changes in the Mission Statement. With the new process recently described to the Senate, we have the assurance that the Academic Affairs Committee will review any changes that are made in the mission statement.

Section II contains the Academic Planning Priorities. There is always one area of confusion about this section, and I want to clear that up in advance. These are not necessarily the priorities for the University as a whole, they are the priorities for planning new initiatives or revitalizing areas that need some assistance or a new emphasis. The goals of the University are included in the mission statement. The visionary theme for the year 2007 are included in the Academic Plan. Section II of the Academic Plan contains priorities for planning new initiatives or revitalizing areas which need additional focus.

Several of the priorities have been in previous academic plans under different titles. However, three priorities are totally new this year, and I want to highlight those. The first is planning priority number four which deals with Academic Facilities Improvement/Expansion. The second new item is number six, University Studies Review. The third item is planning statement number seven, Teacher Education. All of the planning statements are ranked in priority order. The priority was determined by the Academic Planning Committee, in consultation with the President and the Provost. We have been criticized every year for not prioritizing the planning statements. So, we thought this year we would prioritize them and see what kind of response we received. We felt certain that this prioritization would be controversial. While the priorities are ranked, it should be recognized that the University is a multi-faceted institution and can work on many activities at the same time. As you can see by following the University's activities, we are already working on most of these planning practices simultaneously.

Section III includes the announcements of new academic program requests and center requests. These are announcements only. The Senate will have the opportunity to review and approve any proposals for a new program that goes off campus at a later Senate meeting. We will be removing the M.S. in Agribusiness; M.S. in Geohydrology; and Specialist in School Psychology from Section III, because the Board of Higher Education approved those programs today. I think we all would like to congratulate the faculty members in those departments, all of the curriculum committees that worked on those proposals, and the Senate. Some of the proposals have been in the works for years. It takes quite a lot of time and effort on the part of the faculty and the Senate committees to get the proposals to the point where they are ready for approval.

We have done something different this year, and that was to include announcements of centers. The Center for the Study of Aging is already being considered by the IBHE. The Center for Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education is in the developmental stages by faculty members in three different departments. We will probably continue to include Center announcements in Section III in the future, because there is quite a bit of activity in the area of center development, and we want the Senate to be aware of the activities that are under consideration.

Dr. Walker already alluded to the memo listing five-year program possibilities. After this meeting, we will either send the memo in its present form, or make revisions to it, and forward it to Dr. Carol Floyd at the Board of Regents. The purpose of the memo is to alert the Board of Regents staff to new program possibilities so they can keep us informed of statewide efforts in areas we will be working on in the future. Very often the staff members know of other universities that are working on the same kinds of programs that we are. It helps us to obtain such information in advance so that we don't get to the final approval stage before finding out that we are competing with another institution for the very same program.

Section IV is probably the section that takes the most time and effort, not only on the part of the faculty, but also on the part of the committees that work on academic planning. Section IV is rather lengthy. Last year, the Senate asked if we would prepare a brief summary of Section IV so that they would not have to read the entire document if they did not have time. That summary is included on the salmon colored pages in the front of Section IV. I will summarize some of the information from the entire Section IV.

This year we reviewed the sciences and mathematics programs in the College of Arts and Science, and also the International Business Program in the College of Business. The science and mathematics programs were reviewed as part of the regular seven-year cycle. The International Business Program was reviewed out-of-cycle with the other programs in the College of Business because this was the five-year anniversary since implementation. We routinely review a program after it has been in place five years to make sure that it is getting off to a good start. I will first talk about the science and math programs in general terms and then I'll make a few comments about the International Business program separately.

In terms of the science programs and mathematics programs, we found several strengths. They are programs that we can be proud of at ISU. Among the strengths of the program are the quality of the faculty, the success of the graduates of the program, the quality of instruction provided to students, the faculty command of subject matter, the solid core of knowledge that students receive, the high quality of students attracted to those programs, and the steady enrollment in programs. We only had one program where enrollment was a concern, and that was Geology. It has a history of declining enrollment since 1977 when it was at its peak. This enrollment decline is typical across the country in Geology programs. Part of the reason for the decline is that enrollments in the Geology Department are closely linked to the petroleum industry and ebbs and flows in that field. Our program, however, has more of an environmental emphasis than a petroleum emphasis. As a result of that it should be less susceptible to fluctuations caused by the petroleum industry. Unfortunately, guidance counselors and career advisors do not always understand that distinction so our program has suffered enrollment decline. On a positive note, the Department of Geology/Geography started a very strong recruiting effort with the goal of recruiting one new student a week last Spring. They met that goal. I anticipate that if they continue that way, they will have no problem with enrollment in the future. The only other enrollment issue was in the area of Physics. Their enrollment is adequate for their program, but they have a desire to become more selective in the students they accept. Physics students must have a very strong science background in order to succeed.

We addressed several curricular issues in the Science and Math programs. We found, in general, that the science programs need to examine their curricular structure more frequently. There is quite a bit of emphasis in the sciences on updating courses to keep them current. However, the program as a whole needs to be examined more frequently, particularly as the sciences become more and more multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary.

At the graduate level, the science programs need to continue to monitor the curriculum to ensure we are providing adequate focus and are taking advantage of the strengths that we have among our faculty. The faculty are generally very productive in the research areas of science and mathematics. However, some of the disciplines are concerned about the future of the research potential because they have seen a shift in the interest of some faculty members away from the research area. In order to maintain the currency that is needed in the science areas, the programs must maintain a continued emphasis on research. Research in the sciences continue to be expensive. The University has limited funds to support research, and the faculty need to seek external support.

The sciences as a whole have begun to focus on the assessment of learning outcomes. Physics, for example, has been very successful in this process. Some of the other science areas have lagged behind. The University has a requirement from several agencies to assess learning outcomes, so we are encouraging the science programs to submit assessment plans to us within the year.

Another concern was the status of general education. In some science programs, students thought that they did not have an adequate liberal arts preparation. There were very specific areas, and they varied by program. In almost every case, we have asked the science and mathematics programs to examine alternative methods to reinforce general education skills.

Finally, in the sciences across the country, not just at ISU, but certainly here as well, there is a need to attract more females and minorities to the science and math areas. This is a difficult process and one that needs more emphasis.

The program review also identified resource needs in the science areas. As all of you probably know, the sciences are desperate for facilities. Our facilities have been inadequate for some time both in quantity and quality.

One of the more interesting findings this year was the status of library resources for the science program. The library conducted an analysis of the materials that are available to support the programs. We also have asked faculty, students and alumni to evaluate the quantity and quality of library materials available to support their programs. This year, the library reported that the science periodicals consume 51% of the periodical budget for the university, i.e., approximately ten programs in the university consume 51% of the periodical budget. That is not enough. There are three problems: First, there is significant cost inflation among the scientific

periodicals. According to the library, there has been a 375% increase in the cost of science periodicals over the past twelve years, while at the same time there has only been a 45% increase in the ISU periodical budget. An average chemistry or physics journal now costs \$367 per year. That number increased from \$70 ten years ago. Second, the number of science journals is increasing in direct proportion to the interdisciplinary work that is occurring in the sciences. So, as the science programs are expanding, new journals that are in demand. Third, the science faculty are not pleased generally with the availability and access to library materials. Many of the back issues of journals are in storage and the faculty need to have frequent and immediate access to those materials. So, we have a problem not only of cost and quantity, but also of storage and adequate access to the faculty for their research.

Other resource needs identified through the program review included the need for additional laboratory technicians and computer technicians to support the science/math programs. Virtually all of the graduate programs have a need for increased graduate assistant stipends to remain competitive with other universities and to attract the best students to ISU. Equipment, while very good, is in need of constant updating because science equipment is changing so rapidly. We need additional funds in the equipment budget to support these programs. In the mathematics area we found a need for three additional faculty members, not only for math majors, but also to provide additional course work for students in the University Studies program.

I will make a few comments on International Business. This is a new program that is just developing across the country. As it develops across the country, there is a question as to whether International Business programs should be established at the undergraduate level or at the graduate level. There are questions as to whether or not a student should get a degree in a functional area of business with some support work in international studies or whether students should obtain a specialized degree in international business. ISU has chosen to offer International Business as an undergraduate program. However, we are going to continue to monitor that decision. The College of Business plans to work with the alumni and with employers to find out if this is the best structure to prepare students for the business world once they enter the international arena. The program review outlines a process for the International Business program to continue to monitor the developments across the country to make sure that ISU is providing the best services for students. I would be happy to respond to questions.

Senator Mohr: I enjoyed reading this Academic Plan. It was very well put together and very lucid and it did an excellent job of harmonizing current programs that revolve around the vision statement. I found it one of the most logical plans that I have seen on this University campus. I do have a few questions. On Page 29, the second to the last paragraph: "As a critical player in the trend to become an information society, Illinois State University must integrate the technology of the information age into all aspects of campus life." I don't know what IBM or AT&T will say about that. It reminds me just after Pearl Harbor South Africa declared war on Japan before John Bull did. I hope we don't get trampled by our big competitors. It seems there is a little extravagant language there.

On Page 20 there is reference to the Vision Statement in the first sentence: "Theme three of the ISU Strategic Plan states that the University will encourage and respond to diversity caused by changing demographics and globalization." At the time when we first discussed the Vision Statement in the Senate, I did bring that out. I also wrote a letter to the Strategic Planning Committee about confusing the issue of providing an environment in which we accommodate students from all over the world with different cultural backgrounds and the idea of globalization of programs. Again in this plan, I saw no reference to globalization of educational programs. American is rapidly becoming a third world country. Currently in most strategic and economic planning in the rest of the world, the specific economic communities become far more important than the United States as an economic entity. I think that we ought to wake up and realize that if we don't enter the world soon, we will be isolated and pretty soon we will have no place to go but South America. I think there ought to be more emphasis on the attempt at international globalization in our curriculum, and I see no reference to it anywhere.

Dr. Batsche: That same topic came up in the Academic Affairs Committee. I will give you the same response that I gave there. I don't know if it is a satisfactory response, but at least it will be consistent. The Academic Plan for the last five years has had a planning priority to increase understanding of global and national interdependence and expand knowledge and understanding of other cultures. Typically, these planning statements remain the Academic Plan for a period of three to five years. As a result of the 1990 hearings, we heard a few comments on International Studies, but not nearly as many as in other areas. So, we removed International Studies from the Academic Plan, not to de-emphasize its priority in the University, because it is still one of the goals of the University in the Mission Statement, but to give increased emphasis to other areas that are new or are in need of revitalization.

Provost Strand: I wanted to indicate that one of the other planning priorities that deals with the university studies review, Planning Priority Number 6, and it indicates that as part of the process of university studies review a philosophy statement will emerge. A statement of philosophy that came from the University Studies Review Committee does in fact directly reference globalization and it is part of the process that the hearings have been concluded and if anything, there was an affirmation of the use of that. Lest you think that university studies is the core and is separate from the major, there is the deliberate reference to the integration of the major with university studies. So, globalization is referenced in that report in the total baccalaureate program. While it is not referenced specifically in here, it is coming through in an alternate way which is the University Studies Review process. That will surface before the Senate in the very near future. Your point is well taken, but it is being addressed in other ways.

Dr. Batsche: I imagine that the Academic Affairs Committee will discuss that when they go over the Strategic Plan.

Senator Mohr: On Page 35, the title to that section "Academic Planning Priority Seven: Teacher Education: A Campus-Wide Heritage (Teach)" with the Planning Priority to "Increase the University-wide Commitment to Teacher Education." What are you referring to there? I think we have drifted away from being a teacher's college and have become a more comprehensive University and I don't know if that is the tradition you are referring to or the slogan of the University, "Gladly would he teach and gladly learn." That certainly has nothing to do with teacher education.

Dr. Batsche: No. This planning priority statement was written in conjunction with the Council for Teacher Education and they came up with this concept. The thought behind it was that teacher education is important for everybody at the University, not just for those in teacher education programs. The reason is that the students who come to ISU from the high schools are prepared by individuals that we prepare as teachers. If we don't do a good job of preparing teachers, they will not be able to be successful with students who are going to come to us. Even if a student is going to enter a program that is not a teacher education program, they must have appropriate writing and speaking skills to be able to function effectively in a business class or a philosophy class. So, the intent behind the planning statement was to re-focus the University on the importance of teacher education for all of us, not just those in teacher education programs. I think that is what they meant by the word "heritage".

Senator Mohr: The other thing that personally disturbed me a little bit is in the next section on the trying to improve the educational opportunities for graduate students. In that section there is also reference to preparing graduate students for teaching: "Technologies for Teaching and Research -- Improve Technologies for teaching and research through campus-wide coordination of services, faculty training programs, and library/media service technology enhancement." I am not sure that I can quite go along with that philosophically. At the graduate level, generally we concentrate on the subject matter, science or whatever, the content of the program rather than the ability to transmit that content to somebody else. I am not quite sure that I can go along with the idea of investing graduate program money in preparing graduate students to become teachers.

Dr. Batsche: There is a two-fold emphasis here. One is there is an emerging national concern about the lack of preparation of individuals who are going to teach in the university. This concern grows out of the concerns with the quality of undergraduate education. As we hear more and more concerns from students about the quality of instruction, we trace the problem back to the fact that people who enter higher education often do not have any preparation in the area of teaching. As a result, you will see much more emphasis in articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education and other journals that graduate programs need to prepare students not only for research, but also for teaching. The other part of the national concern is that graduate students are frequently assigned to teach undergraduate classes and not all of them have had adequate preparation to do a very effective job. So, the planning statement is trying to address a two-fold problem: First, to prepare individuals who may become faculty at the University, and second, to prepare graduate students who are in the classroom right now without adequate preparation for teaching. I understand your concern, but there is a national trend moving in the opposite direction.

Senator Mohr: Is the intent then to develop courses and teaching methods for graduate students that require students in Chemistry, Geography, etc.

Dr. Batsche: I don't think we have gotten that far with the concept. The emphasis thus far has been on preparing orientation programs for graduate students prior to entering the classroom in the fall semester. A week-long graduate student training program was conducted prior to the start of the fall semester this year. Some departments have conducted orientation programs for teaching assistants for the past several years, but not all departments have done that. The Graduate School and the University Teaching Committee put together a workshop at the beginning

of this year to help those departments that needed a program for the students.

One example of a graduate program which incorporates teaching into its model is the DA in English. The DA in English actually fits the national model that is being proposed for all Ph.D. programs in English. The MLA has published a model of the idea Ph.D. program because they are concerned about the quality of teaching at the University level. The DA in English already fits this model.

Senator Ritt: On Page 32, I feel very uncomfortable about starting a rationale and introduction with quotes from Bloom and Hirsch. The relevance of the work that they did on the quality of education in the United States appeals to the best selling list, but should not be a basis for our rationale concerning education. This would be equivalent of saying Spiro Agnew's collection of works concerning education. I think it would be better to address teaching and research technologies. On Page 24, Academic Facilities, I don't want my remarks to be construed to mean that we don't need academic facilities. However, if you start your introduction and rationale by contending that "Between 1983 and 1989, enrollment at ISU increased from 19,817 students to 22,241 students," then the wind would be taken out of our sails because we are proposing to decrease our student enrollment by 3,000 students in the next five years.

Dr. Batsche: I will convey your concerns to the committee.

Senator Ritt: On Page 22, I notice that your goal number 4, "Seek FY92 PIE funds to initiate new services, and to provide community college transfer students with support services in teacher education." does not refer to minority students.

Dr. Batsche: That is incorrect. It should include the word "minority" before the words, transfer students.

Senator Ritt: I am seriously concerned about some statements on Page 16 and 17. On the top of Page 17, there is a statement: "President Wallace directed the 1990 University Review Committee to solicit and review the faculty reward system. President Wallace indicated that intensive scrutiny of the policies and procedures for faculty reward and recognition are periodically necessary to assure that their content and implementation appropriately serve their intended purposes. Improvements in the reward system should translate logically into faculty performance enhancements which collectively benefit the University community and its academic climate." I don't think that is quite an accurate picture of the events that took place.

I believe that President Wallace spoke to the Senate about his concern for this problem, he wrote a letter to the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee requested the Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Review Committee to address the problem. I think it sort of overstates the situation to say the URC is acting as a result of a directive from the President to review the problem. I think better wording would be to say that "as a result of an inquiry by President Wallace in 1990." I don't think it is a true statement to say that the URC is acting as a result of a directive from the President. I accept that there are a large amount of faculty concerns for the ASPT system, however, these particular matters such as Goal Number 3 on Page 17: "Examine the desirability and feasibility of implementing a differential faculty assignment and evaluation system in which the distribution of each faculty member's teaching, research, and service activities will be matched to the strengths and interests of the individual and the needs and expectations of the department." I am sort of disturbed by the implication that there have to be changes in the ASPT system to accomplish this. A lot of the misapprehensions of the faculty and the President about the reward system, is because in some way there has been an idea that departments and colleges do not have under the present ASPT system the capability of rewarding all of these programs according to their desirability. I think that the fact is that many departments do not know that they have that flexibility and that many faculty do not know that their departments have that flexibility. The ASPT guidelines as they now exist were written specifically to provide that degree of flexibility at the department and college level. There is nothing that prevents a department from giving differential assignments and deciding for itself what the reward system would be.

Provost Strand: That statement doesn't indicate that the ASPT system has to be changed, it simply says: "Examine the desirability and feasibility of implementing a differential faculty assignment evaluation system....." I read that statement to mean that the latitude may already exist. Therefore, upon discussion with the departments chairs, the DFSC's and so on, perhaps differential staffing may be an option that is already possible within the current system.

Senator Ritt: I am happy to hear you say that, Provost Strand. That was my basic concern. I would not like to see some sort of adventure of re-writing the ASPT document so as to ensure this type of result. I have no objections to an education program, or administrative opinions being expressed in these matters, for department heads and deans in consultation with their departments and colleges instituting a program of this nature. My concern for this was that this was perhaps going to

be interpreted as a University-level program whereby some collection of fixed rules for certain types of faculty rewards was to be instituted. Certainly, my interpretation of some of the things that have come out of these research committees would imply the creation of certain types of rules for rewards. It is the way in which this is interpreted that is important here.

Provost Strand: My interpretation is that within certain CFSC and DFSC guidelines, this option can be accommodated. It is just a matter of whether or not it has been implemented at the department or college level. So the flexibility already exists in some colleges, including the College of Arts and Sciences.

Senator Ritt: I will accept that. One of the problems is that people have constantly suggested that the ASPT procedures need to be redone to accomplish these things. I don't think anything needs to be done to the ASPT procedures to create this particular system.

Dr. Batsche: We may add a statement that this may be accomplished within the existing ASPT system.

Senator Walker: I think the Provost is right. I think that flexibility exists now, but DFSC's can only operate within the guidelines of the CFSC. I'm not certain that all the Colleges have the same opinion that is being expressed in Goal Number 3, here, and I think we need an initiative such as the one worded here that comes top down, rather than bottom up. It says, we want to "examine the desirability and feasibility of implementing a differential faculty assignment and evaluation system....." I think it should be top down, rather than bottom up. DFSC's are bound by CFSC guidelines. We don't necessarily need a revision of the ASPT process, but I think that flexibility is there so that Deans, College Councils, etc. push that initiative forward.

Provost Strand: I can assure you that the Provost Office will pursue this particular goal.

Senator Roberts: This is a question about the data base that you are drawing from. In the description of the process earlier, it was fairly clear how the university committees were involved, but then in your informal explanations you suggested that alumni assessment of department programs were a part of the planning process. Could you indicate how you do that and what concerns you have about the methodology and sample bias.

Dr. Batsche: The comments I made about the process refer to Sections I, II, and III -- primarily Section II.

The process we use in the program review is different. We start the process with students, faculty, and alumni surveys. Surveys are sent to alumni for the past six years. The problem with that approach is that the return rate is fairly low and we never know who is returning the surveys -- happy alumni, unhappy alumni, or what. We use the survey results as a piece of information among numerous pieces of information. We also survey all the junior and senior students. We administer the surveys in class. We also survey the faculty in each program. In the Fine Arts programs, some faculty teach in six different areas, so they had to fill out the survey for six different programs.

Senator Roberts: I was concerned about the response from alumni. Am I correct that some of your earlier comments referred to that data base.

Dr. Batsche: Yes. Throughout Section IV, you will find references to the survey data. When that data is questionable, we have several options. We can re-administer the survey. We can't do that for alumni, but we can for students. On occasion, we have met with students to get clarification of their responses. Survey data is only some of the information that is used. We use the self-study that is done by departments as well as data from departments and from Institutional Research. It is a multiple method approach. The final check in the process is the negotiation session with the Chair and Dean. The Chairperson is invited to an Academic Planning Committee meeting to discuss questions and areas of concern. Then we prepare a University Analysis with recommendations. The final step in the process is a negotiation session with the Dean and the Chair. It is not unusual at any point in that process to realize that the conclusions that we have made are possibly off target. I think there is quite a bit of opportunity for the departments to correct us if we reach invalid conclusions.

Senator Tuttle: I would like to add to the last comment as a member of the Academic Planning Committee, that what we have been doing in communicating with departments this past year may have been more than in previous years.

Dr. Batsche: We have continuously tried to increase the amount of active involvement that we have in the program review. For example, in the Ph.D. in Biology, the survey results didn't fit with what we knew about the program. One of the survey items indicated that the students felt that they didn't have enough interaction with their faculty. The Ph.D. program in Biology is almost an individual faculty/student based research program. We couldn't understand that response. We called a meeting with the doctoral students to find out why the surveys suggested a problem

with student-faculty interaction. Basically we found that the students work very hard, get paid very little, and they are tired. This came across in the survey. The students also pointed out strengths of the program and some areas of concern.

Chairperson Schmaltz: As a member of the Academic Planning Committee, particularly when this batch of reviews for the math and sciences (Chemistry, Biology, Physics, Mathematics) were reviewed, as we read through these, we have some real reasons to be proud of our programs. I love hunting for weaknesses, and love to scream and yell about them but these are some fine departments. The frustrating, sad part is, that time and again it comes through that they don't have the funds or the facilities, which is reflected in the suggestions for improvements. It is almost like we are sitting on a gold mine, and don't have the money to mine it. As a faculty member, I was not only proud of our programs, but very frustrated.

Provost Strand: I want to express my appreciation to the members of the Academic Planning Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and Dr. Batsche for what I think is an outstanding effort in bringing together the Academic Plan. Some of the veteran members of the Senate may recall that several years ago we spent literally the entire fall semester, two or three hours per meeting, going through components of the Academic Plan. Some members of the Senate suggested there ought to be a better way, and in fact, there was. I believe that effort to involve members of the Senate and a large number of faculty members in the academic planning process at an early stage provides a monitoring mechanism along the way. We also have been following established governance processes, soliciting input from across the campus with hearings and other mechanisms. The result is what you have before you tonight. What has evolved the last several years and matured with the Senate is an Academic Planning document which has been highly praised by both the Board of Regents and the Board of Higher Education. In fact, the Board of Higher Education said at its July meeting that the program review process at Illinois State University is the best of the twelve public universities in Illinois. There is a great deal about which we can be very proud. The academic plan is a really outstanding document. Finally, I would like to say that what we have before us proves that shared governance does work when all parties contribute in a constructive and good faith effort. I am pleased to be a part of this.

Dr. Batsche: The next step in the process is that the document will be sent the Board of Regents. This year, it does not have to be sent until January 25th. Usually, it is due January 2nd. We will have some extra time to make changes if you have time over the holidays to review the Academic Plan. We will make more changes after we return to campus the first week of January.

Communications

Senator Engelhardt: On the calendar of Senate meetings that we received this evening, will the June meeting be canceled because of the new policy of calling summer meetings only if necessary?

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Executive Committee will consider if a June meeting will be called.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - Senator Walker reported that there will be a meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee this Wednesday, 4 to 5 p.m., in Prairie Room 2 of the Bone Student Center.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Senator Nelsen reported that he had written to the Chairs of the Library Committee and the Facilities Planning Committee asking that the minutes be forwarded not only to the Academic Senate Office, but to the committee level so that we can study them. We also requested that an annual report be submitted by the chairs of those committees to the Administrative Affairs Committee so that we might be more responsive than in the past. We will report activities to the Senate itself.

Budget Committee - Senator Mohr wishes our colleagues a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. We would like to caution you not to spend too much money.

Senator Walker: I would like to ask if the Budget Committee has received any potential budget from the Athletic Department?

Senator Mohr: Other than the communication that we distributed to the Senate at the last meeting, we have had no communication with the Athletic Department.

Senator Walker: I would encourage you to remind Vice President Alexander that in our new bylaws we are supposed to get for Senate review the athletic budget.

Senator Mohr: Some time ago the Executive Committee discussed the possibility of inviting Ron Wellman to a Senate Meeting.

Senator Walker: That is separate from the expected budget.

Senator Mohr: Would it be appropriate to invite him to the Senate to discuss the budget?

Senator Walker: I don't think we want Athletic Director Wellman to come to a meeting and re-hash the budget with us. I think what we want them to do is send us an overview of the Athletic Department as to what is going on.

Senator Mohr: What exactly do you want the Budget Committee to do?

Senator Walker: Per the new bylaws the Budget Committee is supposed to get the next year's athletic budget to review. I would encourage you to ask for that budget.

Senator Mohr: We will do that.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt had no report.

Rules Committee - No report.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

Adjournment

XXII-46 Senator Nelsen moved to adjourn (Second, Engelhardt). Motion carried on a voice vote. Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JAN JOHNSON, SECRETARY

ACADEMIC CALENDAR
1993-1994

First Semester - Fall, 1993

August 19-21	R-S	Registration
August 23	M	Classes Begin
September 6	M	Labor Day Holiday
October 16	S	First Half Semester Ends
November 23	T	Thanksgiving Vacation Begins at 10:00 P.M.
November 29	M	Classes Resume
December 11	S	Last Day of Classes
December 12	Sunday	Reading Day
December 13-18	M-S	Evaluation Period
December 18	S	Fall Semester Ends
December 20	M	Grades Due at 12:00 noon

Second Semester - Spring, 1994

January 13-15	R-S	Registration
January 17	M	Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday
January 18	T	Classes Begin
March 12	S	First Half Semester Ends
March 12	S	Spring Vacation Begins at 12:00 noon
March 21	M	Classes Resume
May 7	S	Last Day of Classes
May 8	Sunday	Reading Day
May 9-13	M-F	Evaluation Period
May 13	F	Spring Semester Ends
May 14	S	Commencement
May 17	T	Grades Due at 9:00 A.M.

Summer Session - 1994

May 23	M	Opening of Summer Session
May 30	M	Memorial Day Holiday
July 4	M	Independence Day Holiday
August 12	F	Summer Session Ends

ACADEMIC CALENDAR
1994-1995

First Semester - Fall 1994

August 18-20	R-S	Registration
August 22	M	Classes Begin
September 5	M	Labor Day Holiday
October 15	S	First Half Semester Ends
November 22	T	Thanksgiving Vacation Begins at 10:00 p.m.
November 28	M	Classes Resume
December 10	S	Last Day of Classes
December 11	Sunday	Reading Day
December 12-17	M-S	Evaluation Period
December 17	S	Fall Semester Ends
December 20	T	Grades Due at 12:00 noon

Second Semester - Spring, 1995

January 12-14	R-S	Registration
January 16	M	Martin Luther King, Jr., Holiday
January 17	T	Classes Begin
March 11	S	First Half Semester Ends
March 11	S	Spring Vacation Begins at 12:00 noon
March 20	M	Classes Resume
May 6	S	Last Day of Classes
May 7	Sunday	Reading Day
May 8-12	M-F	Evaluation Period
May 12	F	Spring Semester Ends
May 13	S	Commencement
May 16	T	Grades Due at 9:00 a.m.

Summer Session - 1995

May 22	T	Opening of Summer Session
May 31	M	Memorial Day Holiday
July 4*	T	Independence Day Holiday (Projected*)
August 11	F	Summer Session Ends