

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 9-25-1991

Senate Meeting, September 25, 1991

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, September 25, 1991" (1991). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 584.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/584>

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

September 25, 1991

Volume XXIII, No. 3

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of August 28, 1991 and September 11, 1991

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- ACTION ITEMS:
1. Panel of Ten Election
 2. Approval of Student Member Appointments to Academic Senate External Committees

- INFORMATION ITEMS:
1. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for College of Arts and Sciences Graduation Requirements (Tabled)
 2. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Probation/Reinstatement Changes

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)

September 25, 1991

Volume XXIII, No. 3

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.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Jan Cook called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 28, 1991 AND SEPTEMBER 11, 1991

XXIII-7 Motion by Senator Newby (Second, Ken Strand) to approve the Minutes of August 28, 1991 carried on a voice vote.

Senator Walker had editorial changes to the September 11, 1991 Academic Senate Minutes. Page 3, first paragraph, half way down: "What the Deans had decided is to go ahead and take those internal reallocations now. What it actually means is that those funds have to come from operating budgets at this point in the year."

Later in first paragraph: "I appreciate your thoughts in trying to give a raise, but taking contingency funds and using them for faculty raises at this point when we may have a midyear recision is not the best policy because it can only hurt the quality of instruction that we have.

Page 3, Paragraph 3: "It is the feeling of some faculty that if the raise is a token raise, 1% or 2%, we would think it would be an unwise policy and hurt the quality of instruction because of ultimate internal reallocations which occur to fund the raise."

XXIII-8 Motion by Newgren (Second, Hesse) to approve Academic Senate Minutes of September 11, 1991, carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

The first ballot for the Panel of Ten was cast.

Chairperson Schmaltz announced that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate had received an annual report from William Tolone, Chair of the Athletic Council. Executive

Committee suggested that Director of Athletics, Ron Wellman, be invited to appear before the Senate and give a yearly summary and answer questions. He can attend the November 20, 1991 Academic Senate Meeting. Questions should be submitted at least twenty-four hours in advance to allow for ample preparation before the meeting.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson Engelhardt had no remarks.

STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Student Body President Romney Ruder had no remarks.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

President Wallace: Dr. Strand and I will attempt to answer salary questions. I would like to quote from a memorandum that went to all faculty and staff, entitled Salary Adjustments for 1991-92, dated August 21, 1991. I will read part of that memorandum.

"This fall semester, to honor previous equity program commitments and to address continuing personnel market factors, approximately one-third of one percent of ISU's personal services budget will be distributed from the University's contingency reserve for the following purposes:

- a. Funding faculty promotion adjustments.
- b. Establishing and funding an academic year increment policy for Distinguished Professors. This additional type of financial reward is consistent with the newly established faculty promotion adjustments.
- c. Providing selective faculty adjustments based upon the Dean's recommendation for merit based, market place factors.
- d. Implementing the third and final year of the civil service equity program.
- e. Implementing the second year of the administrative and professional equity program."

The adjustment program of salaries was also discussed by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the Budget Committee of the Senate, the full Senate at the August 28, 1991 meeting,

and the Dean's Council. I would like to go into a little detail which was contained in a September 19th memorandum to Deans, Department Chairs, Directors, Budget Committee of the Academic Senate and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, entitled "Fall Salary Adjustments:"

"The civil service adjustments this fall culminated a three-year program that was based on a study by the Personnel Office of regional market conditions affecting civil service employees. This program eliminated lower paying civil service classifications and resulted in a policy change whereby minima and maxima for various job classifications change each year by the percent appropriated for salaries by the General Assembly."

"The University has also engaged in a three-year Administrative/Professional Equity Program, and this year funds were spent for the second year of the program. This three-year program began when the A/P Council conducted a study and made recommendations to the Vice Presidents concerning the regional and national market conditions affecting A/P positions, as well as attempting to achieve some internal consistency among like positions at the University. During the first year of the program funds were allocated for lower and middle-range A/P positions; this year dollars were allocated primarily for middle and higher salary positions; and next year funds will be allocated primarily to individuals in lower and middle-range positions to address continuing equity concerns. I would note that during the first year of this program, the Vice Presidents utilized reallocated dollars, to a great extent, to make salary adjustments."

I would note that 53% of the continuing staff personnel services budget at ISU was dedicated to faculty positions. Fifty-three percent of the University FTE positions are faculty. This fall 65% of the dollars for salary adjustments are for faculty. Thus faculty received 65% of the dollars and this group represents 53% of the university's continuing staff salary budget. I believe that out of the 244 adjustments, 212 were for faculty. At this point, I would like Dr. Strand to comment on the academic side.

Provost Strand: I would like to start off with a few statements about the Administrative/Professional equity adjustment program and then conclude with comments about the faculty adjustment program. First of all, the Administrative/Professional program is a three year program similar to what was established at an earlier date for Civil Service personnel. During year one of the Administrative/Professional program, which was the last fiscal year, adjustments were made in all four vice presidential areas. In the Academic Affairs area, the adjustments were limited to lower and middle range salaried Administrative/Professional

people. The recommendations for those adjustments in the academic areas were based on a study by the Administrative/Professional Council and input from the Deans. As noted also by the President, some of the funds for these adjustments were reallocated within the academic area for these adjustments. During year two, the year that we are in now, the adjustments in the Administrative/Professional area were made in three out of four vice presidential areas. The fourth vice presidential area completed all of its work last year and had no new people to recommend for adjustments. In the Academic Affairs area this year the adjustments were made for middle and higher range salaried Administrative/Professional people. Adjustments were given to those from the first year lists who did not receive dollars during that first year. This was a list which reflected input from the Deans and from others. There were some individuals on the original list who did not receive adjustments last year. University contingency reserve funds were used as a source of funds for these equity adjustments. During year three, the next fiscal year, and the third year of the A/P equity adjustment plan, all four vice presidential areas will be eligible for the funds. In the academic area, the lower and middle range salaried Administrative/Professional people will be the ones targeted for the adjustments and the A/P Council study plus recommendations from the deans and directors in the academic areas will be the basis for adjustments in the academic areas. The adjustments that were made this year in the academic areas were for Administrative/Professional people, and, in part, for deans and members of the Provost Staff. The exercise constituted an attempt to get these salaries to the average for people in their positions in a national salary study. We had data on salaries for this region of the country. Current salaries for these people are \$14,000 to \$18,000 below the average. We recognize that many of these people have been in these positions for a number of years. They are below the average for these positions. The exercise in which we engaged made up generally less than one third of the differential between the current salaries of these people and the average on the study. That is a summary of the Administrative/Professional adjustment package. Turning to the faculty adjustment program, the President noted that 212 faculty members received adjustments. Of that number in three of the five colleges all faculty members who received exceptional merit ratings, received some sort of adjustment. Across the campus 62% of the faculty who received exceptional merit ratings received salary adjustments. With regard to the size of adjustments for faculty, they ranged considerably: 30 faculty members received adjustments of \$200 or more a month; 2 faculty members received adjustments of \$300 or more a month; and 5 faculty members received adjustments of \$400 or more a month. I note that the adjustments made in the Administrative/Professional area were comparable to the adjustments received by some members

of the faculty and the percentage of increase among the faculty in a number of cases was higher than any of the Administrative/Professional adjustments.

QUESTIONS:

Senator White: Can you tell me, Senator Wallace, what you mean by middle and upper level Administrative/Professional Personnel. What does that mean?

Provost Strand: What I am talking about when I use that phraseology, and this is a generalization, is individuals in director positions and individuals in the Dean's positions.

Senator White: I am a little confused about the number of years that this program is supposed to cover. I understood from another source that originally this was designed as a two-year program. Is that true or false?

Provost Strand: False

Senator White: In this fiscal year, the second year, the middle and upper level Administrative/Professional people got raises. Was it restricted to them, or did others receive raises?

Provost Strand: In the academic area, I know for a fact that it was not limited to middle and upper range people. There were some individuals in the lower ranges who also received salary adjustments.

Senator White: One of the problems with this issue that I run into is that a lot of people are functioning on the basis of rumors. I imagine that is why you are talking about this tonight. I would like to get out questions about the rumors that we are hearing. One of the rumors is that some of the people who were offered raises in fact refused them. Is that true?

Provost Strand: Some of the people who were offered raises chose not to accept them. That happened last year and again this year.

Senator Razaki: I agree with what Senator White was saying, there are a lot of rumors floating around. I am new on the Senate this year, but with this issue I have been contacted by at least nine or ten faculty members who are very upset about the whole process. Their feeling is, and I share this feeling, that universities are primarily built for students, secondarily for faculty, and only in a tertiary fashion for

the administration. But it seems to me that in this case the administration has rewarded itself. In a era of tight economic conditions, at least it seems unfair that that is happening, because I feel that if the administration can reward itself, it takes a little motivation for them to fight for the faculty. If there are tight economic conditions, it would be preferable for everyone to share in the hardships. It just seems that there is a lot of ill feeling on campus. It could possibly be because of these rumors. Would it be possible for you to disseminate information about how much each individual got in terms of raises this year in the entire faculty.

President Wallace: As I said before, we did exactly what we were going to do in the memorandum of August 21st. The amount of money that was delegated to faculty raises significantly exceeded the percent of the personnel base budget allocations to faculty. A question that came to mind as you spoke, would you exclude the civil service and administrative professional people?

Senator Razaki: No.

Provost Strand: I am very reluctant to get into specifics as to salaries for individuals. I am not sure that you or any other member of the Senate would appreciate me quoting your salary to the Senate in front of the media. There is a complete list of salary information in the library that is placed there every year for those who wish to explore salary information about particular individuals. With regard to the role of administration on campus as being a rather ancillary function (correction: tertiary function) and the administration rewarding itself, I would respond by saying that when administration functions well in the eyes of the faculty, we hear very little about the role or the work of the administrator; but you let a department chair or a college dean begin to function in an ineffectual fashion both the President and I are some of the first to be asked "why don't you do something about that." One of the functions of an adjustment program for administrative people is, contrary to your reference to rewarding itself, to insure that we have individuals functioning in those positions who measure up to the task and are the type of individuals that faculty and staff want to have in those positions. In view of the type of feedback that we are receiving on the individuals who were compensated in this process, we have good reason to believe that they were the type of individuals that faculty members wanted retained in those positions, and I had been advised by several of them that there were much more lucrative offers away from Illinois State University which they

could take if they wished to make a move.

Senator Razaki: I agree with you on a number of those points. There are also a number of faculty members who have greater market value than what ISU is paying them. I would suggest that we all be in the same boat. I feel that if the faculty is rewarded, then the administration also be rewarded. I wish we could give you all a million dollars a year.

Provost Strand: I would like to respond to that point by saying that there is a mechanism through the ASPT process by which a departmental faculty group or college can address equity concerns. That has been used in the past, but the most recent example is the College of Business that engaged in an equity study and did so in such a way that it also gained the support of the dean and the dean in this case contributed his share of the equity money to that exercise and there were a number of substantial salary adjustments made in the College of Business at a very important time. At this moment there are no departmental or college equity plans that have reached my desk.

Senator Razaki: Are there similar adjustment plans for the faculty as there is for the A/P personnel. Even at the faculty level, we are underpaid compared to national and regional averages.

Provost Strand: In essence, we engaged in that process this year and we have over the past several years. The funds that were allocated to the college deans were then distributed after consultation with department chairs to individuals who were deemed to be most meritorious of receiving them and deans took different approaches to that process. However, over the past several years we have supplemented those funds appropriated by the general assembly with additional funds which were reallocated within the university for members of the faculty and again a process of deans working with department chairs was used for that purpose. This has been something ongoing in the past and I am certain it will continue.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I would like to point out to senators that the same salary information that Dr. Strand pointed out as being available in the library is also available in the Senate Office.

Senator Hesse: We are sort of like dogs fighting over already bleached bones -- there is not a huge amount at stake in some ways. I appreciated the comments in the Pantagraph about the real issue being the level of funding from the State. The internal squabbling pales in comparison to that. Yet I think these are important issues to discuss. As I listen to col-

leagues, the concern has not been so much that faculty were treated unreasonably, and certainly the figures you are quoting suggest that that is not the case. The concerns seem to be with the A/P adjustments. My question is when was the first year (low to middle); second year (middle to high); and third year -- when was that developed?

Provost Strand: When the Administrative/Professional Council undertook it's study over a year ago, it was evident that numerous A/P positions were very underfunded. It was obvious as the A/P Council began to finalize its work that there was a list of positions for which adjustments were recommended which was far too ambitious to be addressed in one given year. From my perspective, as well as the A/P Council, when we talked to the deans last year, there was a value judgment that there was not enough money to go around. There was consensus that we should deal with the lower and middle range people at that point. Prior to the administration of the adjustments this year, I had consultation with several of the deans and indicated what I was planning to do and did not meet with any resentment or admonition that I should steer clear of this approach. Then the followup stage has been to go back and begin a review with the A/P Council who still should be considered for an adjustment. This process has been evolving and ongoing for two years. It is a multi-year process. The fact that we were addressing the Civil Service in a three-year cycle made sense to put the A/P process into that same time frame.

Senator White: I am afraid that I have to take issue with Senator Wallace's comment about when these raises were announced. He said they were announced August 21st. They were not public until a few days ago. I am frankly bemused that you think it is some way irresponsible or strange that we should be giving you a reaction to that policy now. It seems that the time is perfectly appropriate. I agree with Senator Hesse that the internal bickering that this has created is very unfortunate and I hope that no long term ill will between the administration and the faculty results from it. Clearly, it is a result of things that are largely out of our hands. There is something that it seems to me that people are taking very seriously, and it was in fact part of the last Senate meeting when the Budget Committee reported that they had agonized over whether or not faculty raises should come at the expense of courses and the quality of education. One of the ways in which the money for these raises was created (and I look at it from the position of my department) through the dissolving of some instructional positions. My department lost a couple of positions. When a position is lost, that translates into missing courses. Generally speaking, 100 level courses. That kind of serious-

ness seems to me not just "how much money did you get? -- gee I only got this much" -- it is that kind of seriousness that is at the heart of faculty despondency with raises. The question is should we be cannibalizing the instructional aspects of the University in order to give money to people who are relative speaking fairly well compensated.

Provost Strand: Let me attempt to respond to that statement in this way. Last year during the Spring semester, the University, when it recognized that it was facing some rather stark financial circumstances engaged in a reallocation exercise to address a number of priority issues. The reallocation exercise turned out to be very helpful in the summer, for when we were hit with a 1.3% budget reduction, we had money in reserve for that plus other unavoidable cost increases. Yes, it is true that a small portion of that has been used for salary adjustments for faculty, civil service and administrative/professional personnel. While there may have been some adjustments made in academic departments, the focus of attention is on the \$50,000 for the university as a whole for the administrative/profession adjustments. You can see in an exercise of the magnitude that we are describing, a 1.5 million dollar exercise, a small fraction of that can be attributable to the staffing problem. You can obviously stretch the point and say a position or two across the university has been sacrificed. With a total of 1.5 million dollars, and adjustments of \$50,000, that is a very minor point.

Senator Walker: I really have nothing important to say that hasn't already been said, but since I am so highly paid to be a senator, I feel I must say something. I agree with Senator White's and Hesse's comments and feel it is unfortunate that this type of discussion has to take place. Unfortunately, that is what happens when the have nots have very little. I do want to applaud the central administration for trying to get raises and increase monetary stipends for whoever it may be. I do want to note that 62% of the faculty who were eligible for exceptional merit received raises. While you made reference to the 30, 5, and 2 who received more than \$200, \$300, and \$400, I understand the vast majority of the faculty received considerably less than that. Members of our department received no more than \$35 additional compensation. What I want you to take note of from my perspective, is not over what has been done -- it's been done, we can live with it, and need to go on down the road and look to the future. I think what you are considering in January in terms of an adjustment or readjustment to make up what we are going to lose, from a policy standpoint needs to be addressed very seriously in terms of whether or not we make that adjustment and what the long range repercussions it may cause.

Senator Tuttle: My question is not a new one. I would address it to either President Wallace or Provost Strand. It must be rather lonely for administrators to have to make these decisions by themselves. I would think that you might need faculty input along the way to help you. I would be the first one to point out that the Budget Committee has been involved in discussing the August 21st letter that came to us after the fact. We have done that. Once again, it must have been very lonely making these decisions by yourselves with the help of the deans. Now we have the opportunity for input to what is going to happen in January. The Budget Committee has been in on the January adjustments. I think all of the Senate will have an opportunity to say something about that. I am raising the question, aren't you concerned that in every instance where there are important decisions to be made at the policy level, money for faculty, money for programs, tradeoffs that you might feel more comfortable with if you had some faculty input along the way.

President Wallace: I am not sure what more could have been done. No decisions have been made on the January situation. We have not made decisions on individual salary adjustments.

Senator Tuttle: I recognize the January case. What I was talking about was the August decisions. I would have thought a faculty voice in all of these deliberations might have been encouraging and helpful in the decision-making process.

President Wallace: If our discussions were after the fact, I was not aware of it.

Provost Strand: My comments refer to a memorandum the President sent out on September 20th to individuals across campus inviting persons to react to issues such as salary adjustments. As of 5:30 p.m. this evening, I had received no answer from anyone in any of my areas in response to this. I think that is indicative of something which is unfortunate, and I hope that changes. This was an option for people to contact and respond to their vice presidents and deans directly.

Senator Collier: I have a point of information. In the discussion of faculty increments, thirty people were to receive \$200. How many were associated with promotions?

Provost Strand: Some, but not all. There were some substantial increments recommended by deans and they are included in this figure. There are some in each category which were not related to a promotion.

Senator Walker: You actually have one letter which I wrote to President Wallace prior to the last Senate meeting.

Provost Strand: I have not seen that letter.

Senator Razaki: I wanted to make a comment. I don't resent the raises to the administration. I just think that this is a public relations item. I think the faculty that did not receive a raise felt that it was an insensitive thing.

Provost Strand: I recognize that the fact we are sitting here talking about this means that it is a highly sensitive topic in the minds of many people. We also recognize that we are in a period of tight financial constraint, not only this year, but for the foreseeable future, as a result of the State's financial problems. Some of us were in a room this noon where the speaker talked about circling the wagons. That speaker thought the time had not yet approached to circle the wagons. Some of us might disagree with that. But if we are circling the wagons in an attempt to address external problems, I would hope that we can shoot outward rather than inward to try to address those problems. We may differ in the manner in which we come to discuss this topic this evening, but I know that the President and I are very interested in addressing the internal problems which will make conversations like this unnecessary so we can address the more serious problem of underfunding of the university and the underpayment of the faculty and staff within the institution.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Panel of Ten Election

Results of the Panel of Ten Election (Administrative Selection Committee Chairperson Panel):

John F. Chizmar, Economics
Edmund T. Dorner, Health Sciences
George A. Hickrod, EAF
Jack Hobbs, Art
Kenneth E. Jesse, Physics
Kenton F. Machina, Philosophy
Walter B. Mead, Political Science
Ann Eicher Stemm, Home Economics
Gary D. Weede, Industrial Technology
Jeffrey Alan Wood, Agriculture

2. Approval of Student Member Appointments to External Committees

Vice Chairperson and Chair of Rules, Rob Engelhardt: Brought to the senators' attention Senate Communication 9.19.91.1. He asked that the Athletic Council Nominations be delayed until the October 9, 1991 meeting for more information.

XIII-9 Senator Engelhardt moved approval of the student member appointments to external committees (Second, Ogren). Motion carried on a voice vote. Committee appointments as follows:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

John Bozarth, Pre-Engineering
David S. Brown, Accounting
Laurie Caccamo, Chemistry
Joo Son, Psychology

ALTERNATES

Darrin DeNeve, Math Ed.
Sandra Tomany, Math

COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Kathleen Barry, Business Education
Mary Beth Rand, Elementary Educ.
Michelle Santo, Elementary Educ.

COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Mary Beth Karr, EAF graduate student
Michael Pauletti, Math
Michele Segreti, Math
Theresa R. Thigpen, Crim. Just. Sci.

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

Sara Eichholz, Finance
Carol L. Gard, EAF graduate student
Paul Hahn, Economics
Brad Halferty, Finance
Kristen Wozniak, Child Development

HONORS COUNCIL

Christine M. Adamson, Elementary Ed.
Amanda Eubanks, Vocal Performance
Jessica Gillespie, Pre-Business
Vicki Saweikis, Education
Laura Toncray, Jr. High Education
Tammy N. Truitt, Social Work

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Kaye Borgstahl, ORM
Nicole Dunbar, ACS
Rhonda Elmore, Public Relations
Evon Lee, Math

ALTERNATE

Michelle M. Vervaet, Math

REINSTATEMENT COMMITTEE

Jeff Babich, Ind. Tech.
Jim Begley, Physics/Math
Gina Reeves, Marketing

ALTERNATES

Jennifer Schrimpsheer, Biology
Scott Mooberry, Env. Health

SCERB STUDENT GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Amy Atchison, Political Science
Kevin Berquist, Business Admin.
James Garofalo, Accounting
Cara Ivy, Spec. Ed. Dev.
Jennifer Johnson, Mass. Comm.
Sheila Serour, Crim. Just. Sci.

ALTERNATES

Shawnta Foreman, Crim. Just. Sci.
Rob Wunar, Finance

STUDENT CODE ENFORCEMENT & REVIEW BOARD

Jennifer Kniepp, Business Ed.
David Neiman, Political Sci.
James Pilon, Political Sci.

ALTERNATE

Matthew Schwenk, Marketing

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Kimberly Devine, General Studies
Cynthia Johnson, Accounting
Carol L. Lindamood, Social Sci.
Laura Nelson, Political Science

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for College of Arts and Sciences Graduation Requirements

XXIII-10 Senator Ritt, Chairperson of Academic Affairs Committee: Moved to table the Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for College of Arts and Sciences Graduation Requirements (Second, Stearns).

Senator Ritt: The committee is not quite ready to bring this item up for information. On the other hand, we are on a relatively tight time schedule in respect to the semester since this is going to be a catalog item. We wanted to meet the promulgation requirements as an information item, but at the same time we are not yet ready to answer questions on this.

Senator Zeidenstein: Am I to understand that when this item comes before this body next, we will be able to ask questions.

Chairperson Schmaltz: It would return as an Information Item.

Senator Ritt: Yes. One of the problems with an information item at this time is that one of the persons involved is out of the country at this time.

Senator Zeidenstein: And then after the information stage, two weeks later it would come back as an action item. Is there a possibility that it would be both information and action items in one night?

Senator Ritt: No.

Senator Walker: What does it take to get the item off the table?

Chairperson Schmaltz: A simple majority.

Vote on motion to table the item carried on a voice vote.

2. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Probation/ Reinstatement Changes

Senator Ritt: This proposal comes from the Academic Affairs Committee who received it from Academic Standards Committee. It comes to the Senate with our approval, with the understanding that we always reserve the right to make changes as a result of discussion. It is a three-part proposal and should be looked at in its entirety. The first part is the minimum freshman admission requirements. If you look at the table on page two of proposal one, you will see a table which has a combination of high school percentile rank and ACT composite scores and SAT scores. What those various levels represent are the results of a student that examined a large groups of students in the 1982-83 freshman class which came to the conclusion that students who failed to meet these standards had less than a 40% chance of completing their degrees. It is an empirical study and the Provost Office would like us to understand that these numbers we have in front of us would be in a state of constant monitoring. What they are basically asking the Senate to approve as a philosophical point is the principle of having a probability of 0.4 as the basic requirement. They felt that this was rather important because it permits them at an early stage in the admissions process to immediately tell certain students that they could not be admitted.

The second proposal dictates an inclusion in the catalog of standards by which students can be admitted to various programs. Mr. David Snyder, Director of Enrollment Management for the Office of Admissions and Records, is present tonight to answer questions. As I understand it, these standards are especially set by departments in consultation with their deans. Maybe the deans for the sake of controlling the enrollment in their departments because of the departmental resources or for the purpose of insisting that students have certain prerequisites in terms of previous material, or because of academic competence to be in the program.

The net effect of these two facets of this three faceted diamond is that it is anticipated that the probability of success for students in this university will increase to about 54 out of 100 rather than 60 out of 100 which represents in the Enrollment Management Committee's eyes the kind of increase in the capabilities of our student body which were mandated by this faculty through the Provost Office a few years ago. Our committee is not necessarily in a position to verify the statistics because of their empirical composition, but with the assurance that the progress will be monitored, we don't have too many reservations with respect to our recommendation.

The third proposal is designed to deal with the universal grade point average standard establishes a 2.0 GPA as being in good academic standing at any given time. One of the serious questions that was raised in the committee was the question of does this mean that students who are in a program that requires 2.5 GPA for admission, for example, do they get to stay in the program even though their GPA has fallen to 2.2. The answer is, yes, it does mean that. The rationale provided for this situation is that they felt as though it is better wisdom to let the optical pursuit of getting into a program take place early in a student's career as a major, rather than telling the student later on in the program that he cannot possibly succeed. There are a few exceptions to this which the committee raised questions about, mainly, a case where an external agency through accreditation procedures requires certain grade point average, and we have been assured by the Provost Office that this would be taken care of. The committee also asked questions about the exceptions which are made with respect to minority admissions and that again was a part of the faculty mandate given a few years ago with respect to increasing admission requirements. Dr. Austensen could not be here, but he replied that the university is much more interested in expanding the resources to attract students who meet these requirements than they are in admitting students who do not meet these requirements. Another question asked by a member of our commit-

tee, namely the extension of this last proposition to the exceptions for students with particular talents such as athletes and others. We still look at that as one unanswered question.

Mr. David Snyder: The special admits are students, either freshman or transfer students, who do not meet the minimum university standards as established by the Academic Senate and the university. These students presently for the Fall of 1991 comprise 6.7% of the new students who come into the university. The majority of the special admits came in two principle categories: (1) the adult students; (2) students in the COPE program. Together those two programs accounted for approximately 80% of the students who came in as special admits. The other programs that accommodate special admits include: athletics (19 students who met NCAA standards, but not minimum ISU standards); exchange program students (7); high school seniors who have obviously not graduated from high school (4); and disabled students (2). So the categories for special admissions are designed to accommodate students who have alternate means of qualifications as opposed to meeting the absolute academic standards.

Senator Ogren: I am concerned about the 2.0 grade point average needed for graduation. Why aren't departments more consistent with establishing a higher GPA for admission requirements?

Mr. Snyder: The standards have a dual effect in that departments have controlled the number of students entering an program by raising the admission grade point average of internal transfers and also at the same time, then, as opposed to that acting totally as a screen to determine qualification to get into the program, it has also become the floor grade point of the program. So that should the student's grade point average fall below that, the student is then removed from the program and goes back to the general student category and is not allowed a major of his choice until such time that his grade point average is above the floor that the department has set. Essentially what the departments have created is a dam on the wrong end of the pipeline in that the students cannot graduate from the program and will be put back into the general student population until they pick their grade point average up until they can again attempt to enter the major. This has contributed to a significant number of students in the general student population who are called "boat people". I think this is a terrible term because it implies a very terrible process that is going on with these students. These are students who have chosen a major, but no longer can fulfill that.

Senator Ogren: Has consideration been given to have these programs adhere to the university's standards for graduation?

Mr. Snyder: Essentially, that is what this proposal does. The proposal is to first remove the restrictions on graduation and place them at the admission stage of the program. Qualifications will be established at the time of admission to the program, and once certified and qualified for admission to the program by whatever the department standards are imposed, the student then is free to continue in that program through graduation or dismissal based on probation and reinstatement standards that are currently in effect.

Mr. Ogren: My concern is that instead of a backwash we have a frontal wash of students who cannot get into a program. Where now it seems to be the opposite. I was wondering if the program required a 2.5 GPA, for example, and the student once admitted to the program falls below the 2.5 GPA. What happens then?

Mr. Snyder: This is the thrust of the freshman admissions requirement. It is the intent to raise the minimum qualifications of the entire entering class by picking students who have the probability of graduation that is going to bring the standards up. We are actually capable of graduating 59.7 of every 100 students that comes in as opposed to 53.2. In doing this, we raise the qualifications of the student body and this standard will continue to change upward as we continue to increase the overall admissions standards of the university. We recognize that there is going to be a situation during the phase-in process where we will have to give quite a bit of counseling and assistance to some students in order that they might graduate, or we need to be as upfront with those people as we can to give them an idea of what their opportunities are at Illinois State University. That is not now happening. We are getting students now who are caught in the backwash and they don't know which way to go.

Provost Strand: Our admissions literature will also recommend to high school students that in order to be successful in say the baccalaureate program for Biological Sciences, the student should take these course in mathematics, these courses in science, these courses in English, etc. But, there will be a roadmap, if you will, to assist students in high school to prepare themselves for a curriculum in a given area so that they have some idea of those expectations before they arrive on the scene and they will also know what sort of grade point average and course requirements will be required.

Senator Walker: I am referring to the combination of high school percentile rank and ACT score, on page four, consequences of the proposed change, the last paragraph. "Those applicants ranked

in the Second Quartile (26th to 50th percentiles) with enhanced ACT scores of 22 will also no longer be eligible for regular admission." What exactly does regular admission mean. Is there a way they can get in without an ACT score of 22?

Mr. Snyder: Those students would be admitted under a special category.

Senator Walker: So a student who might have a low percentile rank, but does have a good ACT score could gain entrance?

Mr. Snyder: There is nothing here that is intended to exclude any individual student.

Senator Walker: Is the plan to raise that ACT score in the future?

Mr. Snyder: Our plans are to continue studying the phenomena as it occurs and also as we look at different cohorts. This profile was built on the 82-83 cohort. This year we will be building a similar profile for the 83-84 cohort, and those will continue. If those studies suggest that the probability of graduation by extension the quality of the student body can be improved by raising that minimum ACT score, yes, we would. That must be tempered with our ability to attract sufficient students into our freshman class.

Senator Walker: Do you look at the high school size and how that affects your figures? A small high school, graduating thirty seniors could very well be in the right percentile in their ACT score, but in trouble as far as class rank.

Mr. Snyder: Attempting to compare high schools is like attempting to compare various types of fruit.

Senator Walker: There is some danger in building your scenario based on data alone. I would suggest that you use alternative methods.

Mr. Snyder: The special admission category allows us the flexibility to deal with any individual situation that comes to our attention.

Senator Walker: How does a particular high school counselor know this?

Mr. Snyder: They are already apprised of that particular aspect of it and every year the admissions office handles many calls from counselors requesting special considerations of students who do not meet those qualifications. A second

program that is offered is Summer Opportunities for Freshmen. Through that program students are admitted into the summer school to complete a probationary course of study if they do not meet the minimum fall requirements. This is another opportunity for those students to have access to the university.

Senator Zeidenstein: In the special admissions categories, I see four special categories. Upper middle of page four: "While raising the standard will decrease the qualified applicant pool by about 250 students, it is expected that an additional 250 to 500 students outside this group will continue to be admitted under programs designed for athletes, minorities, and students with special talents." Does that mean that some student who does not meet the minimum qualifications who is not a minority, or an adult, or an athlete, or a special class of student, might be admitted as one of the 250 to 500 students?

Mr. Snyder: Yes.

Senator Zeidenstein: Then the 250 to 500 students are not limited to athletes, minorities, special talents, etc.

Mr. Snyder: No. It would be generally available for us to consider the special application of any student who requests consideration over and above the standard process. As I said before, we entertain probably 50 to 100 of these each year. The majority of them we work into the Summer Opportunities for Freshman program, however, others are considered on an individual basis where we will have to consult directly with the department chair and if we receive the department chair's approval to admit the special student, we will do so.

Senator Walker: The way I read page four, the "250 to 500 students outside this group will continue to be admitted under programs designed for athletes, minorities, and students with special talents." It doesn't actually say anything about the poor white kid from average middle class America.

Mr. Snyder: That student would fall under special talents.

Senator Walker: Can we use that definition universally?

Mr. Snyder: Yes. A special talent can include a good letter of application.

Provost Strand: Senator Walker, one of the key elements is the recommendation of the department. A student's department can recommend admission.

Senator Walker: Shouldn't we say that in here?

Provost Strand: Do you want students who are ineligible for admission to be writing to the department chair. I don't think you want that. I think you want circumstances in which you know there is a student who doesn't meet the published criteria for admission, and you are aware that the student has a special talent, and based on prior experience has a good probability of success you could work with the admissions office.

Senator Walker: I am worried that that student won't even appear here because he doesn't think he will be admitted.

Provost Strand: That is part of what the admissions people do when they are out in the field and also part of what the departmental representatives do when they are in contact with people in their disciplines in high schools.

Senator Walker: I am still concerned that we have not let the average kid know that they can get in.

Provost Strand: We need to keep in mind here that we are trying to put in place some standards that would insure a higher probability for academic success for students. Departments in this university are refining that process so that they can avoid a circumstance where a student is misled into coming to Illinois State University and finding out that he/she does not have a high probability of success. Through that process of refinement by departments there are criteria that are publicized, but as Mr. Snyder said, there are also ways by which those criteria can be waived, and ways in which that process can be communicated to prospective students.

Senator Walker: As long as that is possible.

Senator Zeidenstein: Looking at four and five together, it seems possible as the document now reads to interpret pages four and five as saying: "An estimated 250 young meaning high school non-freshmen potentially (statistically) poor students will be kept out of ISU (that's what it says on page 4); and 250 to 500 potentially poor students (because they don't meet the criteria in the table on page two, but because of categories like minority, adult, talented, or athlete, will be allowed in." Now that is the way it reads. It is all very well if there is a raise in standards of students who enroll. But, if 250-500 students are allowed to be exceptions to those high standards, then you are not actually raising standards.

Senator Ritt: The Senate is being asked to approve a change in the catalog. The other material here is material which explains the interpretation. For example, Page One at the bottom, I - Proposed Change: Freshmen Requirements. There is nothing here that the University is saying publicly these are the only circumstance under which there will be admittance. We are saying you will be admitted if you meet these basic requirements and you will get into a major rather than being a general student if you meet certain other requirements. Within that framework, in my judgment and I think that of the Academic Affairs Committee, that a high school counselor who reads this with any competence whatsoever will read this and immediately know if he has an exceptional student that there is a question of referral.

Senator Zeidenstein: What do you mean by exceptional student?

Senator Ritt: I asked Dr. Austensen what happens if the student is at the very bottom of his class and gets 36 on his ACT score. His response was that if a high school counselor has a student of that sort, he should write a letter of recommendation. On the other hand, you don't want to encourage students who are in the bottom 25 percentile to write Provost Strand a letter. If you look at the catalog copy and base your questions on how the administration will be interpreting this.

Senator Zeidenstein: I was looking where it says see attached on Page Two. Nothing is attached.

Senator Ritt: That asks for the catalog copy that now exists.

Senator Zeidenstein: Near the bottom of Page One, the last sentence above Roman Numeral I - Proposed Change: "Such change would be administrative in nature." I interpret that to mean that if the Senate approves 0.4 POG admissions standard, that the basis for offering a mix of the variables in the table on Page Two, any change would not come back to the Academic Senate for approval.

Mr. Snyder: The statement "Such change would be administrative in nature," as I indicated earlier would be based on on-going studies that we would be undertaking to verify the efficacy of this particular standard. As Senator Ritt pointed out, the proposal here is to approve the philosophy of this approach to determining admissions qualifications as to approving a particular index of an ACT score and a high school class rank. As the study has been determined and presented, the 0.4 probability of graduation does one of the things that the Academic Senate requested which was to raise the quality of the student body, and it does this at the 0.4 level of raising the students such that approximately six more students per one hundred admits who are

admitted here will have the opportunity to graduate. We intend to continue along the course that the 0.4 standard brings us to which is 60 of 100 students. If it is the Senate's intention that we continue to raise that standard, then administratively we would adjust the ACT score and the class rank to continue to achieve the upward increase in the quality of students coming in. But, no it would not be administrative to the extent that based on the current study, that is the end of the process. Any change that would be made as a result of on-going studies of the process.

Senator Ritt: I think that we have to understand that no one will change what is in the catalog without bringing it to the Senate. Any change in these standards would have to be accompanied by a catalog change, and a catalog change is subject to a review process.

Provost Strand: May I clarify that. We have to recognize that there are policy statements in the catalog and there are narrative statements in the catalog. A policy change in the catalog would be subject to consultation with the appropriate governing body on campus. Many narrative changes describing and embellishing policy statements are changed from time to time without coming before the Senate.

Senator Ritt: If in the catalog you change this table on page two, that cannot be done by someone in the Provost Office changing the table. It states quite definitely what the student needs to get into ISU, and can't be changed by the Provost Office.

Provost Strand: I interpret it, if Senate says, and all of these changes came about related to a recommendation from the Senate. If the Senate says they want a 0.4 probability factor to operate, and institutional research data shows the mix of students may vary at some point as defined on page two, it still respects the integrity of the policy. That mix could be dynamic, but the integrity of the 0.4 will remain the same.

Senator Zeidenstein: At the top of Page Two, on Proposal 3, it says "indicate other departments or programs which will be affected and how." That word "affect" is a little misleading. Does it not mean that a program having a standard higher than 2.0 will remain that way? It would affect the program by forcing them to lower their standards otherwise.

Mr. Snyder: Yes.

Senator Stearns: I was wondering how special characteristics of academic programs would be treated in admitting people. Would that continue to exist under special characteristics.

Mr. Snyder: Yes. Admission of special students is also in conference with department chairs. It is on an individual basis. There is no unilateral decision, unless we have something on file from the chair beforehand.

Senator Stearns: Would this program have any affect on transfer students from community colleges?

Mr. Snyder: We expect that it would enhance our ability to attract community college students simply because many transfer students encounter difficulty getting into a program which they wish to enter. We will establish that once they achieve the admission standard that they will be able to enter the program of study that they have entered the University to pursue. At the present time, many transfer students will come into the University and then become no longer qualified to pursue the major that they declared at the time of admission and find themselves in a situation where they cannot progress toward the degree nor can they take courses in the program that they have intended to pursue. Many of them find themselves extending their stay at ISU or transferring to another institution. We expect that this requirement will begin to enhance opportunities for transfer students.

Senator Stearns: On Page Two and Three of Proposal 3, the requirement of a 2.0 grade point average standard is lower than what the College of Education requires for teacher education majors. If we pass this, then requirements of a 2.5 GPA would not have to be adhered to. Would this be automatically erased from the catalog?

Mr. Snyder: No. Standards that are imposed on the University by external agencies are exempt from these requirements. The teacher accreditation process of the State of Illinois requires a minimum 2.5 grade point average to qualify for a teaching certificate. That is an external standard.

Senator Stearns: What about students taking courses in these programs. A student could still take courses and complete a degree without adhering to the 2.5 GPA. That would require ISU to place students in student teaching positions who we feel are not qualified. Would departments be allowed to deny access to courses?

Mr. Snyder: That would become a student's choice, realizing that a 2.5 GPA would be required to get into a particular program to obtain certification. We don't anticipate that this will cause problems. As I indicated, if a program has certification requirements that are imposed on the University, then the department may set a higher standard to insure that students in that program meet those external accreditation requirements.

Senator Stearns: Would that allow us to deny them access to courses?

Mr. Snyder: I believe that you would not be prohibited from doing that. I don't anticipate that this will create the types of problems that you are envisioning because the registration program has within it several checks that allow the department to prevent that student from being in the program until he has actually gained the requirements to pursue it.

Senator Stearns: Then the department would not be allowed to drop that person. A student with 60 hours of C work would need 40 hours of 3.97 GPA to average a 2.5 GPA in order to student teach.

Mr. Snyder: The issue of the teacher education programs is not one that will be affected by this particular requirement. Students who are pursuing a teacher education program would be expected to meet standards that are required of graduates of that program.

Senator Stearns: Then it will be catalog copy?

Mr. Snyder: Yes. And that will become part of the admissions process, so that students who intend to pursue that will know up front that that is one of the requirements of a teacher education program.

Senator Ritt: In Proposal 3, there is not an exact statement of what the catalog changes will be.

Senator Young: What is our current probability of graduation?

Mr. Snyder: The current standard allows us to admit students with a probability of graduation of as low as 1.54. Fifteen of every one hundred students can be admitted.

Senator Young: ISU is a four year institution. I know the State of Illinois has a well funded junior college program which will take care of some of these students. Some of these students can attend a community college. On page two, in the table, is it

true that any ACT test score would be eligible if a student was in the upper 76% of his graduating class?

Mr. Snyder: Yes.

Senator Young: What is someone's probability of graduation if his test score is 5 but he is in the top 76% of his class.

Mr. Snyder: .5 The entire upper quartile, the lowest probability of graduation of students with an ACT score of 1-12 is The entire range has the opportunity of graduating one half the students.

Senator Ken Strand: The study makes no sense. I don't understand that. An ACT score of 5 has a .5 per cent probability of graduating.

Provost Strand: This points out that class rank is a more reliable indicator of success than the test scores. There are many factors which can affect a test score. A test score may not be indicative of the true abilities of the student. There may be a language barrier. There may be a scoring error. The student may have blown off the test.

Senator Walker: On page one, I am concerned about the change being administrative in nature. It seems that you can raise the scores as long as it meets the 0.4 POG admissions standard.

Provost Strand. What we are suggesting here, based on considerable study is that .40 seems to be a reasonable objective. With agreement on that as a policy point, the indices that influence that may fluctuate from year to year. What we are saying is that you may have to spend 3, 4, 5, 6 hours each year with the Academic Senate to bring back the scale. Our thought was that you would want the administration to carry out the instructions of the Senate. If that makes people on the Senate unhappy, we can bring it back yearly, or we could take it to the Academic Affairs Committee each Fall before we publish it in the catalog. Data on this is how it is going to change, and this is why it is going to change. But in the interest of efficiency and more efficient administration of instructions, we thought it would be redundant to come back to the Senate each year to tell you how we are changing the indices to carry our your instructions.

Senator Walker: I appreciate everything you have said and agree with you 99%. But, I am concerned that to meet the average, there may be some pools of students left out in

that process. I think we need some information to come back to the Senate to regulate this. It looks like we are setting an index and saying take care of it.

Provost Strand: Another approach would be to ask that the Provost Office report back to the Senate each year on the results of the admissions of the previous class. At the meeting when this becomes an action item, that could be a part of the resolution.

Senator Ritt: I have an answer for Senator Ken Strand's question. In the combined 1982-83 new freshmen classes, there were 116 students in the top 25% of their graduating classes who had ACT scores between 1 and 12. According to this data 50% of them did graduate. That is what the study showed.

Senator Ken Strand: Were the limitations of the ACT and other tests taken into consideration? The study seems a little strange.

Senator Tuttle: I need a point clarified. Do departments and programs that are identified as over-subscribed still have the option of requiring particular ACT scores?

Mr. Snyder: Yes.

Senator Tuttle: None of these documents addresses the issue of admission standards for transfer students.

Mr. Snyder: There is no proposal to change the standards for transfer students. However, the second proposal which is the introduction of selection criteria to the admissions stage as opposed to the change of major stage could be set by the departments which oppose higher standards for transfer students.

Senator Tuttle: Departments that are oversubscribed could continue to impose a GPA requirement for transfer students from the school they attended.

Mr. Snyder: Yes.

Senator Razaki: I have a question for clarification. I am in the Accounting Department and we have rather high GPA requirements. Suppose a student meets admission requirements and comes into the department and then later on their GPA drops. Can we remove them from that major? Once they are an Accounting Major, it is their choice to remain an accounting major?

Mr. Snyder: Yes

Senator Razaki: Suppose we have criteria such as an A or B required in previous courses, would those criteria no longer be valid? We could not stop them from continuing to take our accounting classes?

Mr. Snyder: The intent is not to prohibit those students from taking those classes. The intent is to allow the student to move through the program.

Senator Zeidenstein: I refer to the Provost's Statement about making reports back to the Senate. What I am concerned about is that as far as a report goes, they could manipulate the table to maintain a 0.40, that is fine, I agree with what they said before. What I am worried about is that the estimated 250 - 500 students in this document might in the future raise to 750 or lower to 150 -- an unknown number of students who come in who do not meet the higher standards that everyone else is required to meet. It is that number that I am concerned about. Some members of the Senate might be concerned about having control over this. The question is, can that kind of information be made available to the Senate on an annual basis -- a breakdown of students who do not meet the normal criteria for admission.

Provost Strand: The Academic Affairs Committee or the Academic Senate could request such information on a periodic basis. It is not confidential.

Senator Adams: When you have students within a major who drop below the 2.5 entrance requirement, and remain in the major, could it be possible that the majors will then raise their entrance requirement to say 3.0 so that their students will have a 2.5 GPA at graduation?

Mr. Snyder: There is potential for that. However, the other half of the equation here is also the number of students a department needs in order to maintain a viable enrollment. There is going to have to be a balance struck between student qualifications and a viable enrollment in any particular department. If the department had enough demand, then eventually they could raise the grade point average quite high. But, for the majority of departments that is not going to be the solution.

Senator Stearns: In regard to the percentile class rank in terms of the number of students, according to Mr. Snyder's data on high schools, 25% of the graduates of the Illinois Math and Science Academy could not meet ISU's admission requirements, unless they were part of a Good Old Boy network and had someone write a letter. The data needs to be examined to compare it with other factors.

Provost Strand: Two points. One is that the Illinois Math and Science Academy does not rank its students. They are a handpicked group. However, there is feedback data provided to high schools about how their students are doing at ISU. Our admissions staff is aware of that. There are other people at the university who share that information and talk with high school counselors and administrators about the performance level of their people. Short of having separate standards for each high school, a lot of that dialogue is going on now.

Senator Stearns: If that data is available, why not adjust applications accordingly.

Mr. Snyder: One of the issues in the admissions to the University is the complexity of the admission standards. The present admissions standards that Illinois State University is using are fairly complex. Often they tend to confuse applicants and counselors. The intent here is to reduce those to as simple a set of criteria as we can and allow the university to raise the quality of the students. If we were to go to a high school based criteria, we would not multiply those out to potential admission standards that the admissions office would have to propose making our communications almost impossible.

NO COMMUNICATIONS

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt called a meeting following Academic Senate.

Administrative Affairs Committee - No report. Senator Newby announced that the committee would meet prior to the next Academic Senate Meeting.

Budget Committee - Senator George Tuttle reported that the Budget Committee met tonight at 6:00 p.m. The committee has had input and discussions on the FY93 Budget and the status of it.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Paul Walker reported that the Provost will give a comprehensive report of non-tenure track faculty in November. The committee considered a report on copyrighted materials and forwarded a copy to the graduate office and research office and a copy will be forwarded to each department chair from the Senate Office. Another item the committee reviewed is Board of Regents regulations for hiring faculty. There has been a request to change that. The Board has agreed to that, but want to look over the wording changes. It involves the number of years that faculty members can bring in towards

tenure. Currently, the policy states that you must bring in at least three years. What is being proposed as a change is that you can bring in one or more years. It gives more flexibility to departments in hiring and more flexibility to the faculty members coming in.

Chairperson Schmaltz: A person must bring in three years?

Senator Walker: Right now, in order to bring in tenure, you must bring in three years. If you elect to bring in any tenure, you must bring in three years. The proposed change would allow faculty with just one or two years. This is a change that has gone to the Board of Regents. They are working on word changes.

Provost Strand: It is a change which emanated from one of the departments on our campus, was shared with the Deans and discussed with the administration here and at the other universities. It is in the Chancellor's Office right now and pending a clarification of wording, will be proposed as a change in Board of Regents policy.

Senator Cook: There used to be a maximum of three years. Is that maximum still in place?

Senator Walker: Yes

Rules Committee - Senator Rob Engelhardt reported that the Rules Committee had met this morning and made final faculty replacement decisions for external committees which will come up at the next Senate meeting. We reviewed the final student nominees for external committees. We discussed a proposal concerning committee membership retention. We began to discuss the Administrative Efficiency Report and will probably be dividing some of it up to other Senate Committees.

Senator White: Our committee has already received part of that report.

Senator Engelhardt: Yes, but we will be dividing it up further.

Student Affairs Committee - Senator Heather Manns had no report.

Joint University Advisory Committee - Senator Nelsen reported that JUAC this year has been given the opportunity to participate in the Board of Regents evaluation of CEO's, the President of the Institution and the Chancellor and his Office. As a result of that opportunity, JUAC will be involved with establishing a schedule and helping to identify constituent groups of people to meet and give input to the consultant when he appears on

campus in October for the purpose of a five year evaluation. JUAC will be meeting with the President on Friday afternoon and discussing with him potential groups that might be of interest to the consultant and also talking about some potential scheduling. One of the areas or groups identified was the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Dr. Schmaltz, Dr. Collier, Dr. Quane, and myself are among the members of the JUAC committee, and if you have a particular suggestion as to a group or some form of input that you feel would be useful, please convey that to us and we will be happy to bring that forward as we prepare a list of groups that will be involved in this. JUAC will be working on this through the month of October.

Senator Collier: The nature of the impact that JUAC will have on this process is unclear.

Senator Tuttle: What input does JUAC have on the Chancellor's evaluation?

Senator Nelsen: At the last Board meeting, it was identified that JUAC would be a group that would be consulted on each campus for some input on the Chancellor's evaluation.

Adjournment

XXII-11 Motion by Zeidenstein (Second, DeRousse) to adjourn carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

**FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JAN COOK, SECRETARY**

