

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 2-9-1994

Senate Meeting, February 9, 1994

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, February 9, 1994" (1994). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 777.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/777>

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

February 9, 1994

Volume XXV, No. 9

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of January 26, 1994

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS:

NONE

INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. Faculty Affairs Committee
Presentation of University
Review Committee Proposed
Changes in the ASPT Document
2. Academic Affairs Committee
Presentation of University
Studies Review Comm. Revised
Proposal for General Education

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University Community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions 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)

February 9, 1994

Volume XXV, No. 9

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:03 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 JANUARY 26, 1994

Senator Zeidenstein had a correction on Page 10 at the bottom. He was not present at the meeting, so could not have moved to adjourn. Senator Schmaltz's name will replace his in the Minutes.

XXV-51

Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of January 26, 1994, by Liedtke (Second, Winchip) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Chairperson Len Schmaltz reported that he had received a reply from area legislators: John Maitland, William Brady, and Dan Rutherford to our Sense of the Senate Resolution, indicating that they were quite concerned about this and that they were working with the President of ISU, etc. and would keep an eye on this as it moves through the legislative process. That letter will go to the Executive Committee, and may be distributed to all senators. In a separate communication, Representative William Brady had indicated that he will be happy to attend the Senate meeting on February 23rd, and make a few general statements and respond to questions from senators.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson, Renee Mousavi had no remarks.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Senator Diane Shaya had no remarks.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

PRESIDENT WALLACE had an excused absence.

PROVOST STRAND had no remarks.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, WILLIAM GUROWITZ had no remarks.

NO ACTION ITEMS:

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Presentation of University Review Committee Proposed Changes in the ASPT Document

Senator Razaki: Three members of the University Review Committee are present this evening for questioning: George Palmer, Milner Library; Paul Holsinger, History, and James Reid, Foreign Languages. The Faculty Affairs Committee commends the URC for their hard work and effectiveness in bringing these changes to Faculty Affairs and the Senate. These changes have been bandied about for several years, but the current URC has brought them forth.

Senator Nelsen: I have a question about the first page. Is this consistent with the previous document at the bottom where it states: "The term 'faculty' in these policies and procedures includes all individuals with full-time tenured or probationary tenure appointments with the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at Illinois State University; it does not include individuals with part-time or non-tenure-track faculty appointments." How does this parallel or cover administrative personnel with faculty rank in terms of merit evaluation? How does this policy relate to individuals with full faculty rank who are serving as administrators?

Paul Holsinger: The section you quoted is in the present guidelines. No one suggested that issue to any of us on the committee. It was not brought up in our studies.

Senator Nelsen: That was not considered as a point later on when you discussed the merit categories? No consideration was given to administrative positions?

Senator Walker: Could we consider these changes in order?

Parliamentarian Cohen: You may consider these changes in any order you wish. It would be much more orderly to do it page by page. You have to be careful not to preclude a question on, say, page seven that goes back to page one.

Senator Razaki: We could consider the changes page by page, it would be more orderly. However, we would like senators to ask what they want concerning the issues.

Senator Insel: This has to do with salary raises. Referring to the orange ASPT document, page fifteen, X. A. 1., there are a few changes that I don't understand. We have two sources of money--personal funds appropriated by the state legislature and other sources--for purpose of salary increase. The changes also refer to "any remaining funds." What do you mean by that? I understand funds appropriated from the state legislature; but the last two categories are ambiguous -- "other sources for purpose of salary increase," and "any remaining funds." It seems like you have three sources of funds, how do you decide which pot the money goes into? Who makes these decisions? The second pot seems fairly small, whereas the third pot could be larger.

Paul Holsinger: All funds that are not appropriated come under the heading "other funds."

Senator Razaki: None of the 80% from any source of funds will go outside the ASPT system.

Senator Insel: On page eighteen of the orange book, item C. refers to "Personal service funds, other than the salary increase funds defined in X. A. 1., may be utilized as supplemental salary increases for individual faculty members covered by the ASPT system. The Dean with prior approval of the affected department's DFSC, shall recommend such salary increases to the Provost. Half of such increases shall come from the Department's salary equity funds allocated under article V. F." Is this part of the second pot of money?

Paul Holsinger: I think that is it exactly. Those personal service funds (20%) are what is left over. There is no third pot of money.

Senator Razaki: For many years the money for raises, salaries, and other funds, the administration always argued that appropriated funds had to go through the ASPT process and any other funds were exempt. Now, no matter what the source of funds, a minimum of 80% will go through the ASPT process.

Senator Zeidenstein: On page fifteen, X. A. 1., it says, "which shall be never less than 80% of the personal service funds appropriated by the State legislature for that year no less than 80% of any funds from other sources for purpose of salary increase." For example, would those funds from other sources be reallocation, PQP kinds of funds, sources used to pay summer stipends, monies used to develop the new proposal for general education -- in other words is it a generic catchall for everything that has been going through reallocation?

Provost Strand: As I understand the 80/20 split, 80% of the funds go to faculty on nine month contracts, (the academic year contract,) through the ASPT process. Regardless of how the funds are generated, the General Assembly appropriation, reallocation within the University, funds which may accrue as a result of tuition increase or any other type of activity within the University would be subject to the 80/20 split. You also used a couple of other examples that would not be subject to the 80/20 split. For example, faculty who teach summer school receive a stipend or a monthly salary based on the academic year contract. If you are involved with an RFP or University Research Grant or something related to the University Studies Proposal, that again is driven off your academic year salary. So, the 80/20 split pertains to the exercise in which we engage every spring and summer that governs the academic year salary.

Senator Zeidenstein: Included in the 80% from funds appropriated by the General Assembly for the purpose of salary increases, I am pretty clear on that. Funds generated by the University through internal reallocation by the administration is the catchall for all other sources. "Not less than 80% of any funds from other sources for purpose of salary increase," will go through the ASPT system.

Provost Strand: Yes, for the academic year salaries.

Senator Zeidenstein: Under the ASPT system, there is also the possibility at the department level of the department taking at least ten percent of their funds in any given year for salary equity. Does that mean in theory that ten percent of the eighty percent might be used at the department's discretion for equity. Will the ten percent

equity come out of the minimum 80%? On the last page, referring to X. C. page 18 of the current ASPT document, the last sentence is to be deleted: "Half of such increases shall come from the Department's salary equity funds allocated under article V. F. Why is that sentence being deleted?"

George Palmer: The Dean cannot use the department's money with the sentence deleted.

Senator Zeidenstein: So, any money that the Dean is using will come from other sources other than the department's own money.

Senator Razaki: I would like to clarify that. The Dean does not necessarily have to get one half of that money from departments. Fifty percent would be coming from the department and fifty percent from the Dean's own money.

Provost Strand: There is a differentiation here that we need to understand. If a given department decides on its own volition that it wants to set aside ten percent of its money for equity purposes, it comes out of the eighty percent; that does not preclude what you are now discussing, a combination of other equity processes that can extend beyond the department or originate outside the department for which may or may not result in funds originating with the use of the department.

Senator Zeidenstein: One last question. Apropos to some of the earlier statements, is it theoretically possible, impossible, or you're not sure, that the Dean could somehow take or seize funds and utilize them without the DFSC's approval, all of the ten percent?

Provost Strand: There would be no way for a Dean to intervene and utilize ten percent of the eighty percent.

Senator Zeidenstein: Even the ten percent given the Dean is up to the department's discretion?

Provost Strand: For equity purposes, yes, that is a departmental decision.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Just for clarification, is that a DFSC decision?

Provost Strand: Yes, DFSC.

Senator Nelsen: The question I have is based on the logic behind our increasing the amount of monies available from ten percent to twenty percent. What was the motivation in doing that? Was it in fact a tradeoff so that the administration would modify the original document and

basically give us the money. Or would it be reasonable to go with ten percent? This is in reference to X. A. 10.

Provost Strand: I think we have two different processes being confused. The ten percent departmental equity amount has been in the ASPT document for many years. That is different from the 80/20 process because 80/20 is a way of addressing X. A. 1. The ten per departmental equity is X. C.

Senator Nelsen: The numbers we have been discussing pertain to X. A. 1., that was appropriated money. Is a 90/10 split possible?

Senator Razaki: This was a tradeoff. In the last two years most of the money came from reallocations. The administration wanted all of the funds to be distributed their way. I recall some rather heated debates in Executive Committee meetings on this topic. This was a tradeoff to get money for future times.

Senator Nelsen: Was there any other number considered other than twenty per cent?

Senator Razaki: Yes, Faculty Affairs Committee considered other percentages. Twenty percent was what the administration would accept.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I think what the Senator is asking is, why do it at all? Where did the twenty percent figure come from? Why not say all salary increases will go through the ASPT system.

George Palmer: The URC was told that could not be done. Faculty retirements etc. enter into the picture.

James Reid: The Provost Office requested from a number of departments their opinions. The URC took an average figure from departments. We took an average figure from departments higher than 20%. We actually went below the average.

Senator Thomas: I am stuck on the 80/20 split. Does this apply to all the salary money that has been designated and goes to the Provost? Is it automatically 80%?

Paul Holsinger: It is not automatic. The change reads "never less than 80%." It is conceivable that some years it might be 90/10.

Senator Razaki: If we look at what happened last year, I think that the administration took about one third of the raises and distributed them outside the ASPT Process.

Senator Insel: Last year they could not have taken one third of the funds appropriated by the state legislature.

Senator Thomas: There could be 20% of other funds.

Provost Strand: No, that is not correct.

Senator Razaki: Any monies over that, but "no less than 80% would go through the ASPT process."

Senator Ken Strand: I would like to ask the URC representatives a question. Why couldn't the breakdown be 100/0?

George Palmer: From the information that came to us, it was not possible.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Who told you that?

George Palmer: A member of the administration. (Anita Webb Lupo) When the URC started talking about this, we had 0%, we were glad to get up to 80%.

Senator Ken Strand: Secondly, according to this proposal, it is never less than 80%. My hunch is that is pretty close to 80/20 all the time. Would that be your hypothesis too?

George Palmer: Yes.

Senator Ken Strand: Now, this question is for the Provost. Of all the monies that can be used for this likely 80/20 split, can you foresee any unusual circumstances as far as the monies that can be used that might make the 80/20 split sort of impractical at that point in time.

Provost Strand: Not really. Let me give you a circumstance where there is a very modest amount of money available (1%) and you get into a situation where splitting it 80/20 results in so few dollars to be used for the equity side of the process that it might all go through the ASPT process. We have a CPI of 7% for a year and the University has 1% salary increase money. At that point it might be perceived that it would be more practical to allocate it all through the ASPT process.

Senator Ken Strand: I was thinking more about the possibility of the opposite happening. A relative windfall, where we have a relatively large amount of money, when maybe the 80/20 would be a good idea.

Provost Strand: I would have to factor in here the type of comments that we often receive from faculty members, department chairs, and college deans that there are either

individual salaries or salaries for classifications of people that get out of sync with what is happening elsewhere in the University or with other peer institutions. There is often concurrence that something needs to be done and that can be best accomplished through the equity process.

Senator Razaki: Personally, I can understand all of the senators' concerns. As you know, I have been very vocal on this. The ASPT document is seriously demanding changes. I think that this is just the first step on the way to a long process of coming up with a better evaluation and reward system at this University. Senator Ken Jerich could not be here this evening, but he said that we have experts in evaluation on this campus. Why couldn't we get the administration to provide services to come up with a better system? The Faculty Affairs Committee plans to go back to the URC and ask for more changes. I do share your concerns.

Senator Zeidenstein: On the same topic on the same page. I don't want to get into the additional merit categories, but I need it for a context, since we are proposing four categories ranging from unmeritorious to sainthood. There are provisions in other parts of this proposal for rewarding faculty who have done something recently like in the last three years with up to 70% of the 10%. With that kept in mind, notice the sentence in X. A. 1. "nor less than 80% of any funds from other sources for purpose of salary increase." The next sentence says: "The Provost may distribute any remaining funds outside the ASPT system for designated categories of faculty reflecting previous faculty accomplishments that have been recognized through a process which includes faculty input." How do you go about the mechanics of rewarding previous faculty accomplishments without going through a nine month annual salary raise. Is it a one time bonus, is it a stipend thrown in for summer work, and attached to the base or what. I heard the Provost say that the salary increase applies to the nine month contract, and then I see the additional reflecting faculty accomplishments, and I want to know how that meshes in mechanically?

Provost Strand: Let me give you an example of how this might occur. We have the merit evaluation process that functions in the Spring semester and lo and behold there are no salary increase dollars available from any source that year. Next year we have five percent salary increase dollars available. That year 20% of those salary dollars are made available through the equity process. Part of the instruction from the Office of the Provost to the Deans and Chairs could be that they go back and look at those people who received exceptional merit ratings and received no salary increases and try to factor in some appropriate level of compensation for these people who just happened to get exceptional merit in a no salary increase year.

Senator Zeidenstein: But, to me that means it is going through the ASPT process. Our department has a policy of dealing with exactly that kind of thing. But, this reads, "reflecting previous faculty accomplishments that have been recognized through a process which includes faculty input."

Provost Strand: First of all, there are many departments that do not have a provision whereby they go back and pick up a previous year when there was a low or no salary increase. Secondly, the office of the Provost would interpret this statement to say that the reference to faculty input would include previous recommendations from the DFSC. It is a matter of record that the faculty were evaluated in X, Y, Z categories.

Senator Razaki: In our department last year, equity money was distributed based on Exceptional Merit for the last five years.

Senator Zeidenstein: Since both examples to answer my question about these previous faculty accomplishments, and faculty input, might be the dominant rather than the minority situation, you might consider changing the wording to "previous ASPT accomplishments."

Senator Liedtke: I have a question X. A. 1. I find the second half of the paragraph very unclear. What does the word "categories" mean? Is it possible to get an understanding of the word, "categories?"

Senator Razaki: It is my understanding that the administration should not have the power to use 20% of the money as they want. We felt that this statement would provide a set of criteria so everyone would be treated fairly. This would force the administration to say what type of criteria will be rewarded. If you want to reward someone, they need to know what the expectations are.

Senator Liedtke: Then why didn't you say that? This should read better, perhaps criteria will be established, or specify what the categories are. I find this whole section very unclear.

Senator Walker: On behalf of my colleagues in my department, I need to ask a question on this page and X.A.1. I would suggest that the Faculty Affairs Committee consider defining two terms: "categories" and "previous" for the purposes of this page of the document. They are ambiguous and maybe they are meant to be ambiguous. I think we need to give some latitude to administrators to give some equity adjustment. I have no problem with this. However, the faculty in my department have asked that FAC consider narrowing down the scope of what the terms categories and

previous mean. Previous faculty accomplishments -- does this mean three years ago, two years ago, ten years ago?

Senator Schroeer: A number of years ago all full professors were given an equity adjustment.

Senator Thomas: I have a follow-up on Senator Liedtke's comment about the categories. My ASPT Document has the date on the front as "effective January 1, 1994." If these changes are passed, does that mean that the criteria in the orange book will change, to say: "The categories should be announced no later than April 1."

Provost Strand: I can give you a couple of reasons why the same time cycle cannot be used for the ASPT part as for the equity part. We do not know a year in advance what the outcome of the salary adjustment process is going to be and what sort of inequities or problems will have arisen.. Also, we don't know on April 1st what the likely combination of salary increment dollars may be that the university will receive. April 1st is in there to allow plenty of time for this to circulate among members of the faculty before the semester ends. This also recognizes the rather ambiguous environment of salary increase recommendations.

Senator Schroeer: How do you deal with it if you have a sum of money?

Provost Strand: Well, if we have prospects of an eight percent salary increase, then there would be discussions going on prior to April 1st. However, what we are trying to avoid here is a complete surprise. We give it the best estimate we have the latter part of March or first week of April.

Senator Thomas: Wouldn't that mean that July 1st would be a more acceptable date?

Provost Strand: It might be, but I cannot see this body accepting a July 1st date in a mail communication. It is far better to speculate or estimate the best you can before the semester ends what parameters this equity process might include while members of the faculty and senators are still on campus.

Senator Williams: I had a follow-up on categories as opposed to criteria. Categories are generated whereas criteria come from the Provost. Departments establish the criteria with the approval of their deans.

CONSIDERATION OF CHANGES IN PAGE ORDER NUMBER:

PAGE ONE - NO QUESTIONS

PAGE TWO - SECTION V. F. 1. (ASPT - PAGE 9)

Senator Parr: Where it says: "and provide department faculty with the criteria (policies and procedures) used for determining equity adjustments," I assume that means in general categorical terms rather than specific cases. Could you clarify that term for me? Would it be more clear to put the word general here?

Senator Razaki: No.

PAGE THREE - SECTION VI. G. (ASPT - PAGE 10)

Senator Thomas: How does this relate to persons who have duties in more than one department or area plus administrative duties? This says the recommendation shall originate in the major Department. How does this fit in?

Senator Razaki: This issue did not come up. The URC would need to consider this.

Senator Parr: The word available in the College Dean's office -- does this mean available to anyone who walks in and asks for the document? How is that determined?

Senator Razaki: It would not be available to just anyone.

Senator Shaya: Point of information: at the bottom it states "copies shall be available to the CFSC's and DFSC's, if requested."

Senator Walker: Perhaps the Faculty Affairs Committee would consider dropping the first or second "available" and inserting the word "only" when this comes up for action.

Senator Stearns: Since it is public money that is being used for raises, why shouldn't information be available for review? I think it should stand as it is.

Senator Nelsen: Could we have a clarification of what the word "area" means?

Provost Strand: "Area" is not a change in the current document. The committee did not consider this.

Senator Nelsen: But the committee did review the entire document in able to propose these changes. Perhaps someone could tell me what this means.

Senator Razaki: We did not discuss this issue at all.

Senator Liedtke: How might it be interpreted.

Anita Webb Lupo: There are some faculty who have assignments in the Dean's Office or research assignments which is reassigned time, not strictly in a department.

Senator Thomas: In terms of administrators being appointed, the departmental faculty must sign off on their appointment and give approval of rank goes into the administrator's files.

PAGE FOUR - SECTION VII. C. (ASPT - PAGE 10)

PAGE FIVE - SECTION VII. D. (ASPT - PAGE 10)

Senator Stearns: The February 1st date is later than what our department requires (January 15) -- will it present CFSC's and DFSC's with a problem?

Senator Kaiser: The February 1st date is in the old document. We are striking "in June or August."

Senator Parr: You might want to reword this "no later than February 1st." If one sees February 1st as the date, they might think they have until February 1st to get it in.

PAGE SIX - SECTION VII. E. 1. B. (ASPT - PAGE 11)

Senator Walker: On behalf of the faculty in my department, I would ask what does "continuing professional growth" mean? Before it said, "personal professional growth."

Senator Razaki: The Faculty Affairs Committee thought that the new wording made more sense, rather than ".....enough personal professional growth and contributions to the stature of the University.....," "The candidate's continuing professional growth and professional activities should be significant enough to warrant promotion to Assistant Professor."

Paul Holsinger: We were trying to get rid of the word enough. The URC felt that professional growth was a continuous process.

Senator Ken Strand: Another important person at this university had the same problem with that wording.

Senator White: Isn't the word "enough" also in your new sentence: "activities should be significant enough to warrant....."

Paul Holsinger: Saying "activities should be significant enough to warrant promotion...." is an entirely different thing.

Senator Hesse: Has the committee considered: "professional activities should warrant....." Doesn't "continuing" distinguish the new version from the old one. The old wording refers to past accomplishments, whereas the new wording "continuing professional growth" is a trajectory into the future.

Senator Walker: The word "continuing" still bothers me some. Promotion is based on past and future together. I would hope the committee considers cleaning up the language.

Senator Zeidenstein: The word "quality" no longer appears. The term significant enough could refer to quantity or quality. I can see where this could be interpreted in the future where they are looking at quantitative research and the quality of past accomplishments is not considered.

Senator Ken Strand: This is for the URC. CFSC's are currently working on amending their documents, and this one as it is progressing would be useful to CFSC's. If we get an amended copy for the next Senate meeting, will the CFSC's get an amended copy at the same time?

George Palmer: This document has not been approved by the Senate.

Senator Ken Strand: This is true, but the CFSC's have to look ahead.

George Palmer: The CFSC's would have to use the final approved document from the Senate.

PAGE 7 - SECTION VII. E. 2. b. (ASPT - PAGE 11)

PAGE 8 - SECTION VII. E. 3. b. (ASPT - PAGE 12)

Senator Stearns: Would you consider changing the requirement of four years at Illinois State University or eight years at the college or university level. We had a fine faculty member who spent several years working full time at a research facility and none of the previous work counted. We are now trying to recruit associate professors who would have to start out at the bottom of the line and wait eight years for promotion to full professors.

Senator Razaki: What would you suggest -- doing away with the time limit?

Senator Stearns: I would consider eliminating four years at ISU. A place like Argonne National Laboratories or such a research facility could be substituted.

PAGE NINE - SECTION VIII. B. 4 (ASPT - PAGE 13)

PAGE TEN - SECTION X. A. 1. (ASPT - PAGE 15)

Senator Nelsen: Was there any consideration given to the concept that members of the Academic Senate would be the appropriate body to revise that criteria rather than just have them show up in faculty mailboxes.

Senator Razaki: There was no discussion of this.

Senator Nelsen: Could the Academic Senate be provided with that information?

PAGE 11 - SECTION X. B. 4. (ASPT PAGE 16)

Senator Liedtke: (a) Why in an annual performance evaluation will you be having materials carried over from one year to the next.

Paul Holsinger: In two colleges, this is already done that way. The College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Fine Arts already do this. It does currently exist.

Senator Insel: (b) How do you work out this distribution of 20% for exceptional and 20% for high merit. It is sort of like grading on a curve.

George Palmer: We worked with different numbers. Do you mean not to put a cap on it?

Senator Razaki: It was my understanding that the administration objected to high percentages of faculty members receiving exceptional merit. The URC considered materials received from departments. In some departments, 40% of their faculty receive exceptional merit. An additional category, high merit, provides for another 20%. The URC considered different breakdowns. This was to formalize what was already being done.

Provost Strand: This relates to an earlier question. You will recall that the administration circulated a series of proposals earlier this academic year and solicited responses from departments and colleges regarding those proposals. The responses were then sent to the University Review Committee which provided somewhat of a context for the URC recommendations as well as their own judgments. The reasons that the administration recommended any kind of a percentage limitation on categories was because we still have some departments who place a very high percentage of their faculty in the exceptional merit category every year.

Chairperson Schmaltz: We hear statement year after year that departments do this -- is it one department, or ten departments?

Provost Strand: It varies. It is a matter of public information. It is distributed every year to the deans and department chairs. This could vary from six or seven one year to thirteen or fourteen in another year.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I take it that the administration is not pleased with that behavior? Why isn't that department chair urged to return to his/her full time love of teaching? Why does the Senate have to undo a problem that is an internal administrative one?

Provost Strand: You're making the assumption that the Department Chair controls the actions of the DFSC.

Chairperson Schmaltz: You are assuming that a Department Chair does not have a dramatic impact on the actions of the DFSC.

Senator Schroeer: The College of Arts and Sciences in the past has tried to address this. It was thought that 80% got exceptional merit. I question whether the institution is going to reduce this by having four categories -- an additional high merit category.

Senator Nelsen: Did the committee consider the effect of these changes on colleges and departments that might have requirements for promotion that require a certain number of exceptional merit, promotions to full professor, etc. There are some colleges and departments that have in their guidelines a certain number of promotions, etc. If you impose the arbitrary percentages on the faculty, how do you determine those departments that have these requirements for faculty to be promoted. Since it is quite possible that you have a department with highly qualified researchers who receive exceptional merit and promotions and have other very qualified people who don't ever get promoted.

Senator Razaki: The ASPT document is the guideline for departments DFSC's and CFSC's and they should follow it.

Senator Nelsen: It doesn't seem appropriate.

James Reid: On Page ten, VII. A. of the present ASPT Document it states: "The attainment of successively higher academic ranks at Illinois State University reflects professional growth and achievement of status within the discipline. Further, such status is generally expected to be demonstrated by a sustained record of professional competence. Hence, promotions are neither automatic nor the product of any set formula based on yearly performance evaluation ratings." The present document does not allow that.

Senator Nelsen: So that is not allowed now?

James Reid: No.

Senator Liedtke: It seems to me that departments DFSC's and CFSC's should have the priority of establishing criteria, and it is at that place in determining the criteria for faculty performance that a differentiation should take place, rather than putting caps on merit. This process of limiting exceptional merit to 20% and high merit to 20% says that whether someone walks on water or not, if your department has more than 20% of its people that walk on water, that faculty member cannot receive exceptional merit. It is possible to submit journal articles, solicit funding, etc. and not get published or receive grants until two or three years down the road. Despite the fact that they have done the things that are in the criteria for the department and college, they have written journal articles, gotten grants, been an outstanding teacher, chaired committees, etc., they might not receive exceptional merit. Did you consider this?

Senator Razaki: The last sentence says: "In such rare circumstances a DFSC may exceed the percentage caps for exceptional and high merit by presenting a formal request and justification to the CFSC."

Senator Liedtke: Why is it not possible to remove that sentence?

Senator Razaki: What has that led to?

Senator Parr: I don't understand why the administration feels that each department should have at least 60% of mediocre people.

Paul Holsinger: This is not in any way the administration's idea. They did not suggest 20% or any number.

James Reid: This was not to limit the number of people getting a raise or the number of people being rewarded.

Senator Zeidenstein: Has the committee considered 30% of a department's people worthy of high merit. Of course you can only go back three years. The department could divide up its percentage: 40% X. B. 4. b. and 40% of people in exceptional merit category.

Paul Holsinger: The last sentence states: "In such rare circumstances, a DFSC may exceed the percentage caps for exceptional and high merit by presenting a formal request and justification to the CFSC. Requests must be approved by both the CFSC and the Provost."

Senator Razaki: I partly blame the faculty on campus for this state of affairs. There was input from departments. Most departments wanted four categories. What the University Review Committee has done is take the faculty opinions into consideration to make these changes. If the faculty on campus is in disagreement with this, they should let their views be known.

Senator Zeidenstein: Does it have to be an arbitrary 20/20%?

Senator Razaki: This was based on the survey. The basis for this 20/20 was that the URC felt if there were four different categories, 20/20 was the best combination.

Senator Zeidenstein: 20/20 is not the same as 70/30.

Senator Razaki: They are related. 30% would be given to people in high merit.

Senator Zeidenstein: What about a 30/10 split?

Paul Holsinger: A 30/10 split for high merit means they would end up with only about \$1.00. Thirty-five percent of the funds could mean that the fourth category would get very little.

Senator Williams: Does the 70%/30% split in raises mean that for every \$7.00 in exceptional merit pay raises awarded to each individual with an exceptional merit rating there will be \$3.00 in high merit raises awarded to each individual with a high merit rating?

Senator Razaki: Suppose there is a department with 7% -- four go into exceptional merit -- 3% or 4% go into high merit.

Senator Williams: Does this create an incredible hardship on DFSC's? Especially in small departments. In those departments it does not seem that exceptions to the 20/20 split would be rare circumstances, but a common occurrence. If you are using a distribution model of performance evaluation as has been inferred, a normal curve would suggest more people should be placed in high merit rather than exceptional merit. Was there some special reason that the high merit category was carved out of the exceptional merit category rather than the merit category?

Senator Razaki: Twenty per cent, 20% and 60%. In our department 90% of the money goes to merit and high merit categories.

Paul Holsinger: Last year 38% of faculty got exceptional merit. We rounded it off to 40%. I don't think anyone had

any problem with making exceptional merit. One department chair said that 75% of his faculty got exceptional merit last year. We added the high merit category as part of that top 40% category.

Senator Ken Strand: I have a question regarding b. The four point scale is related to measurement -- it is better than nominal. A four point scale is better than a three point scale.

Senator Razaki: I believe in having faculty input in salaries. This is a first step in revising the ASPT document.

Senator Ken Strand: If there were five departments in a college, wouldn't there be heterogeneity in departments? If you had six departments in a college, and each got say: 10/ 10/ 10/ 10/ 10/ 50. Wouldn't more merit faculty be at a disadvantage?

Senator Razaki: I was told that Dean would have administrative equity to take care of that.

Senator Ken Strand: Those faculty members with higher salaries will receive more raises. Is this sufficiently fair?

Senator Nelsen: It is like a pass/fail system. How will people who can't decide between black and white be any better at deciding between black, white, and gray?

Senator Razaki: These 20% are high merit.

Senator Nelson: How will we know the right people get their raises.

Senator Razaki: This document doesn't say that.

PAGE THIRTEEN X. B. 10 (ASPT - PAGE 17)

Senator Liedtke: Why do you put percentage limits on people who work the hardest at this University. It seems you are punishing people who do the best.

Senator Razaki: Maybe no one deserves to get insufficient merit.

Paul Holsinger: There is a relatively small percentage of people who receive insufficient merit. We tried to follow the charge from the Senate that we had to use a new category.

Senator Nelsen: Was there a charge to put caps on the others?

Senator Razaki: No.

Senator Winchip: During what period of time are you referring to?

Senator Razaki: The annual salary review. Departments may have 40% in the first two years and the third year have no limit.

Senator Parr: I have a question on X. B. 10. If you want an exceptional merit person to get twice as much, and you have seven people who receive \$10 each for a total of \$70; you could have one person in high merit who could receive the whole amount.

James Reid: Yes.

Senator Insel: I don't think this is written very clearly. Would it be possible to re-write it?

Senator Walker: Could the Faculty Affairs Committee consider eliminating the percentage figures in the high merit and exceptional merit categories? Or could you consider eliminating the percentage figure in high merit and raising the percentage figure in exceptional merit; or could you consider allowing an average percentage figure to be used in each of the top two categories over a period of years to allow some years to be higher and some years to be lower?

Senator Stearns: There seems to be a problem with department who oversubscribe to exceptional merit. Secondly, a large number of faculty in one category might result in a low raise. DFSC's make the decisions. It seems like a departmental problem. Also, a department can set up criteria system caps.

Senator Razaki: If you want to make all those changes, then perhaps the existing ASPT Document should be kept as it is. The Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Review Committee will have fulfilled their task of reviewing the document. There is no point in looking at these revisions, if you don't want them.

Paul Holsinger: Could we consider having the Deans go to the problem departments. Some departments have more consistently given exceptional merit. The issue of rare circumstances included a different kind of rating and intended 20/20 to be a percentage. It is up to departments to decide. A department could choose to make it a three year rating.

Senator Nelsen: We are talking about an annual performance review. A new CFSC document is written each year. The rewrite could preclude that.

We may have a word problem with exceptional merit. The DFSC's do it -- it cannot be termed a problem.

Paul Holsinger: It seemed to me as I considered this, that people in the administration felt that a department that chose to give everyone exceptional merit had violated what exceptional merit was all about. If 4/5 of all faculty members are exceptional, then the department has no standards at all.

George Palmer: The additional high merit category is another way to look at this. Up to sixteen per cent of departments only had 40% in exceptional merit.

Senator Amster: It is possible that all members of a department do not have to go the same speed limits to receive the same ratings. In our department there is no such word as mediocre. In Fine Arts, we feel it not degrading to get a merit raise, or an additional high merit raise. I feel all those here give great performances and would be much more comfortable with the work the URC has done.

Senator Schmaltz: Would it be possible to define the term exceptional?

Senator Parr: I am beginning to wonder if we should change "exceptional" to "highest?"

PAGE TWELVE - X. B. 8. (ASPT - PAGE 17)

PAGE THIRTEEN - X. B. 10 (ASPT - PAGE 17)

Senator Schroeer: Has the committee considered rewording this page?

Senator Razaki: We will consider a word change to include Senator Insel's suggestions.

Senator Nelsen: Would the administration consider using the pool of exceptional merit money to give to all exceptional merit on an equal basis.

PAGE FOURTEEN - X. B. 11. (ASPT - PAGE 18)

PAGE FIFTEEN - X. C. (ASPT - PAGE 18)

Senator Schmaltz: I have a copy of the resolution pertaining to the ASPT Document passed in the General Faculty Meeting in November. Senators may wish to read that again.

Senator Razaki: I would like to thank the members of the University Review Committee again. We do understand the concerns expressed this evening and thank the URC for presenting the changes.

2. Academic Affairs Committee Presentation of University Studies Review Committee Revised Proposal for General Education

Senator Paul Walker, Chair of Academic Affairs Committee, introduced the revised university studies program entitled: "A Proposal for a New Program of General Education at Illinois State University," and a "Pilot Implementation of the Proposed General Education Program."

Academic Affairs Committee at this time is asking the Senate to endorse a Change in the University Studies Program and to approve Implementation of the Piloting of a New General Education Program.

As part of its review process, the Academic Affairs Committee asked three committees to review the University Studies Proposal. University Curriculum Committee approved the proposal 11/10/93; Council for Teacher Education supported the concept of the proposal on 11/17/93; and while the Council on University Studies chose not to endorse the USRC proposal, the Council did provide recommendations for revision on 11/23/93. The Academic Affairs Committee subcommittee was composed of eleven members: Alan Dillingham, Acting Dean of Undergraduate Instruction, three members who represented the original USRC: Wayne Lockwood, CAST; Macon Williams, CAS; and Judy Mogilka, COE; three members who represented Academic Affairs: Paul Walker; Paul Borg, and Doug Hesse; four members from the university community: Paul Schollaert, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Mohamed Tavakoli-Targhi, CAS, Jill Attaway, Business and Chair of CUS, and John Kirk, Fine Arts and member of CUS. The subcommittee reviewed the proposal and the written and oral communications resulting from the three University wide forums held in December.

The Academic Affairs Recommendation is on the back page of my cover letter of February 1, 1994: "Attached to this narrative is the revised University studies proposal and recommendation for implementation. In accordance with the charge received from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate the Academic Affairs Committee unanimously recommends

that the Academic Senate: (1) endorse the need to change the existing University Studies Program; (2) approve the implementation process which included a pilot of the proposed General Education Program, and; (3) upon conclusion of the piloting period, approve, modify or reject the proposed General Education Program."

The Senate is not approving something up front before it has been piloted or tested. The basis on which you will approve it is explained under the first paragraph under Introduction: The Purpose of the Pilot Implementation, and it outlines the basis for the pilot program. It is our intent to have an information session this evening and put it up for action at the next Senate meeting.

Senator White: I have a problem. The new University Studies program is very important to students. We find ourselves in a situation where faculty domination of the first part of this meeting has virtually driven off most of the students. We need to have students here in order to have a meaningful information session on this topic.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Is that a point of order, or a point of information? You may ask a question of the committee or express a point of order or point of information.

Senator White: It was a point of information that the majority of the students have left.

Chairperson Schmaltz: It is the sense of the Chair that we continue the Senate meeting as long as we have a quorum.

Senator Mersinger: The Senate has only two more meetings for the present senators' terms. If we prolong this any longer, it will not be presented to this Senate.

Senator Liedtke: Do we have a quorum.

Senator Cook: Yes.

Chairperson Schmaltz ruled the questions out of order.

QUESTIONS:

Senator Zeidenstein: I have two very proforma questions. The first is for Senator Walker. On page three of the Pilot Implementation, under Fall 1996, point five, it says see page 27 of the proposal -- do you mean page 17 there?

Senator Borg: It should be page 15 which replaces page 27 -- General Education Coordinating Committee.

Senator Zeidenstein: On page two of the Pilot Implementation Program where it mentions what happens in

spring, summer, fall of 1994, etc. For the summer of 1994, what would be the source for these summer stipend funds? Are they coming out of the regular source of summer salary funds?

Provost Strand: In anticipation of this eventuality, I have previously reallocated \$200,000. Those dollars are being held for stipends for this stage of the process. It has nothing to do with the current summer school budget. It is part of last year's university wide reallocation of funds.

Senator Zeidenstein: It has nothing to do with the budget amount for the summer of 1994?

Provost Strand: That is correct.

Senator Zeidenstein: Is this \$200,000 just for the stipend for the summer of 1994, or succeeding summers?

Provost Strand: It is available in perpetuity for the University Studies/ General Education Program. It is not just a one year amount. It is available each year in the budget for the general education program, unless my successor chooses to use it otherwise.

Senator Liedtke: My first question is on Page One, the last line reads "A Capstone Seminar: clarification of

Senator Borg: It is a clarification of the relationship of the topics. There are two specific topics, a multi- or trans-disciplinary option for university-wide courses, and an option within the discipline. The USRC document states that the preferred version would be activated within the department or discipline, should the discipline choose to do so. The subcommittee decided that was not appropriate and that is what was changed.

Senator Liedtke: Page Fifteen, under duties of the Director of General Education, which is a new position. Who does this person report to? On page sixteen, near the bottom, it states ".....the Director of General Education as an Ex Officio member, representing the office of the Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction." Does the new position report to the Dean of Undergraduate Instruction?

Senator Borg: That is an administrative decision. The recommendation is that such a position is necessary. A recommendation to be made to the Senate is that certain adjustments be made in the Blue Book for the Council on University Studies duties. It was not the purpose of the committee to decide on the reporting of new positions.

Provost Strand: It would be my opinion that this new position would report to the Associate Vice President for Instruction and Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

Senator Liedtke: Page 17, under Transfer Students, item one: "Students who transfer into Illinois State University and have completed an AA or AS degree at a Community College with which the University has an articulation agreement will have satisfied all General Education requirements except the Capstone Seminar." We also have on this campus several articulation agreements with community colleges for students who transfer without an AA or AS degree. What will happen to those students? Will they have to take their University Studies classes over again? Or, will there be new articulation agreements with other institutions?

Senator Borg: Those students who have associate's degrees, are taken care of. It is my understanding that all other situations will be taken care of on an individual basis. Articulation for those who come with a partial fulfillment of university studies will be done on an individual, category by category basis.

Senator Liedtke: I would like to see the committee look at number two where it says "Students who transfer into Illinois State University without a completed Associate's Degree will be responsible for completing all General Education courses....." It sounds to me like they will need to take all of their university studies courses over.

Senator Borg: If you read on in that same sentence: "all General Education courses and course categories for which no articulation is made on a course-by-course basis." That does address the issue. If there is a particular problem with a specific AA or AS degree, I can see no reason why that would not be specified.

Senator Liedtke: Will those articulation agreements have to be rewritten?

Senator Borg: I think all articulation agreements, course-by-course will have to be rewritten.

Senator Liedtke: We have articulation contracts with community colleges that say if you take courses A, B, C, D, E, the first year and G, H, I, J, K the second year, your university studies requirements will be fulfilled. Now, those course will not be there anymore.

Senator Walker: They will have to be re-articulated. I think number two answers your question. It allows transfers to occur on a course-by-course basis.

Senator Borg: Does your current articulation agreement have it written on a course by course basis or category by category as you have mentioned?

Senator Liedtke: Our articulation agreements are drawn up saying that if you have an Associates of Applied Science Degree from a certain Community College, and you have taken the following courses to earn your degree, then when you come to ISU your classes will transfer. If those courses are not available any longer, then it renders that agreement null and void.

Senator Walker: It may be that those courses will be substituted by new courses and incorporated. We will have to work with our admissions office on that. Those people will be accommodated.

Senator Borg: If you feel that a statement specifically referring to the AA or AS degree is required, I see no reason why that cannot be done.

Senator Liedtke: I wanted to make sure that the articulation agreements that we have with other institutions will be honored.

Senator Borg: I would point out that in the pilot implementation program the necessity as this is drawn up for Senate approval, communication with community colleges to talk about the nature of the program and where things will change. That is one of the elements of the pilot program-involvement early on.

Senator Walker: That is why we are asking the Senate to approve the pilot, and not the program, so that hopefully during implementation these kinds of things can be worked out.

Senator Liedtke: What kind of criteria will you be using to determine if the pilot is successful?

Senator Walker: The first paragraph under "Introduction: The Purpose of the Pilot Implementation states questions that will assess the value of the program. Purposes include: (1) providing structures and support for faculty to develop course syllabi; (2) developing instructional methods and media in support of the courses; (3) identifying potential faculty for the pilot course offerings; (4) providing faculty development for individuals electing to teach courses; (5) establishing administrative structures; and (6) offering the program on a limited basis as an alternative to the current University Studies Program. Based on those things, the Senate will receive interim reports and be kept abreast of what is happening in the pilot program and be provided by the

implementation committee a report on the success of the pilot program.

Senator Liedtke: What might the red flags be that the program is not doing well? How will we know?

Senator Walker: I think that will be developed by the implementation committee as it conducts the pilot program.

Senator Insel: In the definitions of the courses, sometimes you use the article "the" in front of the word "course," and sometimes you use the word "a" in front of the word "course," and sometimes you use the plural "courses." I am confused and would like clarification on this. Is it only one course, or more?

Senator Walker: Specifically, what are you asking about?

Senator Insel: "Foundations of Inquiry?"

Senator Walker: One course.

Senator Insel: "Literacy courses: Language and Composition?"

Senator Walker: One course.

Senator Insel: "Language and Communication?"

Senator Walker: One Course

Senator Insel: "Math Literacy?"

Senator Walker: One course selected from a small distribution based on competency of the student.

Senator Insel: "Science Literacy?"

Senator Walker: There will be one course developed by each of the four basic science groups.

Senator Insel "Quantitative Reasoning?"

Senator Walker: Several -- small distribution.

Senator Insel: "Language in Context?"

Senator Walker: Several -- small distribution.

Senator Insel: "United States Tradition?"

Senator Walker: Several -- small distribution.

Senator Insel: On Page Six, Math Literacy, the last sentence under content reads: "Connections will be drawn to life and culture....." I have been teaching Mathematics at ISU for 25 years, and I was wondering how one teaches that?

Senator Walker: Applications for Math. Apply mathematical principles.

Senator Insel: They can be applied in many ways to life; but what about culture? My second question is about the suggested topics at the bottom of the page entitled "Mathematical symbols."

Senator Walker: You don't use symbols?

Senator Insel: Any discipline uses words or symbols.

Senator Walker: Isn't that a connection to life and culture. This is not a course outline, this is a suggestion. In the implementation stage you would actually develop courses from this criteria. This is just a guideline.

Senator Insel: Then we could ignore this?

Senator Borg: One of the reasons for giving many of these guidelines is to ensure that this course locates itself in the program instead of being an isolated experience. The intention of a General Education Program is not that we have a selection of individual entities, but that, in fact, there is a purpose for having a math literacy course. This is to be a general education program that serves all undergraduates. The language was intended to bring to discussion what Math does in general education.

Senator Insel: These committees have no quantitative people on them.

Senator Hesse: This is exactly what Senator Liedtke asked in her question previously about how the pilot would be evaluated. In this course development by the implementation committee, I assume that the committee would have someone from Math on it, and if that committee had problems developing a course, that would be a yellow or red light. Those are legitimate questions to continue to raise during the course developments.

Senator Walker: These guidelines may be altered as we go.

Senator Insel: On page thirteen, number four, you appear to exclude from university studies any course that would serve as a prerequisite for a major course -- for example Calculus I. You would create tremendous problems, because basic

courses like this are required for upper level Mathematics Courses. They would be excluded.

Senator Walker: I think you are reading more into this statement than what is there. "Courses in General Education aim at broadening student horizons, rather than functioning as introductory courses for specific majors...." You may still have a course in the General Education program that serves as an introductory course, but its sole function cannot be strictly to serve that major. It must have a General Education focus to it, and that would be one of the primary aims of it.

Dean Schoellart: I think that clearly majors may take the general education courses. What is the primary purpose of the course. One of the courses primary functions is General Education. If that serves a major as well, that is fine. If it fits under the University Studies program, then that is what this means.

Senator Insel: Where would advance placement be considered?

Senator Walker: We allow for that to occur on an individual basis. Exceptions will be allowed on a case by case basis.

Senator Insel: High school students currently receive college credit for courses. Will this continue?

Senator Walker: Will they receive credit for this particular course to fit in? That would be an interesting concept.

Ira Cohen: High school students enter the university now with advance credit for calculus and have no problem for anything that they missed at the 145 level. Are you talking about a case by case, or course by course basis?

Senator Walker: Course by course basis.

Senator Nelsen: I will make the broad statement that, "You can do anything in the world given enough money and time." Is this program cost effective? Is it that much better? And that much more prudent, as to be cost effective to do it? When will we see criteria that will enable us to make a decision as to whether this is a cost effective program that is appropriate to run in the University in view of the dollar amounts that it takes to run it and the benefits over the existing program.

Senator Walker: In the second paragraph in the Introduction: The Purpose of the Pilot Implementation, we have listed six things. Under number six, we have allowed

for that to occur: "offer the program on a limited basis as an alternative to the current University Studies Program. The Implementation Committee will ask the Provost to develop those figures that you are asking for.

Senator Hesse: In the summer of 1996, the Provost is charged with preparing an impact statement of the costs of the general education program, and the implementation committee will begin drafting a final report and submit it in the fall of 1996.

Senator Walker: It does address the issue.

Senator Zeidenstein: You have covered transfer students, but what about current students, say Sophomores, Freshman, how will this affect them. What about students in the Fall of 1994 who are going to be sophomores, and have already taken some of their general education courses?

Senator Hesse: In each of the cases, as we have projected bringing one of these courses on line, a step that is included is that the implementation committee will work out what those courses will count for, and that no student be penalized for taking a pilot course.

Senator Zeidenstein: Suppose someone who is already an ISU student does not want to take these pilot courses?

Senator Hesse: I would assume that the customary rules of the catalog under which the student entered the University will apply.

Dr. Alan Dillingham: A student is subject to the requirements under which they entered the University. Incoming Freshmen classes will be subject to the catalog under which they enter. There will be students under the old program and students under the new program. Incoming classes will be the first ones to take the pilot courses.

Senator Schroeer: To what extent did the committee consider just looking for competency in certain areas like Math and Speech to have advanced credit? I don't see any place where Foreign Language fits into this.

Senator Walker: We developed the program for a typical student, and exceptions will be allowed on a case by case basis. Foreign Language is allowed to be in the program in several places. One, it could be in language and context, in the outer core; two, it could occur in the option under Humanities in the outer core. It does not preclude Foreign Languages.

Senator Kaiser: On the chart on page three, number seven, "Language in Context" is not allowed until Sophomore or Junior years. It lists three prerequisites. An intermediate foreign language course would have three prerequisite courses. Is this a slip in some way or a change? The problem that we have is that students who study foreign languages in high school and come to the University wanting to continue their study of foreign language like French in their first year, would be precluded from taking a foreign language for two years and in fact have their language skills suffer as a result.

Senator Walker: Yes, we did consider that extensively in the revision. We did have two foundation courses. Now we only have one. I am not certain that a student would have to wait until their second year to take foreign language.

Dean Schoellart: I think under language and composition in the current proposal it includes the instruction of basic grammar which include fundamental skills. Under language and context, it states that students who already possess basic skills in a language will build on their language experiences."

Senator Kaiser: I think the answer to my first question is that there is no place for foreign language at the elementary or intermediate stage, only the advanced stage.

Senator Walker: Not in the inner core, only the outer core at the advanced stage.

Senator Kaiser: Where would foreign languages fit into the first four semesters of study? In most universities humanities programs, foreign language fits into the first two years of experience.

Senator Walker: No where at the beginning language level.

Senator White: I have a question about the degree of interdisciplinary programs allowed. Would it be possible under 11. a. for a faculty member in English to offer a course in technology and culture as say, Science?

Senator Walker: Anything is possible. It is less likely to occur under that category than under another category.

Senator White: But, theoretically, it is possible?

Senator Walker: Yes. However, practically, I doubt that the course would be approved.

Senator White: I was talking about someone in English teaching a course called Science and Technology.

Senator Walker: Part of the ability for a person to get a course approved would be that they have the proper credentials to teach that course.

Senator Macon Williams: There is also the issue of having a limited number of courses. Is this faculty member prepared to teach seven sections -- of course not. There may be some practical matters that make it improbable.

Senator White: It is important to understand this. We have some people in our department who teach technical writing. They study issues of technology and its relationship to culture. Could they offer a course under technology and science?

Senator Walker: Particularly if it were co-instructed with someone out of the science and technology area. That is what we mean by interdisciplinary. I would hope that kind of course would be available.

Senator Insel: I notice that the science literacy courses can be replaced by the science laboratory courses. I wonder if it makes sense to have similar provisions for the Mathematics courses?

Senator Walker: It was considered when the USRC first began. But, realize for any particular science course it says that these particular courses must include specific general education content and be approved for the General Education Program.

Senator Williams: One of the courses left off for which Calculus I was a prerequisite, then that student could not take Calculus III. There would be no problem with that.

Senator Insel: There are majors outside of the Math Department, taking courses for their own benefit.

Senator Williams: There was no intent to have just one course, like Calculus I.

Senator Walker: Just because a major requires a certain course, does not mean that course necessitates a part of General Education. That is one reason a major may require a particular math course that is not approved for General Education. They may still need to require the course, even with the new program, and it is that major's option to do that.

Senator Insel: Are you going to establish criteria for selecting students for the pilot program?

Senator Walker: We talked about that a lot, and wanted to leave that up to the implementation committee. I would ask that Dr. Dillingham reply to that.

Dr. Alan Dillingham: We have discussed a number of alternatives, such as offering the pilot program to honors students, limiting the number of seats to new freshman, etc.

Senator Insel: Wouldn't offering the program to honors students skew the results?

Senator Hesse: I guess the question is, what do you mean by results? If we were measuring student proficiency as a result of a course, then yes the results would be skewed. My interpretation was that we would use a general cross section of students that would volunteer. These courses might well be attractive to all students.

Senator Zeidenstein: If you have students that are basically self-selected, not all honors students, it may well be that they are some of the better students are the ones who select the courses. You will have better outcomes and homogeneity in the courses before they go into the course as opposed to coming out of the courses.

Senator Hesse: Again, I might point out that the second paragraph of the purpose of the pilot study does not have student outcome. That does have some effect in the deliverability of the course.

Senator Walker: I am not certain that you can measure student outcomes after a single pilot study.

Senator Zeidenstein: You still have phrases in your document about participating students interacting with faculty, etc. That connotes a certain quality of student either going in or coming out of the program. Select students at random, and use that for your test. Eventually, if the pilot works out, every student in the university will be taking this program in 1996. So, why not test a random selection of students?

Senator Hesse: That's not the nature of this pilot study.

Senator Walker: I think the implementation committee should deal with that.

Senator Williams: We as faculty did consider these issues in our discussions, but we didn't want to dictate too much to the implementation committee.

Senator Liedtke: How will this committee be selected?

Senator Walker: It is spelled out in the document.

Senator Liedtke: I have a concern about the Language and Context. Based on the premise that our students will be living, working, and surviving in a future that includes people speaking many languages, can there be a way to understand more fully that foreign languages cannot be included in language and context.

Senator Walker: They can be (in language and context).

Senator Liedtke: So there could be a course that has European languages and culture that talks about commerce, economics, etc.

Senator Walker: Your point is well taken, but I don't think that is the point Senator Kaiser was making. Yes, we do allow for such courses.

Senator Liedtke: It is the nature of the courses.

Senator Zeidenstein: Does one speak Spanish or French in these candy language courses? What does it mean? Business in Latin America? Spanish or Portuguese will have to be spoken in a course that involves this. Business and Culture in Brazil. How much language will be spoken?

Senator Walker: I think you are missing the point.

Dean Schollaert: See page eight, Language in Context, Content: "Students who already possess basic skills in a language will build on their language experiences in earlier writing and speech courses to exercise their formal language abilities in an academic context." Basic skills in a language other than English could certainly be developed in one of these courses. It is very explicit that students must already possess the basic skills.

Senator Liedtke: How many freshman students come to ISU with skills in foreign language?

Dean Schollaert: Students who already possess basic skills in a language, build on their language experience. What that excludes is basic language instruction.

Senator Liedtke: Students may have basic foreign language knowledge, but it may not be French 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 level.

Senator White: One of the attractions of this program is increased creativity in coming up with new interdisciplinary courses. Courses are going to be offered in such quantity in basic sections, will this be possible?

Senator Walker: Only in the inner core. The outer core will allow for this.

Senator White: Why did Senator Williams say it would be impractical to offer a course in seven sections?

Senator Borg: Multiple sections are necessary for those classes in the inner core. Classes in the outer core could be more interdisciplinary, and might not necessarily need to be offered in many sections. The inner core would need a number of sections to handle the number of students.

Senator White: A large part of this program is to encourage faculty development and creativity, isn't it?

Senator Walker: Yes.

Senator Rosenthal: I have questions on two different things. In the language in composition sequence, I would like to point out that there is nothing worse for a high school student who has had preparation in language to hold off for a semester or a year. Language in context is designed as a follow-up for course number two. You are actually discouraging good students with preparation in foreign language from continuing. Are intermediate courses specified for four hours -- doesn't this penalize people who only get three hours credit?

Senator Walker: Yes.

Senator Rosenthal: What does basic ability in a language consist of?

Dean Schoellart: Some things need to be covered in the implementation process. It is a question of prerequisites: basic skills, foundations, grammar, speaking skills, etc.

Senator Nelsen: Is it safe to assume that the committee has considered "value added assessment?"

Senator Williams: It is built into program evaluations. You can't really assess the entire program.

Senator Nelsen: Will there not be one complete group that goes through the program?

Senator Walker: We can't test the students because they will not have completed the entire program.

Senator Hesse: It would be virtually impossible. If the Senate would approve a nine year pilot study, we could do this.

Senator Nelsen: Then the pilot study does not include the whole program. How can we have a capstone experience, if the program is not complete?

Senator Hesse: I guess the question is whether we can expect the students to sign on for all thirteen courses to get a complete study.

Senator Walker: You realize that you have the right in 1997 to accept, reject, or make recommendations for change. The Senate can do anything they want to in 1997. If they don't want to approve it yet, they can ask for an extension.

Senator Williams: If you look at other programs that have been implemented nationally, there is no way that you can fully assess a program after only three years pilot. Many of these programs take ten years to implement.

Senator Nelsen: How do you plan to assess the program then?

Senator Walker: I think we can assume that value added assessment will be part of the program.

Senator Mersinger: Currently under graduation requirements, a student is allowed to waive the constitution requirement by taking POS 105. Will you include a similar POS course or do we have to take the constitution exam.

Dr. Dillingham: There is a course that allows for that: U. S. Traditions. The issue is addressed later on.

Senator Insel: Under Language and Context, Criteria 4: "The course must be directed toward language use, not to the content and substance of specific disciplines and disciplinary groups." I teach mathematics courses, and it is very important for students to grasp the language of the course and be able to write in that language. How can you divorce one from the other.

Senator Walker: Divorced and directed are not synonymous terms.

Senator Insel: Why couldn't there be a requirement for disciplinary courses?

Senator Walker: This doesn't preclude that. It is a writing course.

Senator Williams: There is a difference between a course which actively involves teaching or using the language and simply relating on paper the content of the course. There is not special expertise being imparted to students if they are just writing a lot of papers to be graded. It is not the focus of this course for people to just write papers and get graded on them.

Senator Insel: That isn't the way I interpret it.

Ron Fortune: There is a difference between creating a focus and actively teaching writing skills.

NO COMMUNICATIONS

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Senator Walker announced a short meeting following Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Senator White reported that his committee had discussed the Facilities Planning report.

BUDGET COMMITTEE: Senator Nelsen had no report.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Senator Razaki called a brief meeting.

RULES COMMITTEE: Senator Johnson announced a short fifteen minute meeting prior to the next Senate meeting on Feb. 23rd.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: No report.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

XXV-52

Motion to adjourn by Zeidenstein (Second, Chernicky) carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JANET M. COOK, SECRETARY

Date: 2/9/94

Volume No. XXV No. 9

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOICE						VOICE NO.	U	M
		ROTION	ROTION	ROTION	ROTION	ROTION	ROTION			
AMSTER	P							XXV-51		✓
BARKER	EXCUSED							XXV-52		✓
BORG	P									
CHERNICKY	P									
COOK	P									
DEVINATZ	P									
GRAUMENZ	P									
GBROWITZ	P									
HESSE	P									
HOFFMANN	EXCUSED									
INSEL	P									
JERICH	EXCUSED									
JOHNSON	P									
KAISER	P									
KUSH	EXCUSED									
LAUGHLIN	P									
LEON	RESIGNED									
LIEDTKE	P									
MALEE	RESIGNED									
MANN	EXCUSED									
MANZO	P									
MC CUNE	P									
MECKSTROTH	P									
MERSINGER	P									
MOUSAVI	P									
NELSEN	P									
NEWGREN	P									
PAGE	P									
PARR	P									
RAZAKI	P									
RITCH	P									
ROSENTHAL	P									
SAKALAS	RESIGNED									
SCHMALTZ	P									
SCHROEER	P									
SCHWARTZKOPF	P									
SHAYA	P									
STEARNS	P									
STRAND, D.	P									
STRAND, K.	P									
TAYLOR	P									
THOMAS	P									
WALKER	P									
WALLACE	EXCUSED									
WHITE	P									
WILLIAMS	P									
WILNER	P									
WINCHIP	P									
ZEIDENSTEIN	P									