

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 2-5-1997

Senate Meeting, February 5, 1997

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 5, 1997" (1997). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 791.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/791>

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 5, 1997

Volume XXVIII, No. 10

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairperson, Jan Cook.

Seat New Senators

Jan Cook welcomed and introduced 2 new Senators:

Jordan Wilner - Grad student, assigned to the Administrative Affairs Committee

Ryan Hall - student, replaced Amy Venditti in Student Affairs Committee

Roll Call

Secretary Paul Borg called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve minutes of January 22, 1997 by Senator Thomas (seconded by Saultter.)

The Senate office corrected two typing errors on page 4 as follows:

change substitute legislation to *substantive legislation*

This would help fund *a portion* of the program that will come before us next month.

With corrections, carried unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson, Jan Cook thanked an anonymous Senator for the confidential communications that arrived at the Senate Office this last week. It was very carefully sealed, "confidential" typed on the tape that sealed it. It contained three cartoons from the Chronicle of Higher Education; one about serving on committees, and two about dogs. I appreciated all three.

At the January 27 Executive Committee meeting, we brought forward the fact that one of the student members of the Senate, had far exceeded the specified two absences. It was agreed that Matthew Malinsky would receive a letter telling him that he no longer qualified for the membership. We will look for a replacement for Matthew Malinsky.

During the late afternoon on Monday, February 3, the officers of the Senate and Professor Ed Hines, of Educational Administration and Foundations, counted the ballots returned on the General Education Proposal. The results of that tally are on the table tonight and being distributed to the Academic Departments in the morning. They will also be distributed to the Academic Department Chairs by e-mail, and can be forwarded as desired. The matter will be addressed later under the presentation of the General Education Proposal by Academic Affairs.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairman Joe Jannazzo welcomed Senator Ryan Hall and Senator Jordan Wilner.

Senator Jannazzo reminded the students of the Student Caucus scheduled for February 12, at

6:00 p.m. in the Redbird Room.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Saulter welcomed the two new Student Senators, Ryan Hall and Jordan Wilner.

At the Student Government Association meeting February 4, we had a very good discussion about General Education. Pat Meckstroth came to our meeting and brought two students who have taken courses in general education. A lot of questions were answered for the legislators. We anticipate a vote will be taken at the next meeting, which will take place on February 18.

Also, we installed a new legislator, Beth Sprengel.

Administrator's Remarks

President Strand had an update on the \$4 million needed to complete the Science Laboratory Building.

Today, in one of the Illinois Senate Committees, Senate Bill 143 was voted favorably out of committee. Now it moves to the floor of the Senate. That particular bill is a Supplemental Appropriations Bill that does contain the \$4 million for our equipment for the Science Laboratory Building. We are hopeful that the Senate will act not only favorably, but act with dispatch, and this particular piece of legislation will move to the House, where we hope it would receive favorable consideration. This is the part of the 11th hour of work in negotiation to hopefully bring that money to the campus in time to open the building next fall.

With respect to the General Education Proposal, which is coming before the Senate, I am very supportive of the need to make a change from our current program to the new program; however, I will reserve my substantive comments until the night on which we vote on the proposal. I am looking forward to hearing the discussion.

Provost Urice announced the last of the Library Dean candidates is on campus today. We expect a closure on that search within about two weeks. The Search Committee should report back to me early next week.

With regard to the General Education Proposal, I would like to echo President Strand's comments and add that I appreciate the comments that were shared at the general meeting. I want to thank many people who have gone to great lengths to express intelligent opinions on the variety of perspectives. I am looking forward eagerly as a faculty member and as Chief Academic Officer of the University for the discussion tonight. This is very important to this University.

Vice President Taylor no report.

Vice President Gurowitz reported that two week-ends ago, the Student Judicial Office had

Conflict Resolution/Mediation Training for approximately 20 students. Conflict Resolution/Mediation is in addition to our Judicial Process. It will be very helpful to help students settle arguments before they get into a formal judicial process.

I report a continued success story about the Night Ride bus service, which started 1½ years ago. As of January last year it had a total of 28,000 riders, and at the end of January this year it had 43,000 riders.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs: Senator Borg, Chairperson, said the committee has changed the regular meeting times because of change of schedules for Spring semester. Because of all the work, the meeting time is:

every Thursday at 11:00 a.m.

Wednesdays, alternating with Senate meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Tonight we bring an action item forward. The proposal for a sequence in Computational Physics, from the Physics Department.

We bring together with the Budget Committee, a proposal for a new major in Biochemistry/Molecular Biology.

We are also working on and listening to comments about the new General Education Program we will be dealing with over the course of the next three meetings.

Administrative Affairs: Senator White, Chairperson, no report. Administrative Affairs will meet at 6:00 p.m. before the next Senate meeting and discuss the next three Academic calendars.

Budget: Senator Jones, Chairperson said the Budget Committee will meet on alternate Wednesday nights of the Senate meeting at 7:00 p.m., in Felmley Hall of Science Building, room 309.

At our last meeting we unanimously approved the proposed deletion of the Human Biology Sequence from the minor in Biological Sciences. We saw no budgetary reason why this program should not be deleted.

We also discussed the Physics Department program to add the Sequence on Computational Physics to the curriculum. The Physics Department is requesting notice of funds in a plan to support this program by reallocation of resources. We saw no budgetary reason why this program should not be approved. We ask that the Academic Senate, the University Curriculum Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee, Chairs of Departments, and Deans of Colleges look at future requests as they come through their different offices to address problems of the issue of reallocation. A lot of programs are funded through reallocation. People may or may not have thought it out in great detail, but in the proposals coming through, it is not very clear how the reallocation will be done. There should be more formal

budgetary information to these proposals as they come through.

The committee discussed and unanimously approved the proposal by Chemistry and Biological Sciences for the Biochemistry/Molecular Program. We carefully reviewed the budget, which is a substantial budget. We found it as a very appropriate budget in terms of faculty, equipment, and commodities, to deliver a quality program at Illinois State University.

We received excellent comments relative to the Library budget from Senator Jagodzinski. We would like to recommend that as this budget and program go forward to the IBHE, that this be visited again. We probably have an underestimate in this budget since the rate of inflation or Library materials is about 18%.

We agree with the Academic Affairs Committee to recommend that the program not be implemented unless the budgetary needs are going to be met on this campus, either by reallocation or new funds through the IBHE process.

The committee discussed the General Education Program Budget. Tonight we have passed around a preliminary, but not final report. We are still gathering more information. Look this over so we can have discussion next time. Please read the following:

“At this time, we are continuing to obtain information related to the BUDGET part of the General Education Proposal. We anticipate presenting our final Budget Committee report and recommendation at the next Academic Senate meeting on February 19, 1997. We recommend that senators urge their constituency departments to contact Budget Committee members if they have important budget-related questions or concerns about the General Education Program.”

If there are more budgetary issues that are not yet being addressed, please let us know as soon as possible, so that we can get as much information as we need.

Faculty Affairs: Senator Reeder spoke for Senator Weber, who was unable to attend the meeting tonight, because of problems with a research project in Hawaii. The committee did meet, with a quorum. The major activity is a survey conducted jointly with the University Review Committee. It is a survey of faculty regarding the appointed salary, promotion, and tenure procedures at Illinois State University. The survey was distributed the first week of classes this semester and due back January 31. The survey has had over 250 survey responses. The survey results are being tabulated by the URC, and should have some preliminary results next week.

Rules: Senator Nelsen, Chairperson said the Rules Committee met tonight at 6:00 p.m. We discussed the revision to the Board of Trustees Governing Documents, that we were provided with last week. We have a couple concerns we will address to Dr. Susan Kern, and invite her to join us at the next meeting. The meeting will be scheduled before the next Senate meeting, but trying to find an alternate time.

There is an allusion to the Board's authority to approve the Constitution, but the only

reference to a constitution in all the Board Governing Documents is that one word on that one page, and so we are really trying to start proceeds to talk to Dr. Kern, initially to discuss that, and also to discuss the section the “Inter-relationship of the of the Board of Administrative and Faculty Staff and Student Body”, where there is allusion to (but not called) a shared governing process, whereby there will be the AP Civil Service, Student Government and Academic Senate, but we need to have a discussion as to the thinking of it. It basically indicates that those groups will provide advice or information, and it is a semi-radical departure from the early document. With that exception, the observation was made that the overall work that was done on the document (getting rid of a lot of stuff in the early board governing documents) was done very well. We have a couple of questions focused primarily on the governing structure, i.e., Constitution and the relationships of Senate and the other bodies on campus.

The Rules Committee is going to remove from the agenda the action item to bring forward nominees for any committee, to allow more time for Academic Affairs to deal with General Education.

Questions:

Senator Razaki said the Academic Senate has a very important role in advising the Board. *Reply* - The documents will be going before the Board for a first reading in the February Board Meeting. There will not be any action on these documents until approximately 3 months later. Rules Committee will invite Dr. Kern first, to meet with the committee, and then have Trustee Froelich re-join the committee once we have a general discussion on what the committee feels. This is a very serious concern of Rules Committee.

Senator Brooks asked Senator Nelsen how he reacted to the assertion on the first page of the governing document where it says “these governing statutes of the Board take precedence over the University Constitution in the policies and procedures of the University”, where it also says on page 3 “that the Board expressly reserves to itself, the power to act on its own initiative, in all matters affecting Illinois State University”, where it says on page 6 “that the President shall serve as the official medium of communication between the Board of Trustees and the Senate, and the AP Council, and the Student Government Association, and members of the faculty and staff.” I am surprised on your lack of outrage, at what appears to be a power grab by the Board. There is not a mention of shaved governance anywhere in that document. *Reply* - The term shaved governance is not going to appear in the document in a combination of words. There is the concept of elected bodies for AP Civil Service and the Students. If one reviews the documents we currently operate under, the Board of Regents Governing Documents, it was kind of adopted as part of the process going through, that phraseology is not very different than that which appears in the Board of Regents Governing Document. We are working from a set of documents that exist.

Senator Schmaltz asked where the wording came from. *Reply* - There was a condensation of the 179 pages down to the 27 pages that are currently in the proposed Board of Governing Documents.

Senator Schmaltz asked who did the condensation. *Reply* - That work was done by Dr. Kern. That is why it was presented to the Rules Committee to review and the President's Liaison Committee.

Senator Schmaltz said as he recalls, when the enabling legislation was set up to establish the Board of Trustees, didn't it say that the Illinois State Constitution remains in effect? *Reply* - Yes, this is a serious concern.

Student Affairs: Senator Robertson, Chairperson requested to delay the Athletic Council By-laws action item until the next Senate meeting.

The Student Affairs Committee met with Priscilla Matthews, Chair of the Athletic Council, tonight. It seems the proposal to take away a faculty member puts a strain on the sub-committees. They have requested that we add a non-athlete student. That will be included in the next Senate packet.

There will be a Student Affairs Committee meeting at 6:00 p.m., February 19, before the Senate meeting.

Action Items:

(1. Elections to External Committees - deleted by Rules.

XXVIII-84 (2. Motion to move that the Senate adopt a new sequence in Computational Physics in the Physics Department (seconded by Jones.) We have Professor Matsuoka with us to answer questions.

Senator Laymen asked how long it will take for enough students to enroll so that classes will not be canceled ACS Chemistry class. *Reply* - We hope to include more students in the major and offer more classes this fall.

Senator Borg asked how many classes were canceled in the last 3-4 years. *Reply* - Two.

Senator Schmaltz asked if this program is unique, the only one offered in the country.

Reply - Yes, it is the only program.

The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

(3. Athletic Council By-laws. Student Affairs Committee withdrew this item until the next meeting.

Information Items:

(1. *CHE/BSC Proposal for a New Major in Biochemistry/Molecular Biology (BMB)*. Presented by Senator Jones for the Budget Committee. This is a new program that would be a joint project between Chemistry and the Biological Sciences Department. Dr. Michael J. Kurz, Chair of the Chemistry Department and Dr. Carleton Philips, Chair of the Biological Sciences Department are here to answer questions. This a very expensive program. The major expenses are instruments, and two new faculty positions. We think this is a program that will be very good at Illinois State University. There is a lot of interest in Biochemistry and Biotechnology, in the State of Illinois and across the Country. There are many jobs in these areas. Interest by students in this program is high.

Questions:

Senator Jagodzinski asked about the Budget Committee's recommendation that the materials budget be increased or revised. At what point would that happen? *Reply - Senator Jones* - The Budget Committee would go back and fine tune it with IBHE. *Senator Borg* - The cautions anticipate some of the Budget Committee, that to provide a quality program costs money. Our caution comes from the fact that this University wants to do a program of this quality, and to do this the funding must be there.

Provost Urice - The preparation of the budget is college based, where the Deans solicit data from the departments in late fall or early spring. They are routed through the State's appropriations, starting in March. The results are usually released shortly after we have the Legislative Hearing, on the Legislative Budget in Springfield. The decisions are made as early as possible, before the start of the fiscal year.

- (2. *General Education Proposal.* Senator Borg said Academic Affairs has met several times about Pilot Implementation Committee's General Education Proposal. It is based on almost three years of a piloting process that the Academic Senate passed on February 23, 1994. The proposal has received many comments. The Pilot Implementation Committee document written in December 1996, is now submitted to the Academic Senate. We are trying to get input of various sorts around campus. This is a very important curricular initiative on the campus. We intend to listen to comments tonight, then the committee will decide whether and what changes we might adopt to the PIC Proposal, then ask for a further information session two weeks from tonight, before we have an action process. The Chair of the Senate has urged that we all look at all of the input before we make decisions. We are open to discussion. There are members present of the Pilot Implementation Committee and the University Studies Review Committee to answer questions.

Chair Jan Cook said in accord with Roberts Rules of Order, it is the standard procedure that on a subject with a large participation and discussion, each speaker is limited to two opportunities to address the same proposal, which is the General Education Program.

Questions:

Senator Schmaltz asked the Budget Committee about their budget report. *Reply - Senator Jones* said that at the next meeting they will have their formal comments. *Senator Schmaltz* said page 1, second paragraph of their report refers to Illinois State University receiving \$725,000. In new funds, did we get this amount in every year of '96, '97, do we expect to get \$725,000 in '98? *Reply - Provost Urice* said in fiscal '96 the IBHE gave us \$100,000, which is now part of our base budget, repeated in '97, to be repeated in '98. In '97 (the year we are now in), they supplemented that with another \$300,000 base dollars, therefore we now have \$400,000 in base, which we are using and spending. The proposal in front of the General Assembly, to be endorsed by IBHE, calls for \$325,000 additional dollars. If that is approved, then we have the \$725,000. *Senator Schmaltz* said, then we did not get \$725,000 in '97, but hope to get it in '98. *Reply - Provost Urice* said \$325,000 is in front of the General Assembly, we have the \$400,000. *Senator Schmaltz* asked what does retirement mean? How much money will be generated, and how it is going to do it? *Reply -*

Senator Taylor said they will have that data available before the presentation.

Senator Nelsen asked how many people the referendum represents? *Reply* - Chairperson Cook said 738, all those eligible to vote for faculty members of the Academic Senate. 449 responses were received by 4:30 on Monday, February 3. An additional 41 arrived too late to be tallied.

Senator K. Strand said the results of the survey leave him in a state of ambiguity. Can someone try to interpret these results? *Reply* - Senator Borg said more than half responded to the survey. There were 197 votes for the proposal, without comment. Two additional voters commented in the section where not requested to comment. There were 86 votes in favor of the proposal with various modifications. Add those together and get a majority. Among the people who preferred the old University program, many chose to explain the choice. These comments urge the support of a new program.

Senator White asked for an explanation of the course called "Language in the Humanities". The category was found necessary because the humanities did not exist elsewhere. Why is it that PIC does not perceive a place for the humanities in the other categories? *Reply* - Dr. Dillingham said PIC did not find it necessary. It was the decision of faculty colleagues, on the feedback from faculty. Humanities has plenty of opportunities all through the program. I see no violation of interdisciplinarity. The results of the piloting process, we see we have a much richer notion of interdisciplinarity.

Senator White asked how to read this category and understand it as inviting to (example) Social Sciences to participate in the category language? *Reply* - Senator Borg said the original philosophy encourages the notion of interdisciplinarity.

Senator White asked about the new category of individuals and society. This category reads more like a course description than a category description. Did PIC consider that this category description looked like in introductory to Sociology course description? *Reply* - Senator Borg said that the document is under study by the Academic Affairs Committee. Senator Walters said in early drafts of this program, a Foundations Course was deleted in subsequent drafts. The decisions from PIC came from long discussions throughout a wide range of departments from 5 Department Chairs. It never was conceived as just a Sociology Course, but a course to be taught by people interested in the Social Sciences. Senator Borg said the committee is looking for ways dealing with language to help assure the people that inclusions are the case. We are looking at all specific suggestions having to do with these matters and making the clarifications to determine what does and does not work.

Senator White asked how courses in the Languages and Humanities would work? How many students in a section? *Reply* - Senator Borg said PIC crafted the course category to specify that some portion of the course must be conducted in small class environment.

Senator White asked if the small sections would be lead by faculty or graduate students. *Reply* - Senator Borg said this priority demands different solutions to different problems. Yes, I do fear that graduate students must be the instructors.

Senator White asked, would courses offered in this category essentially count as English 145 does now? *Reply* - Senator Borg said in order for a program to work must not deal just with specialties, must accommodate the understanding of the entire economic community.

Senator White asked what would be the interaction between graduate students teaching writing and the faculty teaching the lecture, especially in the description of the category?

Reply - Senator Borg said can graduate students deal with writing and what the subject matter is we are writing about. Dr. Dillingham said there is no desire on the University or the Department offering the course, or the General Education Program; to prescribe the details of instructor. There must be dialogue between faculty and staff involved in delivering instruction in General Education.

Senator Jones asked why the distinction between the BS and BA was decided on one of the middle core courses. What is the rationale for using General Education Program to distinguish between BS and BA? **Reply** - Senator Borg said the current University Studies Program is a separate program from the distinction between Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science graduation compliance. The current University Studies Program allows the accommodation within choices of the University Study, for a particular student to select one or the other. In the 1994 proposal of a Comprehensive and Coherent General Education Program, the distinction and accommodation was made more difficult. The input suggested that such accommodation for whatever a BA & BS should mean, should at least be accommodated in some part in a General Education Program. There is considerable confusion about what the terms mean and how they should overlap. The requirements for a bachelor in Arts and Science are uneven and do not distinguish the Bachelor of Science Degree from a Bachelor of Arts Degree.

Senator Jones asked if PIC has considered English 249 as an option for the writing course for students to take? **Reply** - Borg said PIC is looking at the program procedures. It is not the intention of PIC to do the screening of the program.

Senator Deutsch said since 145 voted for the old version, why so many people voted in this fashion. Need to put the best construction on this response. The letter from Professor Harris gives a concern to entering a system that may place burdens on us. Consider items 3 & 4 on page 3 of the Budget report where it is indicated that both departments have voices. What reassurance can you give to the 145 people who are thinking, they just don't know enough about what is going to happen to us. **Reply** - Senator Borg said some implications being dealt with openly among the administrators. Dean Schollaert said we need to watch what has happened already. I have no interest in promoting and taking on a program that is going to create a predictable problem if we do not have the resources. I have full confidence that the resources that have been allocated for this program are going to go to the program. That is the most important issue.

Senator Blum asked if the PIC Committee has addressed the issue of long range planning for this program. What is the long term assurance for the faculty? **Reply** - Senator Borg said the philosophy adopted by the Senate in 1991 says "The University Studies Program consists of courses which rate as high in caliber, which are taught by the most qualified faculty, and which develop both general and specific knowledge."

Senator Blum asked what it costs to develop such a program? **Reply** - Dr. Dillingham said the cost in General Education Programs is unavailable. The programs are made up of courses that serve multiple needs. We spend a lot of time working on staffing and staffing

costs, and it is important. The cost depends upon the size of the freshman class, the retention rate for freshman and sophomore years, and the number of students. Provost Urice said the administration in a large part, is very supportive of the proposal, to make sure it achieves its academic goals. We need to look at the uncertainties of a large environment. Budget projections we have seen can be implemented and implemented well with the money now in hand for this year. Undergraduate education is the highest statewide priority for IBHE.

Senator Pereira asked why this proposal refers to foreign countries as Non-western? What does Western include? *Reply* - Dr. Dillingham said the only answer is 'habit and tradition'. You make very good points in your memo. Senator Walters said the State of Illinois does require from students something called 'Non-western'. Illinois State University has tried to define it. We welcome a suggestion.

Senator Kurtz asked if the extra 41 ballots will be included? *Reply* - Chair Cook said no. **Senator Kurtz** asked if it is premature for us to be considering whether or not a specific course will or will not fit under any process. *Reply* - Senator Borg said yes.

Senator Varner asked do we have a formal assessment of the academic success of the program so far? If we do not have, what plans do we have? *Reply* - Dr. Dillingham said the when the Senate approved the Pilot Program assessment it consisted of these questions:

1. Can these courses and this structure achieve the adopted philosophy?
2. Can these courses that are proposed actually be developed and taught?
3. What, specifically, will be their syllabi?
4. What existing or new courses will be appropriate for the program?
5. Will faculty be interested in and available to teach them?
6. What are the ramifications for department, college, and university resources?
7. How will administrative structure of the program work?

The Pilot Committee has undertaken a wide variety of assessment efforts, associated with understanding what happens in these courses. We have presented the results of some of the work. We have no outcoming information for any existing classes, thus, no basis for comparison. We have had 250 faculty involved in the Pilot Program.

Senator Neulieb asked how Academic Affairs will sort out the next revision? *Reply* - Senator Borg said it is impossible to make an absolutely objective reply. We will try to make some sort of judgment on expertise and interest of the comments, balanced with the process. The committee must pay attention and make the decisions. The matters of language and wording are extremely important to the discussion tonight. We need to look not only at the individual issues, but the entire package. *I will not force issues with the committee, without discussing them with the committee.*

Senator Newgren asked about the maximum of 3 hours for counting toward the majors on the outer core. *Reply* - Senator Borg said there are 2 ways current university studies serves various things. One is a prohibition, the other is piggy-backing programs one on another. This is part of the issue having to do with the accommodation of Bachelor of Arts and

Bachelor of Science.

Communications: None

Adjournment:

XXVIII-85

Motion to adjourn at 9:25 p.m. by Senator Schmaltz (seconded by Saulter). The motion carried unanimously on a standing vote with no abstentions.

February 5, 1997

Date: 02/05/97	Vol XXVIII	No. 10								
Name	Attendance	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Vote XXVIII-	Y	N	Abstain
		#83	#84	#85	#	#				
Amstadt	absent	all yes	all yes	all yes						
Blum	X	no abstain	no abstain	no abstain						
Borg	X									
Brand	X									
Brooks	X									
Cook	X									
Corl	absent									
Deutsch	X									
Diggs	X									
El-Zanati	X									
Fisher	X									
Garner	X									
Gilbert	X									
Gurowitz	X									
Hall	X									
Jagodzinski	X									
Jannazzo	X									
Jones	X									
Koehl	X									
Kurtz	X									
Layman	X									
Lockwood	X 7:15 PM	no vote								
MacDonald	X									
Mullen	X									
Myers	X									
Nelsen	X									
Neuleib	X									
Newgren	X									
Pereira	X									
Razaki	X									
Reeder	X									
Riley	X									
Robertson	X									
Ruyle	X									
Saulter	X									
Schmaltz	X									
Sterling	absent									
Strand, D	X									
Strand, K	X									
Taylor	X									
Thomas	X									
Thompson	X									
Urice	X									
Vargas	absent									
Varner	X									
Walters	excused									
Weber	X									
White	X									
Wilner	X									