

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 4-11-2012

Senate Meeting, April 11, 2012

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, April 11, 2012" (2012). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 845.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/845>

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
Wednesday, April 11, 2012
(Approved)

Call to Order

Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senate Secretary Susan Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

Presentation: General Education Review (Dr. Claire Lamonica and Dr. Jim Palmer, Co-Chairs General Education Taskforce)

Dr. Lamonica: Not much of what we say tonight is carved in stone. We are still looking for your feedback. Our task was to review the existing General Education Program. This was not meant to be a wholesale review of the program. We were asked to look at a number of specific areas. We spent most of 2011 talking about the program's mission, goals and outcomes. We are still working on that. In the fall, we started working in subcommittees. This spring, we have been meeting as a whole taskforce. We listen to the various reports from the subcommittees. We also have engaged in a number of open forums on campus.

Dr. Palmer: One of the things that our taskforce has been doing is to revise the mission and goals document for general education. We do have a draft version of the revised goals and outcomes on the General Education Taskforce, Provost's website. We will be meeting to recommend final changes to this document.

Dr. Lamonica: We hope to deliver our report by the end of this month. The Administrative Structure and Communications Subcommittee--the biggest change that that subcommittee is considering is to move the Director of General Education into the Provost's Office. The second recommendation is the addition of some work groups. The other recommendation is changing the institutional culture surrounding general education so that we change the way we talk about general education from being a hoop that you have to jump through to a program that really has a value for students. That will require some improved communication, marketing, conversations with advisement, talking to faculty and how we talk to students about general education.

Dr. Palmer: Another subcommittee on the taskforce has been working on curriculum structure and mapping. It relates to how we communicate about general education to students. There are two main recommendations that this group is considering. The first is to simplify the general education structure from three cores to two tiers. In that simplification, we have merged part of the middle core and outer core.

Dr. Lamonica: The next subcommittee has been working on writing across the curriculum. Writing is not the purview of any particular or program. Writing across the curriculum is not simply a general education issue, but one of our goals for general education is to create a program that integrates with the majors. This committee has explored three options for writing across the curriculum. Option one is what we are doing now but providing additional resources for faculty support to help faculty to understand how they can support student writers. The second model which they call English++ would place the burden of teaching writing instruction on the Department of English by adding an additional English course as a requirement for general education. The third model requires writing intensive courses throughout the curriculum both in general education and the major. That model has gathered the most support. The committee has a tentative recommendation that incentives be created for faculty who include writing in their courses.

Dr. Palmer: Another subcommittee has been looking at the role of the co-curricular activities in support of general education. The overall recommendation is that more can be done to put the co-curriculum into the

service of general education. The goal is to help students see connections between what they are experiencing outside of class and what they're learning inside of class. Another recommendation is that as syllabi are designed, co-curricular assignments should be encouraged.

Dr. Lamonica: The next subcommittee concentrated on issues of pedagogy and professional development. Major recommendations of this committee are first that general education pedagogy should incorporate teaching strategies that provide learners with new information and ideas. They are also recommending that we develop, implement and designate resources that will support a comprehensive and rich professional development program. They are also recommending that the responsibility for developing, coordinating and disseminating these resources for professional development be coordinated by a single unit and that we work to identify ways to recognize the teaching of general education as part of the ASPT process.

Dr. Palmer: Another group has been looking at this assessment of the General Education Program. We are not talking about the assessment of learning of individual students. We are talking about the assessment of the program, itself. This group has made four recommendations. One is to employ a full-time director of general education with expertise in administration, instruction and assessment. The second item speaks to the adoption of a multi-source approach of assessment. The portfolio work should continue and be a feature of assessment, but that other items ought to be included. This group is recommending an expanded assessment effort to determine if students are achieving the learning that we intend.

Dr. Lamonica: We hope to finish our work in the next few weeks. Our goal is to submit our report to the Provost by the end of the month. The Provost will review our report in conjunction with the Director of General Education and any changes that are made will be made through the regular curricular processes. They will move through the Council on General Education, University Curriculum Committee, and Academic Affairs and will end up here with this body. Any other information you like can be found on the general ed task force website.

Sen. Horst: Would you clarify if you are potentially recommending to add units or subtract units in general education?

Dr. Lamonica: The current set of recommendations call for cutting the number of required general education hours by three. The recommendation is that those three hours come from the area of social sciences. Right now the social sciences are overrepresented.

Sen. Horst: Would there be an additional writing component?

Dr. Lamonica: That's an option, but it is not really the option that has risen to the top.

Sen. Rich: Has there been much discussion regarding professional development and sustainability over time? The current General Education Program was initiated with a significant amount of first-year investment. The institutional memory of that professional development really didn't continue. So maybe less on the front end and more attention to sustainability might lead to longer term attainment goals.

Dr. Lamonica: I am not a member of that subcommittee, so I can't speak in terms of what kinds of conversations they have had. I do know that there is a recommendation that the responsibility for professional development be assigned to a particular unit. We have an existing professional development unit now. I think now with some of the resources that we have for professional development, it's possible to make that a more sustained effort.

Sen. Larson: If the goal is to cut three hours from general education, students frequently when they come out of general education don't have enough hours accumulated to snag many other major classes. If they are accumulating less hours, what kinds of adjustments can be made?

Dr. Jonathan Rosenthal: The committees have been very attentive to the fit of general education and the major. The gen ed curriculum of a biology major is quite different from the curriculum of an elementary education major, even within the same program because there are lots of options. It is variable between one program and another. In the fine arts, for example, you have lots of major courses that are for freshmen whereas other majors really start as a junior cohort.

Sen. Gallagher: Is the idea of simplification trying to make it easier for the freshmen to understand or are you going to be changing the requirements to make it easier for them to meet the requirements?

Dr. Palmer: Communicating to the students has been an issue we have talked about. The three core structure is something that students have found very difficult to understand and apparently many faculty members. I don't think we are trying to make it easier for students. I am not sure what you mean by that. We are trying to align the structure with what seems to be working for students in practice.

Sen. Weeks: You talked about the importance of writing and the multi-source assessments. I am kind of familiar with the difficulties of portfolio assessment. Do you plan to conduct assessments with regard to specific courses of the effectiveness of teaching writing?

Dr. Lamonica: Our goal in general education assessment is never to assess either students or courses. The goal in general education assessment is to assess the General Education Program. There are programs within programs, for example, in the General Education Program, there is the first-year composition program. That program is also the subject of assessment. There is programmatic assessment at that level.

Provost Everts: I would like to take this opportunity to thank our co-chairs. They have done a wonderful job for approximately 18 months, as well as to thank all of the members of the taskforce.

Chairperson's Remarks

Sen. Holland: Reading Week is not on the agenda. There are an awful lot of questions about it. It will be looked at much more carefully in the fall.

Student Body President's Remarks

Sen. Owens: We had our student elections last week. Andy Manno was elected as our new Student Body President. Nehemiah Chung will be the new Student Body Vice President. There are several student senators sitting around the table who were reelected as well. As a reminder to the student senators, your appointment continues until the May meeting, so you are expected to come to the April 25 meeting.

Administrators' Remarks

• President Al Bowman

President Bowman: State appropriation payments are being distributed on a much more timely basis this year. We have received about half of our FY 12 appropriation. The most recent payment was \$3.8 million dollars. The remaining portion will be distributed between July and December. Lots of discussion about the Governor's FY 13 budget. It does include reductions for higher education, at least as of today, a 5.4% reduction, which means Illinois State would receive \$4.3 million dollars less next year, but it is pretty early in the process. Moody's has released its analysis in conjunction with our upcoming bond sale for the Hancock project. There were favorable remarks about our established market position and good liquidity and management of our finances. I would like to complement Dan Layzell and his team for that work. The Governor has been very supportive of the MAP program. With the proposed reduction mood in Springfield, that program is at some risk. There is a MAP rally scheduled for April 19 and I recommend students pay attention to that. Our FY 13 budget includes additional dollars for MAP supplemental funds.

Sen. Holland: With the 5.4 reduction, what is the probability of raises next year?

President Bowman: We built a budget with the assumption that there would be at least a modest reduction, so we would be able to move forward with a raise. It's hard to know exactly the percentage because we still don't know what will happen in Springfield.

Sen. Gizzi: It looks like the tuition waiver bill died.

President Bowman: Yes, it did. Reason prevailed and that benefit is still there.

Sen. Cedeño: Is there any word on the concealed carry?

President Bowman: That bill did pass out of the agriculture committee. It's hard to know if it will pass the Senate. Even if it passes the Senate, the Governor would be able to veto it. It's probably a matter of time before it happens, unfortunately. Finally, the pension discussion is just swirling. It is difficult to know if anything substantive will happen in this session. I would recommend that you look at a document that was put together by a group at the University of Illinois. I will get a copy of that to Cynthia so that we can put it up on the Senate website. They have put out principles that could be used to guide modifications in the current program.

- **Provost Sheri Everts**

Provost Everts: The College of Education dean search is progressing rapidly. The last of the four finalists visited campus on Monday and Tuesday of last week. An announcement associated with this search will be coming soon. The Associate Provost Search Committee, chaired by Sharon Naylor, has begun their review of candidates. They are currently scheduling on-campus interviews and you can look for those dates on the Provost's website. The search committee for the Director of the Graduate School concluded its on-campus interviews. An announcement on the search will be forthcoming. Sen. Kalter asked the question when we last met regarding a TPA, the Teacher Performance Assessment. Last week, there were additional questions at the Council of Chairs. It was suggested that Barb Meyer, Chair of C&I, request that CTE hold a TPA forum. As that forum takes shape, I will bring additional information to the Senate.

Sen. Kalter: Sen. Owens asked last time about the Best Practices Document. Do you have an update on that?

Provost Everts: There are students on every search committee dictated by policy and there are certainly no changes there nor any changes in the Best Practices Document associated with that. Also, one of the pieces that has come forward this year is that we need to make sure that we pay attention to the individual cultures of departments and schools in regard to students as members. The one piece that was forwarded was that we ensure that there is search committee training, but that does not pertain to only students.

Sen. Kalter: I remember his question was specifically about whether there is a status of the whole recommendations.

Provost Everts: There is not necessarily a change to that document, but as that document was formed, there was an expectation that it would change and grow over time depending upon what each individual departments and schools want to do, so we will continue to change and alter that as we move forward.

Sen. Kalter: So the four offices have accepted the Senate's revisions?

Provost Everts: There have been no, in my estimation, changes in regard to such, but certainly an acknowledgement that there is an additional document. I think that the hope was what we would do is look at what this year has brought in regard to an evaluation process and see what we have learned about what has

worked and what hasn't worked and what we need to change. An item that has been underscored in both of documents is the need for training.

Sen. Ellerton: Last week, I received an e-mail from HR that had attached a letter of reappointment with a request that the letter be signed and returned. Not all tenure-track faculty received that. When I phoned and asked, I was told no, I don't. Since it bore your signature as Provost, I have a couple of questions. Would this be a future happening? What do we do with the letters?

Provost Everts: I will get back to you with the answer associated with that question.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Larry Dietz***

VP Dietz: Congratulations to the new student government slate. I will be swearing in on Sunday. Thanks to the current student government for serving this past year. The Division of Student Affairs had an affair today called the Star Program. It looks internally at individuals in the division that have served in outstanding ways for both the university and also professional associations. 39 of our staff members have finished degrees or anticipate finishing a degree and graduating this spring. There was one additional award bestowed upon a program within the division called On Common Ground. That program's award was from the Minority and Friends Network that represents some quite notable institutions. In addition, there was one taskforce that received an award today. That was the Cardinal Court Implementation Team that will bring that project online this fall.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Layzell***

VP Layzell: The governor's taskforce on pension reform will release its report on April 17. We will have some sense of what the administration is thinking.

Senator Weeks: I have been asked by my colleagues to bring some concerns and questions to you about the notification of the security breach in 2000. When this came up, there were mixed reactions. Are we being encouraged to follow up on this? Should the administration be taking action?

VP Layzell: To provide context for the issue, a couple of weeks ago, and we found this out by accident, we found some unsecure information that was available via a website. At least one of the files included social security numbers. We are required by law and by policy to work very diligently and quickly to inform the individuals who were affected by this. We have no evidence to suggest that any of this data has been used for any illegal purposes. We certainly encourage those who received a letter to at least put a fraud alert forward with credit reference bureaus so that they have that on file. In terms of what the university can do, because such information is considered confidential, we can't on behalf of you contact the credit bureaus. We can do, if you are concerned and you want us to contact these bureaus on your behalf, saying that this did happen. The two individuals that are handling this are Andrea Ballinger and Mark Walbert, who are working in collaboration.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee:

Senator Stewart: We talked about the study week or Reading Week. One of the problems that we found and a lot of the comments were about the title of the policy. We talked about a title that would be more amenable to everyone. There was a lot of misunderstanding of the intent of it, so when it is re-crafted, there might be a preamble before it to explain the context of the idea. A lot of people had problems with several of the ideas in it that we had no intent of putting in it. It was just the way it was worded suggested something other than the intent. It will go through a lot of consideration before it comes back sometime next year as an Information Item. We also talked about the grade challenge policy that is coming up as an Information Item this evening. We discussed that the library should have a little more open communication with the Senate so that misunderstandings don't occur. We are not trying to dictate to the library what it does, but just ask that it communicates a little more.

Sen. Gizzi: The library committee, not the library?

Sen. Stewart: Correct.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:

Senator Cedeño: We had a brief report from VP Layzell on the budget status for next year. We worked on the final details of the Academic Impact Fund. Recommendations will go to the Executive Committee next Monday as an Advisory Item next time.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Senator Kalter: We talked about the proposed Academic Freedom Policy, which would go to Exec on Monday.

Planning and Finance Committee:

Senator Rich: Our annual Institutional Priorities Report has been submitted, but the Executive Committee has not yet brought it forward. We look forward to that next time.

Rules Committee:

Senator Fazel: We assigned faculty to serve on the External Committees based on their interest and also based on the requirements of the committees. We have almost done all of it. We are going to send that to the Executive Committee. This is our last meeting so I wanted to thank the committee for their active participation, especially our student members.

Action Items:

03.28.12.02 *Dean Responsibilities Policy (Administrative Affairs Committee)*

03.28.12.01 *Chairperson Responsibilities Policy (Administrative Affairs Committee)*

Sen. Cedeño: Everyone should have received a new version of the policies with some of the corrections that were brought up at the last meeting.

Motion XXXXIII-60: By Sen. Cedeño to approve the Dean Responsibilities Policy and the Chairperson Responsibilities Policy.

Sen. Holland: Since they are pretty much identical policies, we can bring them at the same time.

Sen. Ellerton: I am assuming that this is a new policy for new appointments only and that existing deans and chairs the previous policy is what applies to them.

Sen. Holland: You would not change policies, but the policies are basically unchanged.

Sen. Cedeño: It is always the intention that the policies will apply to the new personnel.

Sen. Holland: These are on the regular cycle and will be reviewed again in five years.

Sen. Bonnell: I was disappointed when this vote came up in committee and that I was in the minority. According to what we talked about at the last Senate meeting, this will be studied next year and reviewed. We talked almost all year, and last year, we reviewed them as well. The piece that we talk a lot about was the compensation piece. In that case, the language is similar for chairs and deans. When you look at Milner, if for instance, the Dean of University Libraries would step down for whatever reason after five years, that person would actually maintain their salary because we have a 12-month contract. It seems like there could be a little more like the flexibility in how this policy is written to accommodate that. There is a morale piece to that. We

have many civil service in the library who have tried to get upgrades and the scrutiny that they get it usually ends up being a dollar an hour. It seems like there is a discrepancy there. Chair Cedeño put a lot of work in investigating the salaries. You can also look at that data if you come into Milner. With Public Act 96266 you can actually take a look at these salaries online if just Google IBHE faculty salaries. You can find FY10 and FY11 faculty and administrative salaries. The library has FY12. Thank you to Sen. Cedeño and to Senator Kalter who worked on these. A lot of hard work went into these.

The policies were approved by majority vote.

03.15.12.01 *Tenure Policy-Revised (Faculty Affairs Committee)*

03.15.12.02 *Suggested AAUP Policy Language (Reference Document)*

03.15.12.03 *IBHE Report of 12/10/10 (Reference Document)*

Sen. Kalter: In the first paragraph, we are adding a statement that helps to remind us that we are protected when we talk about matters of public concern or when we are in the role of shared governance. This is for people with tenure, but we are also working on the policy that will clarify that this applies to anybody who is in a research, teaching, shared governance function in the university. The paragraph under General Provisions, we are just clarifying that the reasons for a termination of a tenured faculty are outlined in the ASPT Policy. We crossed out on the bottom of that paragraph something about the rank of instructor, because as we understand it nobody on the tenure-track is called an instructor anymore.

Motion XXXXIII-61: By Senator Kalter to approve the Tenure Policy as revised.

Sen. Horst: Was there a friendly amendment that you wanted to add?

Sen. Kalter: Yes, there was. At the end of the first addition, after “to speak or write on matters of public concern...” Sen. Fazel asked us to add something about “subject to”. I want to rephrase it very slightly: “subject to academic standards and the University Code of Ethics”. I make that motion on behalf of my committee.

The policy, as revised, was unanimously approved.

12.07.11.01 *CAS Bylaws Revisions (Rules Committee)*

03.22.12.02 *CAS Bylaws Without Revisions (Rules Committee)*

03.27.12.02 *CAS Bylaws With Revisions (Sent to the Senate by Email) (Rules Committee)*

Motion XXXXIII-62: By Senator Fazel to approve the CAS Bylaws. The bylaws were unanimously approved.

Information Item:

01.02.12.01 *Final Course Grade Challenge Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)*

Sen. Stewart: We have been working off and on on this for a while and there has been good feedback from Exec and the committee. There are some changes. Some changes are not in the document you received. On page 2, number 1, it reads, ‘if after discussion with the faculty member, the student believes that the grade was arbitrary’ and we changed this next phrase: “or if there is an inability to reach the faculty member.” We also altered no later than ten business days after the start of the academic semester. That is not to say that a student could not bring it before that time. The committee also changed the composition of the committee, item number 5. Rather than there being two faculty members and one student, it was suggested that one student by themselves may be a guppy among the sharks. It might give the students a little more courage to speak their mind if there is more than one. It was amenable to all on the committee, three faculty members and two students.

Sen. Holland: Perhaps this can be added to the Blue Book as one of the committees they can volunteer for.

Sen. Owens: I think that we discussed in Exec that SGA would recommend the two students.

Sen. Bushell: How different is this than the Student Grievance Committee?

Sen. Stewart: There was a problem with the Student Grievance Committee not handling these issues in a timely manner and if it were housed in the Provost's Office, it would be expedited.

Sen. Edwards: How often is this exercised?

Sen. Stewart: Not very often.

Sen. Ellerton: There is a comment that a letter needs to be communicated. I am assuming that an email is acceptable.

Sen. Stewart: I believe electronic communication would suffice as a letter.

Sen. Smudde: Does the 10-day window supersede that faculty have to maintain their files of courses for up to a year?

Sen. Holland: They are separate issues. You have to maintain these files for one semester to give students time to pick up their previous semester's work. But if they have been given the grade, then they have that 10-day window into the next semester.

Sen. Stewart: They send an email to a professor before the semester begins.

Sen. Holland: More often than not, I think that this is going to be a situation of someone failing a class and being unable to register for the next semester. We want to take care of that quickly.

Sen. Kalter: In the Executive Committee, I brought up the point that I didn't feel comfortable when a student majority on a committee like this could overrule faculty. I am wonder how the faculty would feel is there is a split: two students and one student that say that the grade must be changed. That allows for a student majority. I don't think students should be able to overrule faculty in grade matters.

Sen. Stewart: If there is a faculty member siding with the students, they are not overruling the faculty. The other situation is with two faculty and one student, if one faculty member sides with the student, you would still have the same situation.

Sen. Holland: Since a lot of this is going to be happening between semesters, it seems like it would be easier to get two faculty and one student.

Sen. Gizzi: There will be because they have ten days once the semester starts.

Sen. Holland: If is somebody needs to register and it occurs in late May, a lot of faculty are gone and most of the students are gone.

Sen. Dawson: Just confirming that the committee only makes a recommendation and the Provost makes the final decision.

Sen. Horst (inaudible)

Sen. Holland: Since the SGA President and Vice President are both here during the summer, they could both be available.

Advisory Items:

03.30.12.01 *Academic Calendar (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

03.30.12.02 *Academic Calendar Day and Class Minutes Analysis*

03.30.12.03 *Academic Calendar Profile*

04.04.12.01 *Academic Calendar Development Procedures (Provost Everts)*

01.27.10.01 *Academic Calendar Procedural Information (Jonathan Rosenthal)*

Sen. Cedeño: You have five different documents. One is a memo from Jonathan Rosenthal. The second one is the Provost's advisory on the considerations that goes into developing the Academic Calendar. Then of course the draft and tables that are put together by the person in charge of the Academic Calendar for 2016-17. As mentioned in the memo from Jonathan, there is not much flexibility on the Academic Calendar. There is no room for change. If you catch any mistakes, contact Jonathan Rosenthal or Sam Catanzaro.

Communications

Sen. Horst: The ISU Orchestra will be holding a concert on April 26 at 8:00 p.m. in CPA.

Sen. Woith: What would it take to be able to split that Thanksgiving break into two days in October at midterm on Monday and Tuesday and the Wednesday, Thursday and Friday Thanksgiving the way it was a few years ago?

Sen. Holland: You may recall that when we did it that way, students used to start taking off Monday and Tuesday anyway. It was brought to us as a proposal. Now they take off Thursday and Friday the week before. I am not sure how we would go about doing that.

Sen. Souk: (inaudible)

Sen. Stewart: I would like to thank the students who serve on the Senate, especially the ones who have served on my committee. They bring a lot to the Senate and I think we need to appreciate the service that they bring.

Adjournment