

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, February 11, 2008, 4:00 P.M.
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Holland called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Present: Larry Alferink, Allison Graham, Mark Cassata, David Horstein, Ted Mason, Dan Holland, Susan Kalter, Paul Borg, Acting Provost Jan Murphy

Absent: Farzaneh Fazel, Ed Stewart, President Al Bowman

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of January 28, 2008

Motion XXXIX-38: By Senator Alferink, seconded by Senator Horstein, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of January 28, 2008. The minutes were unanimously approved

Distributed Communications:

01.24.08.01 ***From Susan Kalter: Recommendation for Formation of Admissions and Retention Review Committee (See Exec Packets of 1/28/08 for this document; Provost Murphy requested discussion to continue on 2/11/08)***

Senator Kalter: We discussed this last week, but I sent around a supplementary e-mail. The term “review”, as referenced in document distributed at the last meeting, might not have had the meaning that I meant, which was not to be a review of any particular person or a sort of passive listening device, but more on the order of looking at apps and other retention issues. Secondly, this is only one possibility among several and I had written it to be opened ended so that the Senate could discuss it.

This is basically an idea to have a committee of some sort to look at admissions and retention issues. In the minutes from the last meeting, President Bowman suggested that a standing committee look at this and decide if something like this was appropriate. Several universities do have committees like this that include faculty and students.

Provost Murphy: I said I would sit down with Jonathan Rosenthal and with the President and try to look at this. I was really going back to those original five points in Senator Kalter’s document. There are currently four committees that look at admission and retention issues. Two were appointed by the President, one by the Provost and one is an administrative group that works with EMAS on admission and retention kinds of things.

When I talked to Jon, and I would agree, that probably a method to more formally communicate to the Senate might be really helpful. The President charged Jonathan and Shane McCreary to convene a group to draft the student diversity statement. There are legal issues to help us think about the philosophy. In 2006-07, Jon convened a committee that continues to meet biweekly throughout the year to address recruitment and retention issues. That’s a pretty broad group. What might be missing from that group is a faculty and student component. This group has members that can add all of the pieces together: Admissions, UCLA, EMAS, U-College, SSS Trio, MSAC, so that is a group of individuals that is dealing with those issues every day. A lot of programs developed by the group are what Jonathan talked about at the Senate meeting. They continue to meet, though not as often. Maybe adding a faculty and student component to that committee and the continuation of those meetings to review all of the programs out there would be helpful.

In November 2007, President Bowman convened a group to look at financial aid, proactively. We meet every other week. We look at merit and need-based scholarships and continue to advocate to increase those. We have done a tremendous job with need-based scholarships and we are trying to now look at merit and talent-based scholarships. There is also an ongoing Program Enrollment Management Committee that makes sure that we have adequate numbers of majors. All of those things kind of fit together. Out of all of the committees, probably the committee that looks specifically at recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups might be the best place to

start by perhaps adding a faculty and student to that committee and then thinking of a mechanism for formally communicating to the Senate. I think the pieces are out there and it wouldn't take a lot to add what you are suggesting.

Senator Kalter: Could you provide the names of those who constitute those committees because I think one of the things that faculty don't know is that some of this is going on and who's doing it. I am concerned about the shared governance aspect of it and I think it would be great to include faculty and students. Although communication to the Senate is extremely helpful, it tends to be more of a one-way communication.

Provost Murphy: You are right; I think that a lot is about communication. The roles of an admission office are very legally defined; there is a limit to what we can do. We have to be so very careful about how admission decisions are made. Having a really large committee sit around the table and try to talk through admission decisions—that's something I don't think we can do. The bigger issues of how are we recruiting students and the programs for retaining students is more advisory in nature, but there are legal processes in play when it comes to true admission decisions.

Senator Kalter: I understand that; I don't think having faculty on those committees would go against a legal statute.

Provost Murphy: How do you involve faculty in reviewing 13,000 apps? We can't get faculty to populate half of the committees we have.

Senator Kalter: I do know that other universities have these types of committees, so my idea was to generate a discussion about 'Why do they have those kinds of committees?' 'Is this a good idea for ISU? If not, why not?' I'm not going in with the idea that we need to have that, but rather to think about 'What are the constraints of a university with 13,000 vs. 40,000?' 'Why do some universities have them?'

Provost Murphy: Faculty actually making admission decisions for...? We have faculty making admission decisions for degree programs once the initial admission process has occurred; that's something very different. We have faculty and students involved when we look at programs like the Presidential Scholars; I see those as recruitment processes. I can see the recruitment side of it, but I worry about the admissions process.

Senator Alferink: I wonder if this might move along if we have a list of the institutions that have such committees. That list could be examined to see what the functions of the committees are, what the nature of the institutions are, etc.

Provost Murphy: So Susan, you must have a list since you mentioned that you know that universities have those committees.

Senator Kalter: I don't have a comprehensive list. I know that the places I have been have had those kinds of committees and my sense, from reading the legal cases, is that Bollinger and Michigan had committees like that. Now whether they were working is another question. In the law school case, they did say that that kind of committee was useful and that was what allowed the law school's admissions process to pass muster in the Supreme Court as opposed to the undergraduate process.

Senator Holland: Do we know if our comparator schools have such committees?

Senator Alferink: Is there a list serve that we can use to pose these questions?

Provost Murphy: There's ASCU, but it's not a provost list serve. There are probably admissions list serves.

Senator Alferink: Could we post this question on one of the list serves to see what other institutions are doing?

Provost Murphy: Yes, we can do that.

Senator Alferink: That might be the most effective way of seeing if there is something out there.

Provost Murphy: So, find out if there are institutions that enlist faculty in the admissions decision making process?

That's something much different from what you proposed in your e-mail, Susan. Those five points dealt more with oversight of how recruitment and retention occurred.

Senator Kalter: I am not thinking about oversight.

Senator Borg: "Advisory" might be a better word, with a primary function of communication to the Senate.

Senator Kalter: I think that recruitment, retention and admissions are related issues. I don't know if this means no committee, several committees or a single committee.

Senator Holland: There are four committees. How much communication is there between the committees?

Provost Murphy: EMAS is the underlying unit there, so I don't think communication between committees is an issue. What I'm hearing is that communication to the Senate is the issue.

Senator Kalter: I would put it as communicating with faculty.

Provost Murphy: Communication with the faculty is almost going to have to occur through communication with the Senate.

Senator Holland: Yes, through the Senate Liaisons who represent faculty constituencies.

Senator Alferink: My idea is to use the list serve to find out what's out there and see if that gives us ideas of how we might do something better here.

Senator Borg: We could find out if institutions are involving faculty in those decisions to any large degree.

Senator Holland: As far as adding faculty and student representatives to the recruitment and retention committee, how hard would that be?

Provost Murphy: I don't think that would be difficult.

Senator Borg: How large is that committee?

Provost Murphy: The main committee is composed of nine members.

Senator Holland: What is the name of the committee?

Provost Murphy: I don't have the name; I don't know what Jonathan calls it. It is just a committee that looks at recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups.

Senator Horstein: I think that that would be popular with students; I don't think that we would have a problem finding a student to serve on it.

Senator Holland: Based on the interest in the Senate at the last meeting, I don't think that we would have a hard time finding someone either.

Senator Kalter: Is that the one that the President convened?

Provost Murphy: No, that's the one that Jonathan convened in the fall of 2006. The two committees that the President convened are one that deals with the university diversity statement and another that deals with financial aid practices and procedures. That was just convened in December 2007.

Senator Holland: It seems like it would be a good idea to put faculty and students on that committee and have the

committee report to the entire Senate or to the Academic Affairs Committee, which would then report to the Senate. I think it would make a big difference depending on the time of the year of the reporting. If you wait until spring to do a report like this, there is absolutely nothing anyone can do at that point.

Provost Murphy: The retention side is ongoing and spring is kind of getting ready for next fall. We make 10% of our admission decisions by November 1. Spring is when we are going out and doing a lot of recruitment, so we could report in the spring.

Ms. James: So, is there a consensus on this?

Senator Holland: One, we will get information from the list serve, and two, we will arrange for faculty and staff representation, who will report to the Senate in the spring.

Provost Murphy: I am only guessing about the spring reporting.

Senator Borg: I think we need advice on that.

Senator Holland: As to what's appropriate—when and where.

Senator Borg: That keeps this essentially an administrative committee rather than an External Committee of the Senate and I think that's appropriate.

Provost Murphy: Do you want me to come back to this group with some of this information? Will it go to a committee?

Senator Holland: We need to know how many faculty and students to place on this committee. We have nine administrators on it right now.

Senator Borg: I suggest that Jon and Jan talk with the committee and see what they might recommend and then perhaps have a discussion with that group. As useful as some of these things are, there may be a different way than having students and faculty on a committee to get the back-and-forth communication.

Senator Holland: How often do these committees meet?

Provost Murphy: When they have a lot on their plate, they are meeting biweekly. I wouldn't be able to tell you that they are meeting biweekly now, but last year, we met every two weeks. Right now, a lot of our attention is turned to scholarships and financial aid. Jonathan could better tell you whether the reason that the committee is not meeting as often is due to the ebb and flow of some of these issues.

Senator Borg: It sounds like we need more information and then we can decide where we want to go.

Provost Murphy: Even as he is trying to find out if institutions have faculty involved in the university admissions decision-making process, at the same time, we can add student and faculty to the recruitment and retention committee and then communicate with the Senate.

01.28.08.01 *From Steve Adams: University Property Where Alcoholic Beverages Are Permitted Policy (Dist. Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

Senator Holland: According to this proposed policy, you will no longer be allowed to drink alcohol in any of the dorms. This might go hand in hand with the new housing policy, which gives freshmen and sophomores preference for residence in the dorms.

Senator Graham: We got a lot of backlash about this policy. The students want us to vote against it, but we are kind of torn right now because, with the new housing policy, there won't be as many students living in the dorms who are old enough to drink. We are meeting with Steve Adams tomorrow to discuss the housing policy and how this ties into

it.

Senator Alferink: Would this be more of an Administrative Affairs Committee issue than a Rules Committee Issue?

Provost Murphy: I would say so.

Senator Holland: It could go to the Administrative Affairs Committee, but they are not going to be able to do anything with it until March. They are going through the presidential commentary process.

Senator Graham: We are finishing up the report on that.

Senator Mason: We have already analyzed all of the data.

Senator Graham: We just need to sign off on the report.

02.07.08.01 *From Larry Alferink/Rules Committee: SCERB University Hearing Panel - Proposal for Addition to Academic Senate Blue Book (Senate Information Item 2/20/08)*

Senator Holland: The Rules Committee, essentially, is just bringing the University Hearing Panel in line with the Student Code Enforcement and Review Board (SCERB).

Senator Alferink: This is an Information Item at the next meeting.

Ms. James: The Faculty Caucus populates the SCERB Grievance Committee in addition to SCERB and the University Hearing Panel. Are you considering adding something to the *Blue Book* on the Grievance Committee as well?

Senator Alferink: I don't know that we would deal with the grievance committee; we don't populate that one.

Ms. James: Yes, we do; we fill SCERB, SCERB Grievance and the University Hearing Panel. It's a small committee with, I think, five faculty members.

Senator Alferink: I can check into that.

Senator Borg: I do have one question about your proposal. The document says that the University Hearing Panel reports to the Academic Senate. Should that say to the Academic Affairs Committee instead?

Senator Alferink: Yes, I thought that I made that correction in the attachment that I sent to Cynthia.

Senator Graham: This document says that Community Rights and Responsibilities (CRR) nominates students to the University Hearing Panel. Doesn't SGA appoint students to all of the other committees?

Senator Borg: The last sentence says that the student members are elected by the SGA.

Senator Alferink: That's how they do it currently. This language is from the Student Code of Conduct. Here, we have added student participation so that SGA ratifies the nominations. The student members of the Rules Committee said that if SGA had someone it wanted to nominate, they would refer them to the CRR, which would probably nominate them.

02.07.08.02 *From Larry Alferink/Rules Committee: SCERB – Proposed Revision to Blue Book (Senate Information Item 2/20/08)*

The only revision to the information in the *Blue Book* for SCERB is that that SCERB will report to the Academic Affairs Committee rather than to the Academic Senate.

From Susan Kalter: Human Resources Recruitment Manual and AAUP Policies

02.01.08.01 *Illinois State University Recruitment Manual (Dist. Faculty Affairs)*

02.01.08.02 *Ethics of Recruitment and Faculty Appointments AAUP Policy (Dist. Faculty Affairs)*

02.01.08.03 *Access to Faculty Personnel Files AAUP Policy (Dist. Faculty Affairs)*

02.08.08.01 *From Harry Deutsch: Human Resources Regulations regarding Hiring Processes (Dist. Faculty Affairs Committee)*

Senator Holland: The next three documents are related to the fourth document (the letter from Professor Deutsch).

Senator Kalter: I have been hearing similar complaints to those in Dr. Deutsch's letter regarding our academic hiring process for several years. I had not seen the Recruitment Manual until I served on a search committee last fall.

Apparently, this has never gone through the Senate. I wanted to recommend, and I have accompanying policies from the AAUP, that we talk about weighing whether it's better to be more open or more closed in all kinds of personnel file issues. I believe that Faculty Affairs would be the committee to discuss this if we decide to send it to committee.

It seems to me that some of the decisions being made by HR are occurring without faculty input. It's more about what Dr. Deutsch talks about in his letter to us about closing down the number of people who can see a candidate's file. Faculty seem to be pretty unclear about what kind of case law or legislation is driving these changes, if any, and which of the changes are legislatively mandated versus interpretative versus not at all about any legislation. Also, these kinds of guidelines are not being applied uniformly across departments, so I thought it would be a good opportunity, again, for more communication and discussion about perhaps the norms in academic hiring and if they differ from the norms in other areas. I think the point of view that HR seems to have is that applicants would rather have fewer people look at their applications.

Senator Holland: In a physics search, it came from legal counsel that only people on the search committee could look at the files until it got to the final search—those candidates who were coming to campus. The new legal counsel may have a different opinion. There is a very simple way around it; we just made any tenure/tenure-line physics faculty member a member of the search committee and everyone could look at the files. Then the final decision was made by the DFSC as to which candidates came to campus.

Provost Murphy: Would the department or school bylaws set up the composition of the search committees?

Senator Holland: Each department can set up how they want their department's search committee to be; we wanted everyone who wanted to have input to have that opportunity.

Senator Borg: It also depends on the size of the department. It would be impractical for a department with more than 30 or 40 members. We have special needs search committees; the faculty who know the most about what is needed serve on the committee. That committee serves as an advisory committee to the DFSC. So what shall we do with Dr. Deutsch's letter? He is asking the broader question about the regulation, 'are they in the best interest of the university and if they are not, then we need to change them'.

Provost Murphy: He is just asking the Executive Committee to bring the following questions to the attention of the Senate, which we could do through committee.

Senator Kalter: It would be helpful to even know where the rules are coming from.

Senator Kalter's documents and Dr. Deutsch's letter will be forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Oral Communications (No documents are distributed for oral communications; they are verbally communicated to the Executive Committee by the Senate Chairperson)

02.11.08.01 *From Frank Waterstraat/Academic Affairs Committee: Support for Institutional Artifact Portfolio for General Education Program Assessment (Sense of Senate Resolution on 3/5/08)*

Senator Holland: We received two communications from Academic Affairs that were not distributed. They have looked at two issues and have decided not to take any action on one of them.

Senator Borg: That can come up in the committee report.

Senator Holland: I think that they just want to make sure that it gets into the Senate record. One of them is that they would like the Senate to endorse the idea that we do an assessment of the General Education Program according to an institutional portfolio. I don't know if we need the full Senate's vote to endorse that. It could be a Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Senator Borg: A Sense of the Senate Resolution would be appropriate.

Provost Murphy: The General Education Coordinating Council (GECC) and the General Education Task Force have been working on this for about a year and half. Those are two faculty-based committees that have developed this institutional portfolio model. Given the amount of work that those committees have put into this, it would be nice to endorse what they have done. My view is that we are moving forward with this pilot and in order to communicate this to our faculty, who are teaching General Education, this is something that we are vetting through the Senate. If there are concerns or questions, the Senate becomes the perfect place for those concerns or questions to be discussed. My recommendation to Mardell was that we are about at a point at which we should really bring this to the Senate. To me, General Education, bottom line, was approved by the Senate and it kind of belongs to the Senate, so let's make sure that they are comfortable with an assessment plan.

Senator Kalter: Are you talking about what we have already heard from Mardell, because we did have that presentation?

Provost Murphy: Yes, we are at point where we are almost done with the pilot and I just did not want anyone to not know what's going on.

Senator Borg: We forget that, as the Senate, we are the body that approves, at the university level, all programming. What we have done in the last eight years is taken most of that, trusting the various curriculum committees, and put it on the Consent Agenda. All of that used to come before the Senate for a vote. We don't necessarily want to go back to that, but I think that making sure that everyone is on board and understanding what these committees are doing is an important part that we did not institutionalize.

Provost Murphy: We have lost some of the institutional memory concerning the changes to General Education, so part of the assessment is helping faculty to understand the role that Gen Ed plays and what their course does within the big picture of Gen Ed, but also we really are due for a thorough review of General Education. We need good assessment data in order to form that review.

Ms. James: This is going to be a Sense of the Senate Resolution and though the Academic Affairs Committee agrees with the assessment process, there may be reluctance on the part of the full Senate to endorse this unless there is a presentation.

Senator Holland: They did do a presentation in the fall.

Senator Borg: The committee should bring it up and perhaps a resource person could be there, but I don't think we need a full presentation.

Senator Graham: I don't remember the presentation. How is the institutional portfolio different from the student portfolio?

Provost Shane: The institutional portfolio puts the responsibility on the institution, not on the student, for collecting the artifacts and assessing those. A student-based portfolio is saying 'you are collecting during the course of General Education this information and you have to turn that in as a portfolio and assess that or you won't graduate.' The institutional portfolio says, 'here are the goals and the student learning outcome objectives of General Education and the process we have set up by which we will do the review'. It becomes transparent to the student and we hope that we build a process that is nonintrusive to the faculty.

Senator Borg: This is not evaluating the student; it is evaluating the program so that we can use that data to make

adjustments if necessary.

Senator Holland: The other potential is a standardized test before you can graduate.

Senator Graham: How do they evaluate the program if they don't use student evaluations?

Provost Murphy: It is not satisfaction by the student that we are looking at; we are actually looking at students' work to evaluate. I think course evaluations are important. The better the student evaluation instrument we have, the better a course evaluation is. Collectively, they help us to evaluate a course within General Education. For example, COM 110 is just one piece of the underlying General Education goal of oral and written communication, So to say that the evaluation of COM 110 is the mechanism by which we evaluate whether or not we are meeting the student objective of oral and written communication would not work because COM 110 is just one piece. There are other courses that play a part in that role; it's how they mesh. Institutional portfolios help us to look at the collection of General Education courses. We are trying to do this in a way that does not evaluate an individual student, but evaluates a collection of students taking a collection of courses.

02.11.08.02 From Frank Waterstraat/Academic Affairs Committee: Recommendation that the University Not Adopt a Plus/Minus Grading System

Senator Holland: The other thing that we received from the Academic Affairs Committee, which I think they briefly mentioned in one of their reports, is that they have decided not to pursue a plus/minus grading system. They found no benefit for doing it and because there are so many different types, they feel that they would be unable to agree upon one type.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate for February 20, 2008:

Academic Senate Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, February 20, 2008
7:00 P.M.
OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of February 6, 2008

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Al Bowman***
- ***Acting Provost Jan Shane-Murphy***
- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams***
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg***

Committee Reports:

- ***Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson: Senator Waterstraat***
- ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Chairperson: Senator Lonbom***
- ***Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson: Senator Borg***
- ***Planning and Finance Committee Chairperson: Senator Fazel***

- **Rules Committee Chairperson: Senator Alferink**

Action Item:

01.24.08.03 ***Disestablishment of Academic Units Policy-Revised (See Senate Packets of 2/6/08 for this document) (Rules Committee)***

Information Items:

01.09.08.01 ***Milner Library Bylaws-Revised (Rules Committee)***

02.07.08.01 ***SCERB University Hearing Panel - Proposal for Addition to Academic Senate Blue Book (Rules Committee)***

02.07.08.02 ***SCERB – Proposed Revision to Academic Senate Blue Book (Rules Committee)***

Communications

Adjournment

Motion XXXIX-39: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Horstein, to approve the Academic Senate Agenda for February 20, 2008. With the addition of the *Blue Book* revision to SCERB, the agenda was unanimously approved.

Adjournment