

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Approved)

January 24, 2001

Volume XXXII, No. 8

Call to Order

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Senator Crothers called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of November 29, 2000:

Motion XXXII-68: by Senator Brown, second by Senator Van Draska, to approve the Senate minutes of November 29, 2000. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks:

Senator White: We have a new faculty senator - Senator William Tolone of Sociology and Anthropology.

The Senate office has forwarded to college deans and department chairpersons a request for elections for the Senate and nominations for members of the external committees of the Senate. We are in the unusual situation of electing committees twice during one iteration of the Senate. That will never happen again; but because last year we changed the calendar under which the Senate operates, this year we are going to have to make the committee appointments twice.

I have communicated with the chairs of other Senates at state universities about the possibility of creating a state organization, which would consist of the chairs to those bodies. We would have twelve participants in this group and would work with a very limited agenda and communicating mostly by email, perhaps meeting once or twice a year. We would attempt to come up with position papers on issues of higher education and use our collective strength as a lobbying force with legislators and with the IBHE. This week I issued an invitation to those chairs to meet here in April for our first meeting. If you have any comments or suggestions to get this group going, please let me know.

We are operating without a Parliamentarian. We limit ourselves to those procedures described on the parliamentary sheet.

Vice Chairperson Remarks:

Senator Brown: We had five candidates for two student Senate positions. We had those elections and we have two new senators with us tonight--Kerry Herbert and Ryan McNaught. Later tonight, we will talk about the proposal on shared governance that we have been working very hard on, myself, three other senators, Senators Sass, Patry and Peterson, along with Scott Kording, Student Body Vice-President, and three other members of the SGA.

Student Government Association President's Remarks:

Senator Biondolillo: SGA has been working on a new online voting system. We have a time constraint as well as security issues that we are dealing with. Also, the SGA is doing a revision of its constitution and bylaws dealing with the proposal on governance. I would like to thank everyone who worked on the proposal.

I am on the Parking Task Force for the Town of Normal and the University. Some of the issues that have been raised are having an efficient busing system and public parking areas. The Student Town Liaison Committee meeting will be held next week. Some of the issues we will discuss include the downtown renovations, things such as outlets for students. The Human Rights Symposium will start this semester. SGA will support it and may co-sponsor. I urge everyone to come out and support this.

Administrators' Remarks:

- ***President Vic Boschini:*** Asked everyone to join in in the celebration of Senator White's birthday. The Senate members wished Senator White happy birthday and enjoyed cake and ice cream.
- ***Provost Al Goldfarb:*** No report.
- ***Vice President of Student Affairs:***
Senator Mamarchev: We had a very successful search for our Associate Vice President of Student Affairs. His name is Dr. Brent Patterson. He is currently the Director of Student Life at Texas A&M University. He will be joining us in April. We also had a search for the Associate Director of Student Life in the Office of Student Life. Dr. Jan Patterson, who coincidentally is Dr. Brent Patterson's spouse, was chosen to fill that position.
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning:***
Senator Bragg: The University's energy consumption was 40% higher in November and December of last year. This was coupled with a doubling of the price on average of the natural gas that we consumed this year. We have used up all of the flexibility that we have with the utility budget. You can help us out if in your buildings you notice rooms that are too warm, you let your building supervisor know. If there is any silver lining to this, about a year ago, I had our facilities people start a comprehensive master planning effort on how to manage our utility load infrastructure.

I am passing out a copy of a few tables of the Illinois Board of Higher Education's fiscal year 2002 budget recommendations. This will be the eighth year in a row that we have budget recommendations that are significantly higher than inflation. The first table shows that the average increase for public universities is 5.3%. The second table shows how the individual public universities fared. Illinois State is recommended for a 6.0% increase. That is the second highest among the public universities. I included a third table that shows grant programs that are to be moved into our base budget. The last table shows the capital improvements recommended. Particularly priority #10, Schroeder Hall, is on the list for a total capital outlay of approximately 189 million dollars. We are very hopeful that that will be included in the final appropriations for this year.

Committee Reports

- ***Academic Affairs Committee***

Senator Meckstroth: The Academic Affairs Committee met this evening. We reviewed the issues that are still pending for our committee and are making progress on all of those. Next week, we will meet jointly with the Student Affairs Committee to talk again about student inclusion on the committees on campus.

- **Administrative Affairs Committee**

Senator Kurtz: Administrative Affairs met this evening at 6:00 p.m. We were joined by Dick Runner, who gave us an update on the campus master plan, in particular its relationship to the Educating Illinois Action Plan and the revitalization project.

- **Budget Committee**

Senator Walker: We propose to have the AIF (Academic Impact Fund) report soon for an upcoming Senate meeting. Our committee will meet to discuss this on Friday.

- **Faculty Affairs Committee**

Senator El-Zanati: Faculty Affairs met tonight and will meet again sometime next week. We have a number of issues on our agenda and we are hoping to move forward on all fronts.

- **Rules Committee**

Senator Reid: The Rules Committee met this evening at 6:00 p.m. We spoke about the action item - the revisions to the Entertainment Committee Constitution as well as the proposed changes to the membership of the Senate, which we will talk about as an information item. We have also begun discussion on the possibility of converting the faculty caucus into some type of faculty body. Additionally, we plan to further discuss a new format for the Executive Committee.

- **Student Affairs Committee**

Senator Kowalski: Today, the Student Affairs Committee met at 6:00 p.m. We reviewed three policies. We will pass on our recommendation for the Instructional Material Sales Policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Administrative Withdrawal Policy and the Term Sales Policy were also reviewed. The most important thing that we talked about was the governance proposal that will come forward as an information item tonight.

IBHE-FAC Report

Senator Crothers: My report is based on the Faculty Advisory Committee of last December, which was the annual meeting with the Chairperson of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. You may have read in the newspaper that the National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education's measure of 2000 rated Illinois as the best place in the U.S. to get an education.

We returned again to the question of assessment. ISU is going to have to develop a tool to assess what our students learn. Dr. Sanders has said repeatedly that he does not want it to be some kind of a test at the end of the process where you fill in the blanks. On the other hand, when you ask where we are going to get the resources to do alternative kinds of assessments, he says that campuses need to make it priority.

The State of Illinois is requiring an examination of non-tenure track faculty and their use...the philosophy, the percentage, etc., and that appropriate benefits and salaries be considered for their use. By November 2001, we have to have all of our information to the IBHE and by December 2001, the IBHE is due to have its report to the State. This is now a statewide process.

We then talked about salary. The IBHE is discussing 3+2+1, basically arguing that 3+1+1 has done nothing but hold the line in terms of the relative ratio of salaries. There has been discussion about how the money is going to be distributed. As the IBHE explains it, if your university is above the peer group median, you can spend the money any way you want, as long it does not hurt your position relative to the peer group median. If you are below your peer group median, which we are, then that money, with almost no exception, has to go

to salaries.

The IBHE-FAC will meet again next Friday at the University of Illinois. Senator Crothers' entire report can be found on the Senate web site at: . Click Committee Sites and go to the IBHE section on that page.

Action Items:

05.10.00.03B Entertainment Committee Constitution Revisions

Senator Reid: In Article III of the proposed Entertainment Committee Constitution revisions, the number of students is being increased from 11 to 20. They have taken off all student alternatives. The changes in sections three and four are simple changes in the language indicating that only the faculty membership includes an alternate. There are some additional charges and one charge has been taken away.

Motion XXXII-69: by Senator Reid, second by Senator Razaki, to approve the proposed Entertainment Committee Constitution revisions. The Senate unanimously approved the revisions.

12.05.00.01 Student Election to Honors Council

Motion XXXII-70: By Senator Brown to approve the student nominee, Janna Lindemulder, for the spring 2001 term on the Honors Council. The Senate unanimously approved the motion.

01.08.00.01 Faculty Elections to University Curriculum Committee

Motion XXXII-71: By Senator Reid to approve the slate of faculty nominees for the University Curriculum Committee. The Senate unanimously approved the motion.

University Curriculum Committee Members Elected

Sabine Loew, BSC, Spring 2001 - Spring 2002

Agbenyega Adedze, History- Spring 2001

Torri Thompson, English - Spring 2001

01.23.01.02 Faculty Election to Athletic Council

Motion XXXII-72: By Senator Reid to approve the nomination for the Athletic Council. The Senate unanimously approved the nomination of Ramona Lomeli, EAF, for the spring of 2001 term.

Information Items:

12.01.00.01-04 Proposal on Shared Governance - Student Governance and Senate Membership

Senator Reid: Enclosed in your packets was the proposed new membership of the Senate and I have just distributed the justification for these changes. Our proposal is that the Senate faculty membership would go from 27 to 29 tenure/tenure-track. The increase in the number of students was brought about by the proposal from SGA, in which the students requested 20 voting student Senate members. The Rules Committee felt that if the President of the Student Body was to be Vice Chairperson of the Senate, he or she should be a voting member as well. We felt that we should keep the same percentage of tenure track faculty to students so that is why we added two additional faculty members.

We would also add one non-tenure track faculty, one Civil Service Council member and one AP Council member. The President would remain ex-officio and the Vice President of Student Affairs and Provost, the Vice President of Finance and Planning and the Vice President of Student Affairs would become ex-officio.

We would add to the ex-officios the Chairperson of the Deans Council, a representative of the Chairs Council, the Associate Vice President of Undergraduate Instruction, the Associate Vice President of Graduate Studies, as well as the Student Trustee. The Student Trustee was changed to a non-voting member since he or she would vote in Board meetings on the issues that went from the Senate to the Board of Trustees.

Senator White: We are voting on changes in principle. The Constitution, bylaws and the Blue Book will have to have specific language changed. Since the changes, in principle, affect the Constitution and the bylaws, they will require a two-thirds majority in order to pass. When those language changes return to the Senate, it will not be an opportunity to revisit any of those issues, but to simply change the language. Once we approve changes in the Constitution, they have to go to the President and if the President approves them, they will then go to the Board of Trustees. They will not have to approve changes in language to our bylaws.

Scott Kording, Student Body Vice President: One of the problems that we currently have with students is that we have students working against each other. On one hand, we have the SGA that is the legitimate governing body of the students, but the representatives that students elect to that body only have a binding vote on anything that is in the province of the student body, so on university wide issues, the SGA only has an advisory vote. On the other hand, you have student senators who are all elected at large from the student body and those students vote in the Senate on university wide issues.

We would like to allow the same students that vote on the SGA to vote in the Senate. It also allows students who vote in the Senate to vote on behalf of students, not just as students. The reason for that is that the new senators will be doing double duty, serving both on the SGA and on the Senate. They will be doing what we currently ask of SGA legislators, which is to have more contact with their constituents.

In the proposed membership structure, the break down of the 21 students would be that 16 of those 21 senators would be elected by the student body, five would come from on-campus constituencies, 10 would come from off-campus students and then the Student Body President would also have a vote. The Student Body President-Elect would appoint the remaining five student senators to ensure that all student constituents were represented. For instance, if 13 of the 15 senators who were elected were female, the Student Body President might decide to make those five student appointments male to even things out. The same would go for race, sexual orientation, college affiliation, etc. We want to get as many constituents represented as we can.

There are rules that those appointed must follow. One of the provisions that we hammered out is that graduate students will not lose any representation on the Senate. They will actually gain representation on the SGA. The students in the Senate vote on academic issues. The SGA does not have that privilege, but that would change by having the same legislators that are on the SGA serve on the Senate as student senators.

The SGA will have a much stronger influence in making student appointments to external committees. It will make sure that the students are qualified and interested in serving. A group of students will get together and choose who they feel are most eligible to serve, rather than asking faculty members to make that call.

Senator Reid: When this becomes an action item, all that we will vote on are the proposed membership changes, although these changes reciprocally depend upon the students' proposal.

Senator Walker: Has there been consultation with the AP and Civil Service Council?

Senator Razaki: These things were discussed in the governance committee. What this is based on is the AP

and Civil Service members' request that they be more adequately represented in all important decisions on campus.

Senator Walker: From which colleges will the two additional tenure/tenure-track faculty come?

Senator White: All tenure/tenure-track representation of faculty on the Senate is done through apportionment, which is done by Sharon Stanford in the Provost's office, so the tenure/tenure track numbers are going to break down according to the faculty populations in the various colleges.

Senator Walker: Is this on line so that I can direct my colleagues to it?

Senator Reid: I will ask the Senate office to put it on line.

Senator Landau: Are there no differences in student characteristics from those who reside in residence halls to those who reside off campus? I am asking for the rationale for the distribution of the membership to two-thirds of the student representatives who reside off campus.

Senator Brown: The reason for the proportion is that two-thirds of the students live off campus. It is around 14,000. The reason for it being according to residency is because the first priority of students is student life and the best way to break that up is by area. For instance, off campus students might care more about parking and on campus students might care more about dining services. Then we bring in college representation to make sure that all academics are covered.

Senator Thomas: Would the head of the AP Council and the head of the Civil Service Council vote on academic issues and, if so, what was the committee's justification for that?

Senator Reid: Civil Service and AP have an enormous interest in academic issues. Many of our AP members are advisors in our departments. Many of them teach as well. I think the harder argument would be in terms of Civil Service.

Senator Goldfarb: The discussion in all of the governance committees was that AP and Civil Service are at the heart of much that happens in the academic areas. There are other issues that are discussed in the Senate such as budget issues and planning issues that clearly have an impact on AP and Civil Service. This gives them an opportunity to be interactive with those issues as well.

Senator Razaki: Have you had any discussion with AP and Civil Service about this proposal?

Senator Goldfarb: Not about this proposal specifically, because this is the first time I have actually seen this proposal. The governance committees did talk about representation of Civil Service and AP. The questions I have heard regarding representation were in terms of numbers. What I would say to my Civil Service and AP colleagues is that this is an important step in terms of changing the way in which we operate in governance. Hopefully, we will review it and, if needed, add more people at the table.

Christa Lawhun, Civil Service Chairperson: When the shared governance proposal was brought to our attention, we were very excited that we would have an opportunity to interact and be able to see everyone else's point of view. Civil Service is a very important aspect to the academics. Every person on this campus is important. Even though we may not always agree, I think this proposal is a step in the right direction, though we would like to see more than one AP and Civil Service representative.

Senator Morgan: I have been approached by some of my colleagues about whether or not there was discussion about representation from the Lab Schools.

Senator Reid: We need a formal proposal before we can even begin to talk about it on the Rules Committee. Such a change could be made after this proposal is approved. We have no idea yet if they propose proportional representation or to have one representative. If proportional representation is what they propose, then the Lab Schools would have more representatives than the College of Business. Something formally has to be forwarded to the Rules Committee.

Senator White: The College of Education is welcome to submit a proposal after the fact.

Senator Morgan: Not as any kind of amendment?

Senator White: It is your right to offer an amendment to a proposal on the floor. Senator Reid is inviting you not to do that but to submit a proposal after the fact, but it is your choice.

Senator Fowles: Can we specify a representative of the AP Council and a representative of the Civil Service Council instead of the chairs of those councils?

Senator Reid: I don't think it would matter to the Rules Committee one way or the other.

Ms. Lawhun: Just a representative at this point would be great.

Senator Reid: We could do that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Crothers: Lets assume that we accept this proposal to revise the membership and the students say no, what are the implications? What kinds of secondary plans are in place for having a new Senate structure not necessarily parallel to the student governance structure?

Senator Brown: Since we are accepting this in principle and that does happen, then we need to take back these changes; we would just take back the proposal from the Senate as well.

Senator Crothers: That would then impact the AP and Civil Service.

Senator White: If we approve the proposal in principle, we would not reopen consideration to the proposed changes when we came back to creating language, so it would not be possible to reconsider at that time. There can certainly be motions to be reconsider, but they would have to be done at the meeting in which the proposal was an action item.

Senator Reid: The easiest thing would be to find a way to vote for two more senators. We are moving from 19 to 21 student senators, so the students would have to just vote for two more senators. That is the only way it would affect us.

Senator Kowalski: I would like a more detailed answer as to how the timeline affects student elections.

Senator Brown: The Elections Committee needs to receive any changes for the elections at least 30 days

before the election. That makes the deadline for us to propose any changes February 5th or 6th. That is actually two days before the Senate will meet again, so we need to have it decided at this meeting so we can take it to the Elections Committee.

Senator Kowalski: Is it true then that if these don't get this passed today, the students will continue to be represented as they are and we cannot change that for an entire year?

Senator Biondollilo: I spoke with Mike Schemer in the Office of Student Life and the Elections Committee. We would have to restructure the Elections Code if it were not to be passed tonight. This is not something that we want to tinker with just to fit our needs.

Senator Chang: I was wondering if you have compared the proposal with any peer institutions. Do they have a similar structure as we propose here in regards to AP and Civil Service or are we once again pioneering into uncharted territory?

Senator Reid: That was done by the first governance committee, the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee and also by the President's committee on governance. Most of the universities we looked at had Faculty Senates, generally without students. We were impressed by the NIU model, which had the major effect on the proposal of the Task Force. It involved a Faculty Senate, but then also had a General Council with members from all across the university. There is really no model for the membership we propose. We have one of the highest percentages of students in the nation and I hope we will continue to have that.

Senator Goldfarb: To go back to the College of Education question, would it be possible for the College of Education to send the Rules Committee a recommendation that faculty associates be treated the way the non-tenure track faculty are treated? The Rules Committee could still hear that before they came to the Senate with their final recommendation.

Senator Reid: We are thinking of having it as an action item tonight because the students felt that they would have to change their Elections Code.

Senator White: A proposal from the College could come at any time and be considered by the Rules Committee and then brought to the Senate floor. We propose to have 29 faculty seats apportioned among the colleges and one non-tenure track faculty. There is nothing prohibiting us from making that two and reducing the number of tenure/tenure track to be apportioned to 28. It would just mean that one college would lose a representative.

Senator Reid: Would there be a problem with just adding one on?

Senator White: I think that returns us to the stickier numbers game that your committee had quite a bit of trouble with, that is, the total percentage of faculty versus student representation.

Motion XXXII-73: by Senator Kowalski, second by Senator Reid, to move the Senate membership proposal to action. The Senate voted in favor of moving the item to action with the exception of no votes by Senators Walker, Noyes, Nur-Awaleh and Thomas.

Motion XXXII-74: by Senator Reid, second by Senator Biondollilo, to approve the proposed Senate membership, with the revisions of a representative from the AP and Civil Service Councils instead of the

Chairs of those Councils, as well as a representative from the Deans Council instead of the Chair, and the Chair of the Chairs Council instead of a representative. (These changes are reflected in the proposal on the next page.)

Proposed Membership of the Academic Senate

Voting members	No.	Percent	Ex-officio members
Representative of AP council	1	1.9%	President
Representative of Civil Service Council	1	1.9%	VP Student Affairs
Non-tenure track faculty	1	1.9%	VP and Provost
Tenure-track/tenured faculty	29	54.7%	VP Business & Finance
Students	21	39.6%	Rep. of Deans' Council
			Chair of Chairs' Council
			Assoc. VP, Undergraduate
			Assoc. VP, Grad School & research
			Student Trustee
	Total	53	9

***Proposed student membership**

- 10 elected from and by undergraduates who live off-campus
- 5 selected from and by undergraduates living in the residence halls
- 5 appointed by the President of the Student Body to ensure that:
 - a. There is one student senator from each college
 - b. There are at least two senators that are graduate students
 - c. Otherwise underrepresented groups are represented (based on sex, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, transfer, etc.)
- 1 Student Body President

Senator White: This is a motion in principle. This will all have to be addressed at a later date with specific language. It requires a two-thirds majority to pass.

Senator Thomas: I would like to recommend that we vote against the proposal. Although I am sensitive to the students' timeline, I am also sensitive to the fact that many faculty members feel that the Senate frequently acts without faculty input from non-senators and I feel that I have not had the proper opportunity to gather the faculty input on a change that is going to be this major in terms of the governance of the University. This is the first time we have had exchange of information on this and the ability to ask questions about it. I feel that before I can vote yes or no on this proposal, I would like to know what my constituents would like. I think we need feedback from the people that we represent.

Senator White: You can move to table or move to defer action.

Motion XXXII-75: by Senator Thomas, second by Senator Noyes, to table the motion. Senate members voted against the motion with the exception of yes votes by Senators Walker, Hampton, Noyes, Nur-Awaleh, Thomas and Morgan.

Senator Nur-Awaleh: We have approximately 130 faculty associates in the Lab Schools. Until a couple of years ago, they were members of the College of Education. In order for me to vote for this proposed membership, an amendment has to be made to give membership to one member of the Lab Schools as is suggested for the non-tenure track or increase the number of tenure-track to 30 to include the Lab Schools.

All constituents on this campus should be represented. It would be an atrocity if we neglected this group.

Motion XXXII-76: by Senator Nur-Awaleh, second by Senator Noyes, to add one faculty associate from the Lab Schools who would have the same status as the non-tenure track faculty.

Senator Razaki: I am opposed to that amendment. I have been on the Senate for many years and I have never seen an issue come to the Senate that involved the faculty associates in anyway whatsoever. They are not Civil Service; they are not AP. I personally don't consider them to be faculty members because there are certain qualifications and requirements that you do have to have to be a faculty member at ISU. They are not governed by our ASPT document. They have their own separate evaluation procedure.

I don't think that this is the proper time to bring in this amendment. This is an issue that should be examined in greater detail. There are other methods of granting them representation, either through the College Council, through some other body or as a department of the College and none of those issues have been considered.

Senator Landau: I would like to argue against the amendment. It is my understanding that the faculty associates enjoy that status through the College of Education and if that is the case, they are represented in the Senate. In addition, that constituent group would be represented in the Deans Council and if there is an ex-officio of the Deans Council on the Senate, then indirectly, the faculty associates are represented.

Senator Noyes: I would like to speak in favor of the amendment. The faculty members that are designated as faculty associates are an integral part of the University programming, Teacher Education and support services. They are contributing to the education program of our students and I think it is important that they be represented. They are participants of the retirement system and they hold tenure within the unit rank. Members of the Laboratory Schools have in the past been part of academic programs and held academic rank, so they have been participants in the Senate in previous years.

Senator White: Do you have any evidence that the Lab Schools seek this representation?

Senator Noyes: Yes, after talking both to the Director of Laboratory Schools and faculty members, they feel they are being alienated. They are providing support services in our particular program and the representation of 130 people is a significant factor. I think this would be an approach to do that.

Senator Reid: I am sympathetic to this proposal, but at the same time I would like to hear more argument about how they do contribute to the University. I know in our department, we send some students over to the Lab School and they are partly supervised by these faculty. Beyond that, I would like to know to what extent faculty in the Lab Schools are involved in all of the issues that are discussed in the Senate.

The Senate voted against the amendment to add one additional member to the Senate from the Lab Schools with the exception of yes votes by Senators Fowles, Goldfarb, Hampton, Holmes, Morgan, Noyes, Nur-Awaleh and Panfilio and abstentions by Senators Campbell, Reid, Thomas and Van Draska.

Senator White: If there is no further debate, we will vote on the motion to approve in principle the proposed membership of the Academic Senate. We will need to revisit this topic in the form of specific language changes to our internal documents, the Constitution, the bylaws and the Blue Book. It requires a two-thirds majority to be approved.

Senator Thomas: Asked for a roll call vote.

The Senate voted in favor of the Senate membership as proposed by the Rules Committee with the exception of no votes by Senators Thomas, Walker and Nur-Awaleh and an abstention by Senator Morgan.

Communications:

11.07.00.02 Proposal for Deletion of Educational Psychology and Clinical Psychology Sequences - Senate approved via Consent Agenda as of 12/6/00.

11.22.00.01 Proposal for Revisions to Information Systems Sequences in Computer Science - Senate approved via Consent Agenda as of 12/11/00.

Executive Session: Re: Selection of Distinguished Professor

Motion XXXII-77: By Senator Wells, second by Senator Crothers, to move into executive session. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Senate concluded its discussion in executive session.

Motion XXXII-78: by Senator Noyes, second by Senator Thomas, to move back into open session. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXII-79: by Senator Noyes, second by Senator Crothers, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

Academic Senate

Hovey 208, Box 1830

438-8735

E-mail Address: acsenate@ilstu.edu

Web Address: <http://www.academicsenate.ilstu.edu>



Microsoft Excel
Worksheet