

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**(Approved)**

**November 7, 2001**

**Volume XXXIII, No. 6**

***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 October 24, 2001***

**Motion XXXIII-39:** by Senator Borg, second by Senator Razaki, to approve the Senate minutes of October 24, 2001. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Chairperson's Remarks: No Remarks***

***Vice Chairperson/Student Government Association President's Remarks***

**Senator Kording:** We have two communications on the agenda that we will discuss later. The Student Government Association has made a number of student appointments to external committees of the Senate. At the last meeting of the student government, the SGA Assembly took action on a measure authorizing a preliminary student interest assessment for a new campus rec center. That corresponds with some of the work done by the Recreation and Wellness Center Advisory Committee that was appointed by Vice Presidents Bragg and Mamarchev. That is moving along nicely. We have also been working on the student fee review process and allocating student fee dollars for fiscal year 2003.

***Administrators' Remarks:***

- ***President Boschini: Excused Absence***
  
- ***Provost Al Goldfarb:*** I want to congratulate Distinguished Professor Timothy Lash for his lecture yesterday evening. Also, next Tuesday, the Leading Edge Series will present a lecture by Dr. Richard Preston, an expert on bio-terrorism. He is a replacement for Ray Bradbury who could not come due to illness.
  
- ***Vice President of Student Affairs***  
**Senator Mamarchev: Excused Absence**
  
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning***  
**Senator Bragg: No Remarks**

***Committee Reports***

- ***Academic Affairs Committee***  
**Senator Borg:** The Academic Affairs Committee discussed two items that we will forward to the Executive Committee for placement on the agenda of the next Senate meeting. One of them is a new policy on admissions and the other is a revision of the ISU Mission Statement.
  
- ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

**Senator Crothers:** We are continuing to work on a policy statement regarding student protests on campus, trying to take into account events like Disney's visit and the tent city that was constructed on the quad yesterday and the reactions that some students had to that event as well. We are trying to come up with a policy statement that will cover free speech and decent treatment of any individual.

· ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

**Senator El-Zanati:** No report.

· ***Planning and Finance Committee***

**Senator Kurtz:** Planning and Finance met last week and we met again immediately before the Senate meeting. We continued to craft a model for departmental and collegiate self-study, the ideal process through which we think reorganization should take place. We have moved towards firming up the idea that this kind of conversation should take place on campus every ten years and should take place around the time of the NCA self-study; we are moving towards the idea that it should be subsequent to the NCA self-study. We are going to be analyzing at least three data sets of campus responses to this endeavor, the e-mail survey, the results of the focus groups and the position papers submitted. We did tabulate the list of themes that emerged from the e-mail survey. We will continue our discussion.

· ***Rules Committee***

**Senator Reid:** The Rules Committee met this evening and discussed one possible change in the non-tenure track proposal and decided not to make the change. We also discussed a confidential issue.

***Action Items:***

***02.08.01.01B Proposal for Renaming General Studies to Interdisciplinary Studies and Increasing GPA Requirement (Academic Affairs Committee)***

**Motion XXXIII-40:** By Senator Borg, second by Senator Mitchell, to approve the proposal for renaming General Studies to Interdisciplinary Studies and increasing the GPA requirement for this program from 2.5 to 2.75.

**Senator Eric Thomas:** The proposal contains two items. One is to rename the General Studies Program Interdisciplinary Studies and secondly to increase the GPA requirement from 2.5 to 2.75, both of these are efforts to distinguish this degree as a high-level degree program.

**Senator Walker:** How independent is this proposal from the other two proposals, which are action items this evening. Am I to understand that we are raising the standards of this program and we are proposing a University Studies Program as a fall back for those students who can't even get into General Studies? Since we are raising academic standards, could this work without the University Studies Program?

**Senator Borg:** I believe this was a response to the initiative of the other two items. It also can stand on its own merits. It has been relatively attractive in the past several years and the Honors Program I believe is endorsing this kind of change.

**Senator E. Thomas:** The change was actually proposed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences. It was also approved by the Council on General Education and University Curriculum Committee. Yes, these changes could stand on their own because this is an existing program; the proposal to rename it is to clearly demarcate it from the University Studies Program.

**Senator White:** The University Studies Program is not a failsafe for people who can't get into the Interdisciplinary Studies Program. The University Studies Program is an issue more closely related to the tiered program proposal.

**Senator Reid:** The tiered program proposal can stand on its own. It has no need for the University Studies Program to be a worthy proposal, so I don't think they need to be linked. On the other hand, the University Studies does make sense if you have tiered admissions if you really believe you should have a safety net for those who can't get into a major.

**Vote on Motion to Approve Interdisciplinary Studies Proposal:** The Senate voted on the motion to approve the Interdisciplinary Studies Program proposal. All members of the Senate voted to approve the motion with the exception of an abstention by Senator Hampton.

**02.08.01.01A Proposal for B.A./B.S. Degree in University Studies (Academic Affairs Committee)**

**Motion XXXIII-41:** By Senator Borg, second by Senator Meckstroth, to adopt the B.A./B.S. Degree in University Studies proposal.

**Senator E. Thomas:** The B.A./B.S. Degree in University Studies is designed as a broad and very flexible degree program requiring two areas of concentration on the part of students with all of the regular university requirements and including an additional requirement of nine hours of 300-level courses and also for a capstone experience. The purpose of this degree program is to serve students who have very broad interests, but are not admitted to another major program and are not appropriate for the Interdisciplinary Studies Degree.

**Senator Walker:** I informed my colleagues about this proposal and have received nothing but negative comments about this. Many people see this as counter to our efforts to increase standards of the university. I understand its tied to the two-tiered program, but many feel that this is not the best way to increase our standards, that this is sending a mixed message to students. I have a problem with no request for additional funding for advisors. It says in the program description that this is an advisor-intensive program.

**Senator E. Thomas:** This program has all of the same requirements as our General Studies Degree Program (now Interdisciplinary Studies) has right now. It is no different from any other program here at the university. It carries the same requirements. I hear people say this is not as good a degree as some other degree. The only difference is the name and lack of collection of hours that correspond to a major. Every standard that the university has for a degree program is here in University Studies, plus some additional ones.

**Senator Walker:** Yet we are saying that most of the students who are in this program are students who would not be qualified to get into any other degree program in this university. I understand its necessary with the two-tiered program, so I am going to say no to the two-tiered program as well. If this is trying to solve some sort of problem with standards, I don't see this as the best way to do that.

**Senator E. Thomas:** You have given a particular scenario of how a student would end up in this program and I think there are multiple ways that a student might enter this program. The overall purpose of this program is to allow other programs to raise their standards and what you want to have is a safety net at the level of which they began a program. So if we are going to increase the level of excellence, lets make sure we serve all of the students at the same time. I think some of the lack of support may be caused by misperceptions. I have spoken with the Chairpersons Council on two occasions about this proposal. I went to the College of Fine Arts and talked with the dean and three department chairs there. Your department chair

had some reservations; I talked with him subsequently after some revisions to the proposal and he was fully supportive of it.

**Senator Armstrong:** I don't think this is a standards issue. I think this is an enrollment control issue that as a secondary effect may increase standards. I do think that this is a weaker degree than any other degree at the university. On paper, it requires the same number of 300-level courses, but not all of the 300-level courses at the university are open to these students. They specifically do not have access to courses that are available for majors only, courses which have prerequisites and are part of an overall hierarchal degree program. Then we have a senior capstone experience that is going to be advised by non-faculty. The whole idea of this as a safety net I am very sympathetic too, but when we start looking at a degree program that can have 500 or more students in it, more than some majors have.

**Senator White:** I think we need to talk about the rationale of the tiered admissions program in the context of this debate. I think much of the support that will or won't accrue to this particular motion is dependent upon understanding the rationale for the tiered admissions and therefore the validity of the University Studies Program

**Senator E. Thomas:** The tiered program admissions proposal is one that would allow programs more control over their admission standards and allow them to put in continuation standards for their program. This is clearly a proposal to allow programs more control and move to a higher level of rigor if they so chose. In doing so, some students could in fact not be continued in a program at some advanced stage and the University Studies Degree is designed to give those students an option. The overall effort is to allow programs to move forward and at the same time make sure that no student is left behind without a path to a degree. That's the purpose of University Studies and that is why it is tied to the tiered program admissions.

**Senator Ballard:** As a General Student, I take a great interest in what Dr. Thomas has done here. Maybe the degree is going to be a lesser degree, but it is definitely not a lesser program. The program is going to enhance the General Student's ability to find his or her place in this university.

**Senator Reid:** I have also had some correspondence with some of my constituents. They are also completely against this. I would argue that there is a major drop in standards. The University Studies Degree is basically two minors. The level of understanding and depth is very much below what we get into for a major. To do two minors is to study two subjects superficially. Therefore, this is a substantially inferior program.

**Senator E. Thomas:** I don't disagree with the importance of a major. I think a major is beneficial and is very important, but I do disagree with the notion that simply because this degree lacks a concentration in a major that it is now somehow weaker. It conforms to all of the standards of our university requirements for a degree program except for having a collection of hours in a major. It even goes beyond those standards in the number of 300-level hours it requires and then the requirement for a capstone experience. The only difference is the collection of hours in a major and that has been construed that this is now weaker, that this is somehow lowering standards. It is neither of those. This is a degree program that lacks a collection of hours in a major. That is the only thing that distinguishes it from our other programs.

**Senator Reid:** Yes, it is going to be the same number of hours, but it is also clear that these two minors will go into the subjects on a superficial level and the only course in which they might go into in depth is the senior seminar, which will be advised by a person who is not even a specialist in whatever area they are working.

**Senator E. Thomas:** On the one hand, you can say that Interdisciplinary Studies is a program that has the same curricular structure and is considered an upper level distinctive program, but then you say that the same curricular structure under University Studies is now somehow inferior. They have exactly the same curricular structure, different standards that the students are held too, but the same flexibility in terms of which course work they may take.

**Senator Hampton:** I would like to share with you a comment that was sent to me by one of my colleagues in Theatre. "Students taking courses in minors will often sit next to students who have been admitted to the major. But now those students will be less qualified to be there because they lack the GPA to get into the "real" program." How would address that?

**Senator E. Thomas:** I would say that in every program that I have ever taught you have students with different levels of ability and that perform at different levels. Because a student is there because they are majoring in that area, because they are minoring in that area or because they are taking courses under the General Studies Degree Program, I don't see a real distinction except for the name of the degree that they will ultimately obtain.

**Senator Hampton:** Has this program been approved by the University Curriculum Committee?

**Senator E. Thomas:** This proposal has been approved by the Academic Standards Committee, the Council on General Education and by the University Curriculum Committee. In considering the design and structure of this program, we took a survey of other institutions to see if they had similar programs. They did. They had similar curricular requirements and similar flexibility in the programs.

**Senator White:** Do you have any idea how many departments are likely to move above 2.0?

**Senator E. Thomas:** I am not sure I can answer that. I do have information to distribute that shows how many programs are currently at or above the university minimum. I can't predict for you how many would change. In the second column of the admissions requirement document, it shows the department's requirements for admission into their program. Where you see university minimum, it means that their admission requirements are no different that what is required for admission into the university. As you go through the data, you will see that approximately 10 to 15% of the programs have requirements above the university minimum.

**Senator White:** The purpose of the tiered program is for programs to raise their standards and what do imagine would be a maximum?

**Senator E. Thomas:** I think that is something you would judge as you go along. I think there are programs that have the capability and the desire to raise their standards, but right now are constrained from doing so.

**Senator White:** What constrains them?

**Senator E. Thomas:** My understanding is in the past when programs have tried to change their admission and continuation requirements, it has greatly increased the population of General Students and that has been a problem for everyone because General Student is not a degree program. Students would have a large numbers of hours and still not be able to complete a degree program, even though they were a student in good standing. I have another document to distribute which shows the retention requirements in all programs. The

College of Applied Science and Technology has three programs that require a 2.5 GPA for continuation and one that requires a 2.4. Social Work is the one program in the College of Arts and Sciences that requires "professional standards" for continuation. In the College of Business, all of their programs require a 2.4 GPA for continuation. In the College of Education, they are subject to Teacher Education Requirements. The College of Fine Arts has multiple programs that require a 2.5 GPA.

**Senator White:** So we already have tiered admission requirements in certain areas and the purpose of the proposal is to make the process of moving to a tiered admission program a little more coherent.

**Senator Holland:** My constituents in the Physics Department also asked me to address a few issues. The first one that came up was the lack of 300-level courses that actually have prerequisites. Also it was also stated in the minutes that this is a degree that is going to be much more difficult for anyone outside of the university to interpret as to whether a student should be admitted to a professional school or a graduate school. Rather than creating a safety net of a completely separate degree program, if someone does not meet continuation requirements, the student could be reclassified as a General Student until he or she was able to bring his or her grade point average up to the level that would be required to continue. The other concern is having up to 500 students that are outside any academic discipline, which larger than many majors on campus.

**Senator E. Thomas:** When you consider the number of students outside a major, have you ever looked at the number of students that are in the General Student category beyond 75 hours? There are several thousand.

**Senator Kurtz:** I have some questions about how this would operate. This is supposed to be advisor-intensive. We are going to be giving intensive attention to students who have greater needs than normal, providing them with a capstone experience, but yet you state that the program does not require additional resources. I admit to a certain level of skepticism about that.

**Senator E. Thomas:** The thinking there is that it is going to be more advisor dependent, not that it will take more advisement or more advisors. Because these students will be entering at different points in their college career and from widely different backgrounds, it would be more depend upon the advisor to craft for them a full curriculum that would be tied together by a capstone experience. That is different from the just recently renamed Interdisciplinary Studies Program where the expectation that the student will enter the program very early and will design a unique or interdisciplinary program fully in conjunction with the advisor.

**Senator Kurtz:** What you are describing sounds like more time for advisors to do this, so the idea that this would not require more advisors in the long run seems to be a dubious claim.

**Senator Kording:** I am surprised that none of the people from the Academic Affairs Committee who brought this before the Senate are speaking in support of the proposal. One of the concerns that have been raised is that the standards may be lower because the capstone experience will be administered by non-faculty. There is a communication on the agenda that deals with this in terms of professional practice advisement from faculty in some areas. So I don't think having an advisor who is a non-faculty member advising a capstone experience is necessarily a bad thing. You say that there are several thousand students in the General Student category above 75 hours and you anticipate that in five years, 500 students could be in this program on the path to a degree.

**Senator E. Thomas:** I anticipate that we could serve more students than we are serving now and allow more students to complete their degree. In the General Student category, they could not complete a degree, even though they were in good academic standing.

**Senator Kording:** Will this help the university's minority retention?

**Senator E. Thomas:** Yes.

**Senator Kording:** Do other universities have similar programs like University Studies and are there any standards that are being lowered that the university currently requires? If we approve the two-tiered admissions proposal and we don't approve the University Studies proposal, would we be leaving students behind?

**Senator E. Thomas:** Yes, other universities have similar programs and no standards are being lowered. If we were to adopt tiered admissions only, we would be leaving students behind.

**Senator Orlando:** I think that the student with this degree has gained a well-rounded education. This degree is valid and wisdom and knowledge are obviously being acquired by the person receiving it. I do have a concern that the number of 300-level courses for non-majors is very low.

**Motion XXXIII-42:** By Senator Razaki to move the question. Second by Senator Ballard. Senator Lindblom called for a roll call vote. The motion was passed. There were 37 yes votes and 8 no votes.

**Senator White:** Since the motion to the move the question has passed, we will now move immediately to vote on the motion to approve the University Studies Degree Program proposal.

**Vote on University Studies Degree Proposal:** The University Studies Degree Program was approved by the Senate. There were 29 yes votes and 16 no votes.

**02.08.01.01 Proposal for Tiered Program Admissions (Academic Affairs Committee)**

**Motion XXXIII-43:** By Senator Borg, second by Senator Razaki, to approve the tiered program admissions proposal.

**Senator Thomas:** The tiered program admissions are at the heart of this whole issue. This is now the opportunity for programs to have the capability to elevate their standards. It would allow them to set their initial entry requirements and also to set continuation requirements, which many of them are already doing; but it would legitimize what is currently going on and allow it to be done in a systematic fashion.

**Senator White:** One of my concerns during the last debate is that we did not hear from any members of the Academic Affairs Committee, which brought this before the Senate.

**Senator Armstrong:** Both of these proposals came from the Academic Affairs Committee without affirmative recommendation; the committee was divided and some of us were strongly opposed to these proposals. I remain convinced that the tiered admissions program is primarily for enrollment control. Rigor has nothing to do with it. We have a tough program and we have the minimum university requirements for admission. Rigor is what you apply it within your major program. These are just superficial standards.

**Senator E. Thomas:** As the primary author of this proposal, I can say that the major reason behind it was to allow programs to go to the level of excellence that they sought and desired. I will admit and accept that there is the potential for some enrollment control management, but that was not the primary purpose of the proposal. It would seem to me to be a poor excuse to say we are not going to let programs go to a higher level

because we think they are trying to manage enrollment.

**Senator Ballard:** I would like to say that I would favor any proposal that will give my degree from ISU more substance and value, which I feel that this proposal will do.

**Senator Reid:** When you have a program that has too many students, raising the minimum requirement in the program allows you to keep just the best people. The teacher spends less time explaining basic concepts and you arrive at a much better level of learning. Therefore, this is really a question of standards as well as enrollment management.

**Senator Walker:** This is been described as allowing departments to increase their standards by having an intermediate requirement, yet we are already allowing that to happen, so why is there a need for this? Are we going to require departments to do this?

**Senator E. Thomas:** It would further permit something that is going on to some limited degree presently. It is not a proposal to require programs to do this, but to allow them to do it in a reasonable and consistent fashion.

**Senator Walker:** We require a portfolio for continuation in our department, which is not consistent with other departments. Would we have to change what we currently do? Where is the element of consistency that you mentioned?

**Senator E. Thomas:** This program does not limit programs to go above and beyond what other programs require.

**Senator Walker:** It seems like this is an administrative way to structurally apply some standards and I am trying to figure out what we are trying to solve here.

**Senator E. Thomas:** It's hard for me to see how this proposal is a problem for you when your department already has tiered admission requirements. This is what is already going on. I am saying lets do it systematically to allow everyone the opportunity to do it. We have the safety net now, so if more departments start to raise their requirements, we are able to serve more students in obtaining a degree.

**Senator Albrecht:** Since we are talking about enrollment management, is there anyway to put an enrollment cap on the number of students that will go into the University Studies Program. With the two-tiered admissions, there will be probably be a number of students that will probably fall victim to not being able to be admitted into their major. Is there a way to prevent a huge influx of students coming into University Studies?

**Senator E. Thomas:** There are several different ways that you can do it. This is a program that you do not want to become too large, so you monitor it constantly and look to manage it if it in fact begins to grow.

**Senator Albrecht:** What can you do if does get to be too large?

**Senator E. Thomas:** You would increase your efforts to counsel students into other majors and that's the first step before they go into University Studies.

**Motion XXXIII-44:** By Senator Crothers to move the question. Second by Senator Kording. The motion,

which required a two-thirds majority of affirmative votes for passage, was unanimously approved.

**Vote on Tiered Program Admissions Proposal:** The Senate approved the Tiered Admissions Proposal. There were 39 yes votes and 6 no votes. There were no abstentions.

**Information Items:**

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty Senate Representative Election Procedures:**

**10.12.01.01 Revisions to Constitution (Rules Committee)**

**Senator Reid:** We are considering changes to the constitution and changes in the bylaws, all to allow for procedures for the nomination and election of the non-tenure track faculty member of the Senate. Some of these changes are just wording changes to make it consistent with other documents. Ex-officio does not always mean non-voting, so we have added ex-officio non-voting membership in the second paragraph of the revisions to the constitution and you can see the members of the Senate which are ex-officio non-voting. We have also changed tenure-track to tenure and probationary-tenure faculty, because tenure track is used ambiguously in some documents as meaning both tenured and probationary-tenure faculty and in some cases only meaning probationary faculty. This language has already been changed in the rest of the constitution, so this is just bringing this section into accord. In Section B.1., you will see that full and part-time non-tenure track faculty shall be eligible to vote in the election for the non-tenure track faculty representative of the Senate. In number 3, nominations and self-nominations shall be made by non-tenure track faculty only. Finally, in number 5, we stated that this member would serve a one-year term. This is because non-tenure track faculty usually have one-year contracts.

**Senator Crothers:** What change did you consider at your committee meeting that you are not bringing up here? In your committee report, you stated that you had considered a change to these documents, but had decided not to bring that change forward.

**Senator Reid:** In speaking to a non-tenure track faculty member, she suggested that there would be so many nominations that this would not be practical and that one had to find some procedure to whittle down the nominations. The committee considers it unlikely that there will be a large number of nominations. We are suggesting that you try this out, and if there are problems, we can change it.

**Senator Crothers:** Has anyone consulted with the non-tenure track faculty that meets regularly about any measures that they would like to see in place because I don't think they have been involved in this?

**Senator Reid:** The Provost meets once a semester with the non-tenure track faculty, but to my knowledge, that is not a fixed group for which we have a mailing address. The major problem is that we have no mailing addresses for non-tenure track faculty. It is very hard to contact people, but you are right, we needed more consultation.

**Senator Crothers:** I bring this up because I think that there are going to be a whole host of issues that are going to be extremely vigorous in the next couple of months.

**Senator Reid:** Are you suggesting that they would be opposed to this proposal?

**Senator Crothers:** I can't say that they object to this proposal, other than bringing down the number of nominations.

**Senator El-Zanati:** Is the non-tenure track representative a member of the faculty caucus with all of the

voting rights and duties?

**Senator White:** Yes, because that individual is a faculty member.

**Senator Kurtz:** The membership of the non-tenure track faculty on the faculty caucus merits further study since the faculty caucus has jurisdiction over the ASPT process. It does not seem to me to be appropriate for a non-tenure track faculty member to have voting privileges in that particular decision making process.

**Senator White:** If there is no specific exclusion of that individual, who has voting rights on the Senate, from that body, that faculty member would have every right to sit on the faculty caucus.

**Senator Kurtz:** Could I ask the Rules Committee to take up that suggestion?

**Senator White:** That is a reasonable request.

**Senator El-Zanati:** Where is the current non-tenure track representative?

**Senator Reid:** I have been trying to reach the non-tenure track representative, Mary Kay Rotsch. She says that she still has another meeting on Wednesdays and she is trying to change that. She is hoping to get to the next Senate meeting.

**Senator El-Zanati:** There are some AP staff who actually teach some courses. Are they considered non-tenure track? Do we have an actual definition of non-tenure track?

**Senator Goldfarb:** There is a definition of non-tenure track. I think it is in one of the governing documents, but I would assume APs wouldn't be considered non-tenure track. If their full-time employment is AP, then they wouldn't be categorized as non-tenure track.

**Senator Landau:** Has there been any thought given to the timeline, the fact the contractual status of these individuals will not be established until just before the summer preceding the beginning of the next session. Should there be a specification as to the last date on which this representative can be elected?

**Senator Reid:** We are proposing that they will be elected at the end of February as other faculty are elected to the Senate. Obviously, if the Senate non-tenure track faculty representative found out that that his or her contract would not be renewed, we would have a special election.

**Senator White:** When a seat becomes vacant for an ordinary faculty member, the next highest vote member gets that seat. We might want to spell it out if that's what we mean.

**Senator Borg:** It strikes me that if I were a non-tenure track faculty member, how am I going to know anything about the nominees if the candidates were from other colleges? On what basis could I vote intelligently?

**Senator Reid:** Specifics are addressed in the bylaws and not the constitution.

***Non-Tenure Track Faculty Senate Representative Election Procedures:***

***10.29.01.01 Revisions to Bylaws (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Reid:** The bylaws give more specific procedures for voting. The constitution simply says that they are going to be nominated and elected. We do not get into the specificity that Senator Borg would like, but let

me tell you what the revisions are and then maybe we can talk about that issue. Section A pertains to the election of tenure/probationary tenure faculty and Section B pertains to the election of the non-tenure track member. In Section A, we propose that the rather than specifying the election date as the last Wednesday in February, that the election be held **by** the last Friday in February, since in reality most of these elections take place over several days. We changed "old" to "outgoing". In Section B, we are proposing that the Academic Senate office conduct the election of the non-tenure track member. For tenure and probationary tenure, the individual colleges conduct the elections, but non-tenure track faculty are faculty members across colleges. In number 2, we propose that nominations will be solicited from non-tenure track faculty and only from non-tenure track faculty. This is because some non-tenure track faculty were concerned that the department chair would choose the nominee. In number 3, the election itself will be held by secret ballot in the same way that it is held by tenure and probationary faculty. We also say that the election will be held in the last week in February and the representative will serve for one year. Only non-tenure track full-time and part-time faculty would be eligible to vote for the representative. I wonder whether Senator Borg if the issue you are raising is one that could be brought up informally in the Senate. The Senate could ask for bios from all non-tenure track nominees and those bios could be sent out through email to the non-tenure track faculty. We are in the situation now that we don't have the emails of only non-tenure track faculty, so most likely it would be sent to all faculty and apply to only non-tenure track faculty.

**Senator Goldfarb:** In terms of that process, an alternative might be to create a site on the Senate web site where those bios could be listed and non-tenure track faculty could be directed to review them. That might be something that the Senate could review in terms of all nominations.

**Senator Reid:** I would ask if you want this taken up by the Senate office or if you would like some type of specification in the bylaws.

**Senator White:** I think we need to consider the wisdom of taking constitutional changes to the Board of Trustees in a piece meal fashion. Since we are considering other revisions to the constitution, I think it might be better if we presented them to the Board as one package. However, that also might mean that there is a delay. We might need to have an informal agreement with the President that we can approve the changes to the bylaws, go forward with our non-tenure track elections and perhaps hold off on the constitutional changes.

**Senator Reid:** I assumed that this particular change would go to the Board to allow them to have the elections in the spring.

**Senator White:** It may in fact be possible to bring just this one, but I know that we have had discussions about ASPT related language being taken out of the constitution altogether and just have it in our ASPT handbook, which I think would be very valuable.

**Senator Reid:** I think that would be up to you to talk to the President and figure out what is best to do. We do have quite a number of other constitution changes that could be put in the packet.

**Senator White:** Do you plan to do them all this year?

**Senator Reid:** We originally planned to do so, but it depends on what issues come up. If after we deal with the new Faculty Ethics and Grievance/Academic Freedom document, which will probably take us to the end of this semester, and if we don't have any major issue in the spring, hopefully we can do all of the Blue Book, bylaws and constitution changes this year.

### *Communications*

#### **10.25.01.01** *SGA Resolution Endorsing Review of University's Professional Practice Service Deliveries (Student Government Association)*

**Senator Kording:** The Executive Committee of the Senate decided that we should report to the Senate on a several issues with which SGA has been concerned. The first resolution approved by the Student Government Association addresses one of the issues. It endorses a review of the university's professional practice service deliveries. This resolution was forwarded to the Senate office asking that the Senate work with the university administration to look at the current state of the professional practice service deliveries that the university offers. Many concerns have been raised. Anecdotally, a student in Computer Science took a six-hour internship and never had any contact with any faculty member. The sum of his work required by the university consisted of filling out two one-page multiply choice questionnaires about his internship experience. There was no contact with a faculty member or a requirement for a summary paper. The concern we have is what service is that student paying tuition for? We know that the university is providing a few minutes of someone's time in the Registrar's Office, a few minutes of someone's time somewhere in the ACS Department, but we just were not sure that that warranted \$1,200 in tuition. That was the first situation that came up and there have been more and more complaints. There is no problem in Student Teaching professional practice services, but it appears to the SGA that the university is not earning the money that it is being paid for professional practice courses in certain other departments.

**Senator White:** Is it correct that these are SGA resolutions and you are not presenting them to us as resolutions to be passed by the Senate?

**Senator Kording:** That is correct. I wanted to report to the Senate on this issue. The Provost has agreed to work with the individuals in the various areas who administer professional practice services and will look at the current state of the services delivered. He will report back to the Senate and hopefully you will get that report later this year. If anyone wants more information about the problems that students have had with professional practice, I can take your questions now or you may call our office.

**Senator White:** Does it seem practical that the Provost can report on this by the end of the year?

**Senator Goldfarb:** We will do the review. I have indicated to Senator Kording that I am always concerned about anecdotal material and I think we do need to do a very careful review of this issue and make certain that we are not making decisions based solely on anecdotal information. We will work with Dr. Thomas' office in Undergraduate Studies and try to complete a review this year.

#### **10.25.01.02** *Resolution Endorsing Benefit of Better Grade Policy (Student Government Association)*

**Senator Kording:** This communication is a resolution endorsing a Benefit of the Better Grade Policy. This is an issue that students have been dealing with for a number of years and we are pleased to see that it is in the *Educating Illinois* document. A Benefit of the Better Grade Policy would mean that when a student retakes a course and receives a better grade in the course, that student would get the benefit of the better grade and only the better grade would be used in calculating the grade point average. We are not asking that the lower grade not to be shown on the transcript, but that it not to be included in the grade point average. In the

attachments, you will see that our office has researched other institutions, not only in Illinois, that are considered peer institutions. It indicates that if the university adopts a better grade policy, we will not be out of line with what other universities are doing. This has been sent to the Academic Standards Committee and we hope to get it through to Senate quickly this year.

**Senator White:** The Academic Standards Committee is going to make a recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee on this matter, so when and if it comes to us, it will come through Academic Affairs.

**Senator Reid:** A sub-team of the Successful Transitions Team of *Educating Illinois* has just proposed a policy on this. This will go to the whole committee and then I assume it will eventually work its way here. I can mention that the research of peer institutions showed only one institution that did what you are proposing and that was Eastern Illinois. All of the other institutions were evenly divided, either having our present procedure of averaging the two grades or computing only the most recent grade into the GPA.

**Senator White:** Are you saying that your Successful Transitions Team has already come to a conclusion on an issue like this one?

**Senator Reid:** I am saying only that a sub-team of the team has made a proposal to the team. If the team accepts this, it will then go to Academic Standards. I just wanted to let my student colleagues know that something is taking place.

### ***Graduation Rate Goal Policy***

**Senator E. Thomas:** At the last meeting when the Senate approved the Graduation Rate Goal Policy, I was asked to bring back information on graduation rates from other institutions. I do have that information that I will distribute now. I will tell you that this contains only the graduation rates for other institutions, but the graduation rate *policies*, which are what are really germane, are just not available. We called ten other institutions and only four of them responded. Three of them said that they had no goal. One said that they had a goal of 100%.

### ***Adjournment***

**Motion XXXIII-45:** To adjourn by Senator McNaught, second by Senator Hines. The motion was unanimously approved by standing vote.

Academic Senate  
Hovey 408, Box 1830  
438-8735  
E-mail Address: [acsenate@ilstu.edu](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu)  
Web Address: <http://www.academicsenate.ilstu.edu>