

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES (Approved)

February 20, 2002
Volume XXXIII, No. 12

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 February 6, 2002

Motion XXXIII-90: By Senator Fowles, second by Senator Brown, to approve the Senate minutes of February 6, 2002. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks:

Senator White: I have a few announcements. There will be a speaker for a Black History Cultural Dinner on Monday, February 25, 2002, 5:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m., Bone Student Center Ballroom. Mayor Lee Brown of Houston, Texas will be the speaker. Tomorrow is Founder's Day. In addition to the ringing of the bell, there will be a procession with everyone in regalia. We have received from Sharon Stanford the apportionment for Senate representation next year. The representation is unchanged in terms of distribution among colleges. I would like to welcome a new senator to the Senate, Senator Matthew Anderson, a graduate student representative.

The Council of Illinois University Senates (CIUS), as you recall that with the assistance of this group I helped to organize last year, had its second meeting here on campus last Wednesday, February 13. We had a good turnout for it. It has not been easy getting this group off the ground. There hasn't been a lot of time for senate chairs to participate, even by e-mail, in some of the conversations we have tried to get going. Seven of the twelve universities were represented and three had to cancel at the last minute. They are very interested and eager that we continue our work. With Senator Crothers' help, we worked on a resolution that will be the first action of this group. It is a resolution concerning the relationship of public monies to private institutions, specifically IMAP grants to students. We will bring this as a Sense of the Senate Resolution at our next meeting. All of the senates in the state will be working from this same resolution and hopefully we will be able to go public with it in late March. This is also an organization that I hope the next Senate chair will take a keen interest in because, given the current political climate, the public universities in the state urgently need some form of representation that really looks to their needs and interests.

Vice Chairperson/Student Government Association President's Remarks:

Senator Kording: The student elections for 2002 fast approaching. The voting will be on line from 6:00 a.m. on March 5th to 6:00 p.m. on March 6th. We will also have paper balloting available in two locations. Our current plans are for those to be located in the Bone Student Center on the second floor and at the bottom of the large set of stairs in Watterson Food Court. On March 4th, we plan to have a candidates forum for students who are interested in hearing about each of the candidates. SGA has three major objectives for the remainder of the year. The first is the student participation in the Comprehensive Campaign. We have some senators who are working to coordinate that and our goal is to secure contributions from at least 40% of the student

body. The second item that we are working on with Dr. Mamarchev's office is the appropriation of the student fees for the next fiscal year. Our biggest priority is the recreation and wellness center referendum. Students will be able to vote on that issue on line. If you have questions about the referendum, please call the SGA office or visit the referendum site on line linked to the SGA home page.

Administrators' Remarks:

- ***President Boschini:*** Tomorrow is Founder's Day. It is the 145th anniversary of Illinois State University. At 10:00 a.m., we ring the bell that used to be on top of Old Main. At noon, there is a luncheon and presentation of awards for faculty and staff members. The most important award is the Honorary Degree, which will be presented at that time to Dr. Dave Edmunds. He is an award-winning author and his main area of interest is Native American History. At 1:30 p.m. tomorrow, there will be a Heritage Academy, which involves a presentation by Professor Emeritus Jo Rayfield about the history of ISU. At 3:00 p.m., the actual convocation will be held. At 4:15, there will be ceremony at the convocation to again recognize the winners of the awards.

There is now a new Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Dr. Daniel Lavista. I would be glad to share his biography with you. Interestingly, Dr. Lavista at one time was a professor at ISU in the Theatre Department in the 70s. Since then, he has served as the president of two community colleges and also as president of the community college system.

Governor Ryan gave his combined State of the State Address and his budget message. In all likelihood, fiscal year 2003 will be a lean budget year for the entire state. The IBHE will not make its allocation known for about another week. It does appear that the 2003 fiscal year budget will look very much like this year's budget *after* the cut back in general revenue funds and the payment from all funding sources for group health insurance. Therefore, our base budget will actually be lower than this year's budget. Public higher education in Illinois is better off than a lot of other state agencies and we are certainly better off than public higher education in many other states. The governor did commit to fully funding the State University Retirement System. Illinois State has benefited from its increasing popularity, so enrollment numbers continue to be strong. My first priority will continue to be improvement of faculty and staff salaries, though providing for modest increases will cause us do some internal resource allocation. Next year, we will not have a 3 + 2 + 1 system or anything such as that. I do not anticipate the layoff of any continuing line faculty or staff members at this point.

The remodeling projects for both Turner and Stevenson Halls were not funded under the governor's recommendation. This was not a surprise to us because we received \$17 million for a project last year. The Turner and Stevenson Hall projects will, however, move up on the list for the following fiscal year. As the process moves forward, ISU will be working closely with the General Assembly and the entire University community to provide the best educational experience possible with the dollars that are available. This budget underscores the need to aggressively seek private funds through efforts like "Redefining Normal", the capital campaign for ISU. On Monday, March 4, 2002, we will have another announcement of a very large gift to the University.

Senator Reid: The *Pantagraph* reported that Dr. Lavista left his job as head of the system of community colleges in part because of disagreements over shared governance with the faculty. Do you have an idea of what those differences were?

Senator Boschini: No, I don't, but I have made several inquiries to find out.

Provost Al Goldfarb: I want to underscore how important the bell ringing ceremony is tomorrow at Founder's Day. We will make our *Educating Illinois* presentation to the Board of Trustees on Friday and later to the AP Council. We have already done so for the Civil Service Council. In terms of enrollment, we are trying to hold to our goal of 3,000 freshmen. Our overall enrollment will hopefully stay the same because of our strong retention rate, which would mean that we would not suffer budgetarily because of reduced enrollment. One of the exciting things in terms of enrollment is that we have added an enrollment deposit required of students by May 1 and already almost 1,000 students have submitted deposits. I think that shows that Illinois State is an institution of choice.

Senator Razaki: When enrollment goes up, is it monetarily beneficial for Illinois State or does it cost us?

Senator Goldfarb: I would argue that in the long run it becomes more difficult when enrollment goes up beyond our goals because then we are scrambling to pay for additional sections and to maintain the way in which we structure our first year experience. We are not funded at the level for each student, so in a sense, we are underwriting those costs.

Senator Reid: I looked at the list of students who have been accepted into the French program. Suddenly, all of the ACTs are between 25 and 30. My major worry is that a lot of these people are not going to come. Is it possible that enrollment is going to go down?

Senator Goldfarb: The percentage increases in 25 and above ACT scores in terms of admitted students is a remarkable increase. There is a new process now to make personal contact with our students. I will ask Steve Adams to come in again to address this body. We are making five personal contacts with students admitted in the 25 and above ACT range and we are getting very positive responses. We have to work very hard to convert those admitted students to enrolled students.

Senator Lindblom: As the ACT scores are rising, is the profile of the students staying the same? Are we getting just as diverse a class racially and in terms of socioeconomic backgrounds?

Senator Goldfarb: As part of our goal, we have asked for things like personal statements as part of the admission process to try to make certain we are looking at the overall student. Clearly, we will also admit students who may not have met the average ACT score. Our application numbers are slightly down in terms of minority students, but last year our applications were down, but we had more minority students in the freshman class because we had done a better job of converting applications into enrollment. We are going to continue to use some of the strategies this year. We have expanded the "First Look Program" and have tripled the number of minority students that we are bringing onto campus through that program. Also, we are diversifying the program geographically into East St. Louis and Peoria as well as continuing in Chicago. As part of our goal, we want to keep the sense of accessibility.

Vice President of Student Affairs:

Senator Mamarchev: Thank you for mentioning that Mayor Lee Brown is coming to help us celebrate on Monday, February 25th. I also want to thank Scott Kording and all of the SGA leadership who have been involved in putting the student referendum together. I would encourage you to look at the web site. They have done an outstanding job (<http://www.sga.ilstu.edu/referendum>).

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning: Excused Absence***

Committee Reports

- ***Academic Affairs Committee***

Senator Borg: The Academic Affairs Committee discussed the policy items on the regular review cycle and should have those to forward to the Senate for the next meeting. We received copies of the proposed Student Code of Conduct and the Academic Affairs Committee and SGA will be reviewing that over the next couple of weeks.

- ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

Senator Wells: Administrative Affairs met briefly to finalize our Presidential Commentary Report.

- ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

Senator Deutsch: Faculty Affairs discussed the non-tenure track faculty report it has been putting together.

- ***Planning and Finance Committee***

Senator Kurtz: Planning and Finance is bringing its final report on collegiate restructuring, otherwise known as creating intellectual communities, forward this evening as an Advisory Item.

- ***Rules Committee***

Senator Reid: The Rules Committee continues to work on the Academic Freedom/Ethics and Grievance proposed document. We hope to finish that next week. We also discussed the proposed Policy and Procedures on Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities.

Action Items:

Honorary Degree Committee Elections (Rules Committee)

Election of Faculty and Student Senate Members:

There were two nominations for the Senate faculty representative for the Honorary Degree Committee, Senator Landau and Senator Razaki. Senator Landau withdrew his name. Senator Ryan McNaught was nominated as the student senator to serve on the Honorary Degree Committee. Both Senators Razaki and McNaught were elected by acclamation.

Ratification of SGA Election of Student Member

The Senate ratified the election by SGA of Kenneth Burger to the Honorary Degree Committee.

01.28.01.02 Student Elections Code (SGA) (In Senate Packets of 2/6/02)

(This item was tabled per a motion approved by the Senate at its meeting of 02/06/02. A motion approved by a majority of the Senate is necessary to reopen the issue.)

Senator White: We do seem to have conflicting documents concerning the approval of student election procedures. My recommendation is that if the Senate is not to have a role in the future oversight of the Student Elections Code that it be allowed to at least vote itself out of that role. That is essentially what we are doing tonight. You will notice in the proposed Student Elections Code that it provides for no oversight by the Senate. I would say that this is particularly appropriate because students are no longer directly elected to the

Senate, rather they are elected as members of SGA and then those members are automatically members of the Senate, so the necessity for the Senate to have this oversight I don't think is apparent any longer.

Motion XXXIII-91: By Senator Kording, second by Senator Crothers, to remove from the table the motion for the approval of the new Student Elections Code. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXIII-84: (Previous Motion of 2/6/02) By Senator Crothers, seconded by Senator Bathauer, to approve the Student Elections Code. The Senate unanimously approved the Student Elections Code.

Information Items:

03.16.01.04A Graduate School Bylaws Revisions (Rules Committee)

Senator White: Can you clarify the significance of the items in bold, underlined and in red in the revisions to the Graduate School Bylaws?

Senator Reid: The items in red are additions that came from the Rules Committee and the items in bold came from the Graduate faculty. Only a few additions were recommended by the Rules Committee and were approved by a two-thirds majority of the Graduate faculty.

Dr. Sandra Little, Director of Graduate Studies: The principal part of the changes was to try to get new faculty on the Graduate faculty much quicker than we do now, so the essential things here are that when a new faculty comes on board, they are able to be put on the Graduate faculty upon hire. We also would like to re-institute the Associate status that we had a number of years ago in order that faculty who are new to the system are able serve on thesis and dissertation committees without having to do it by exception.

Senator Reid: The new Associate members would not have the full rights of full members. They will not be able to chair dissertation committees. They can co-chair a thesis committee. They will not vote as a member of the Graduate faculty at the University level.

Senator Armstrong: Section 2 allows for a number of ex-officio members, but no where does it indicate that ex-officio members can chair committees.

Dr. Little: We did not change any of the existing bylaws in regard to that. They could as ex-officio members chair dissertations or theses. Most of these members are already members of the Graduate faculty.

Senator Thomas: On the first page between the last and the next to the last sentence, is there something missing? The sentence just stops after "description of the procedures employed in".

Dr. Little: It appears that the word "determining" is missing.

Senator Nur-Awaleh: When will these go into effect?

Dr. Little: As soon as they are approved by this body.

Senator White: Pending the approval of the President.

Information Items:

06.08.01.14 Extent of Student Teaching Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Borg: The Academic Affairs Committee received three revised policies that were approved by the

Council for Teacher Education (CTE). We were asked to review them. The committee agreed wholeheartedly with the changes that were made. I remain confused as to whether these ought to be information and action or advisory items. The CTE has jurisdiction over policy making having to do with education affairs. I do agree that the Senate should be notified of changes of this importance, but the body responsible for approval is the CTE.

Senator White: It is a gray area, but the Senate needs to approve any changes to academic criteria. Insofar as this is a policy related to something that is required for graduation, I think we could appropriately say that this is something that we need to approve. Can you say something about the changes that were made?

Senator Borg: Both the former policy and the new policy are contained on the same page.

Senator Landau: From my experience, most training and supervision requirements that lead to professional credentialing specify the amount of supervision either in terms of clock hours or number of days. I am a little uncomfortable with the document left as a "full semester experience". If there were some attempt to define that with more precision, I think it may reduce any ambiguity.

Senator Borg: We will look at that.

Senator White: The committee can take that into consideration when it comes back as an action item. My inclination at this point is to bring it back as an action item. We need to be clear about that. Unless there is an objection to this ruling by the chair, this is something that will come back as an action item.

Senator Bathauer: Some students are concerned about elementary education admissions. If there is a shortage of faculty in elementary education, can they extend the number of hours that people have to be in the classroom?

Senator Goldfarb: This document does not specifically address elementary education. It looks at all teacher education programs throughout the University.

Senator Reid: May I suggest that we bring this item back as an information item at the next meeting and have a representative here from the CTE?

Senator White: Senator Borg, would that be possible?

Senator Borg: I think that's possible.

Senator White: Then this item will be on the next Senate agenda again as an information item and a representative from CTE will be here.

Advisory Items:

06.08.01.15A *Supervision of Clinical Practice Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)*

06.08.01.15B *Performance Based Assessment of Teacher Candidates (Academic Affairs Committee)*

Senator White: Do these policies seem as germane to academic criteria as the Extent of Student Teaching Policy?

Senator Borg: These have more to do with supervision and how the experience works.

Senator White: These, therefore, would seem to me to be more advisory.

Senator El-Zanati: What is the role of the faculty in clinical supervision? Does this increase the amount of time the faculty have to spend with the students?

Senator Borg: As I understand it, this clarifies the role of the faculty bringing into focus what most of them are already doing.

Senator Razaki: In the Performance Based Assessment of Teacher Candidates Policy, the first bullet point contains "Realizing the Democratic Ideal, State of Illinois and national standards...assures that all teacher candidates meet these standards..." I am for democracy, but does that really belong in this policy? Is it part of some official language?

Senator Borg: My understanding is that they were concerned with dealing with the NCATE requirements for certification. As we all know with many university documents, language tends to be added if there is the hint that somewhere down the line it will be needed.

Senator Razaki: So this should be included and is not an error?

Senator Borg: Yes, it is not an error.

Senator White: Are they saying that the *University's* conceptual framework is "realizing the Democratic Ideal"?

Senator Borg: I don't know.

Senator Nur-Awaleh: Realizing that the ideals of democracy means that we are going to make sure that students learn certain values.

Senator White: Shouldn't it then say the College of Education rather than the University's conceptual framework?

Senator Goldfarb: This was passed by the CTE probably over five years ago during their last NCATE review. The College of Education is not the only place that teacher education programs are housed. Realizing the Democratic Ideal was the overarching theme that was developed by the CTE with input from all teacher educators.

Senator White: This will not be coming back as an action item. It is purely an advisory item. If you have any other editorial suggestions about these documents, then you can let Senator Borg or the Provost know.

01.28.02.02 Planning and Finance Committee's Final Report on Collegiate Restructuring

Senator Kurtz: What you have before you is a small portion of the final report on collegiate restructuring.

When you add in the appendices and the full compilation of focus group and e-mail responses, the document is exceedingly weighty. Therefore, the committee chose to bring to your attention what it regards as the substance of the final report, that is, the portion that records our final recommendations and information about the process that we went through in reaching those recommendations. The full report, including the appendices is being put together by Georgia Bennett of the Provost's office. There will be three copies of the full report, one of which will go to the Provost. A second copy will reside in the Senate office and a third copy will be placed in the University Archives.

Senator Reid: Is it possible to put this on line. I have received requests from faculty to look at the document.

Senator Kurtz: The whole report is on line on the Senate web site in the portion devoted to collegiate restructuring. All that we are doing for the sake of institutional memory is putting that in hard copy form. Every single item of the report is on the Senate web site with the exception of the analysis of the e-mail survey responses, but we can have it put there.

02.08.02.02 *Review of Distance Education Report (Academic Affairs Committee)*

08.07.01.02 *Distance Education Report of May 2001*

Senator Borg: The Academic Affairs Committee was given the report on distance education that was requested by the Provost approximately a year ago. We are now forwarding it to the Senate. We did decide to append an introductory page in which we noted several things about the report, including its conclusions. We noted that in the transmittal letter, several of the charges that the Provost had given the original committee were not fully addressed. A good deal of this comes down to monitoring what is going in the development of distance education curriculum and there are some good suggestions for that. However, the issue of how much of this we should be doing and the budgetary implications are not considered completely in the report.

Senator White: Do these recommendations exist in the context of a philosophy statement on distance education?

Senator Goldfarb: The reason I asked the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) to look at this issue was because it is in charge of reviewing policy issues that are connected to curriculum. If courses are transferred over to electronic means of delivery that have been approved in other means of delivery, how do we deal with that issue? Do we review distance education proposals in the exact same way we currently review all other proposals? Those are the kinds of issues that I asked the UCC to review. They made specific recommendations and I appreciate very much their work and the work that the Academic Affairs Committee has done. I think that Academic Affairs raises some important questions that need to go back to the UCC. I do think eventually if we are going to make some of these recommendations function, they will need to come back in terms of some curricular policy.

Senator White: We have been anticipating for some time the philosophy statement.

Senator Goldfarb: We have a distance learning committee working on that.

Senator White: Much of what the committee discusses here can't make much sense in the absence of a philosophy statement. Was a draft of the philosophy statement available to the UCC?

Senator Borg: No, the philosophy statement was not part of the discussion in the UCC.

Senator White: Some of the recommendations have to do with allowing more departmental autonomy in

designing and creating courses. They suggest that the UCC is capable of overseeing the creation of courses, but last year we agreed that the UCC would now limit itself to programs and approval of courses would be left in the colleges.

Senator Goldfarb: I must be reading this somewhat differently because I think the Academic Affairs Committee is responding the same way I did when it suggests that the locus is actually departments and schools.

Senator White: I am looking at the discussion section (page 2). They recommend a modest degree of oversight necessary to ensure the adaptation of existing courses to distance education methods. Then on the next page, they say "At the present time, the necessary curricular processes could be addressed through the existing UCC guidelines." But if we are talking about courses in individual departments being redesigned to offer them as distance courses, then I don't think that the UCC would even see them anymore because when we eliminated the review of programs from the Senate, the UCC eliminated its overview of courses. My general concern is that none of this makes any sense in the absence of a centralized institutional philosophy for what is going to be appropriate for distance education. If, following this discussion, we leave autonomy for designing courses in departments, who knows what philosophy they are going to be following, especially since the UCC no longer has oversight of the design of courses.

Senator Goldfarb: I think what they are asking for is that the locus of decision making (#2, page 3) remain in the department. For example, when transforming an existing traditional course to distant format, the proposal needs to be processed at the departmental level only and then sent to the college and the UCC as an information item.

Senator White: I am saying that we decided last year that that is not what the UCC does anymore.

Senator Goldfarb: The courses would only be provided as information items. It would allow them to ask questions.

Senator White: This is an extremely important conversation for us to be keenly aware of the implications. It is very difficult for us to make reasonable comments on these recommendations when there are no illusions to a general philosophy of distance education in this document, nor have we seen such a document regarding philosophy.

Senator Goldfarb: I am more than willing to table this. I agree that this is an important discussion. I think the discussion was not occurring and that is the reason that I asked the UCC to undertake it.

Senator White: It is a very important discussion to have, but we need all of the pieces in order to have it because I don't think that these are good recommendations if they are not being driven by an institutional philosophy.

Senator Goldfarb: Although, there are the pragmatics of it. The reality is that we are moving toward course work in this area.

Senator White: But you don't want entrepreneurial departments designing courses that violate the spirit of the philosophy statement, so those two things have to be brought together. I would suggest that this document be brought back when we have a philosophy statement.

Senator Goldfarb: I have no problem with that. I will check with the committee working on that and see how quickly they are moving that along.

Senator Borg: Last year when the UCC was considering this, it was as confused as we are now and worked very diligently to try to come up with some of the points that are problematic.

Senator White: I thought that the UCC's and the Academic Affairs Committee's points were very well made. Let it be noted in the minutes and to Academic Affairs that when we see the philosophy statement on distance education, this document will come back to the Senate so that we can look at the recommendations in the light of such a statement.

02.08.02.04 *FOI Incentive Plan (Senator Goldfarb)*

Senator Goldfarb: I have received from the implementation team of *Educating Illinois* working on General Education recommendations for transforming the incentive plan for FOI. This is a plan that was put into place about four or five years ago. I am now seeking input across campus about how people feel about transforming the FOI incentive plan. As you look at the plans, there are places where there is some incentive for faculty and some incentive for departments as well as places where there is only incentive for departments. I have sent this to the Provost's Advisory Council, Chairs Council, Senate and General Education Director. I have set a timeframe for responses to the document because I think we need to make an announcement by the end of the spring semester on what direction we are moving.

Senator Razaki: Currently, the first time a faculty member teaches FOI, that faculty member receives \$3,000 as an incentive. Under these revised plans, that would go down to \$1,000. Also currently, the departments are getting no assistance, but with these plans, the departments are going to get assistance.

Senator Goldfarb: That's true, but in a couple of places, there is a suggestion that there be no incentive whatsoever for faculty. There are seven different approaches here.

Senator Razaki: I don't think you should reduce the faculty incentive because then it might be problematic attracting new faculty members to take up this task, which is very time consuming.

Senator Crothers: Of the three people that I know on the subcommittee, there is a department chair, an acting dean and an associate dean. I don't know what the fourth member represents. That such people came up with a plan that prioritizes incentives to departments is not shocking, but what is the current problem that this incentive program is supposed to solve? I can certainly understand why department chairs would think it is a good idea that departments get more money, but I don't understand what the other problem is that even brought this notion forward.

Senator Goldfarb: I think that the document does speak to departmental resource problems. I think that the argument is that there is little motivation for departments to work with faculty to enter into the course itself.

Senator Crothers: If in fact the department has increased resources, but there is no incentive to faculty, it is not clear to me how that solves the underlying problem. The bigger problem seems to be to get faculty to do it, rather than the fact that this undermines the number of courses in the major. That's a structural problem

with FOI to begin with. It is not really a strong argument about the problem of recruiting faculty. I think that this is a document that may be driven by chair concerns. I am suggesting that those concerns are not persuasively articulated.

Senator Wheeler: My first concern is why we have incentives for teachers to teach FOI in the first place. I understand that it is a lot more work, but I feel that if we have teachers that are truly dedicated to education, they would want to do this for the students. If I am a student and the teacher has to get some special bribe or incentive to teach the class, then I think my education suffers because their heart isn't fully in it. If it so hard to get our current teachers to teach FOI, could we consider hiring faculty just for that purpose who would do a good job?

Senator Goldfarb: I think that what you have brought up is probably one of the things that was discussed within the implementation team, this whole question of incentives for certain courses.

Senator Meckstroth: I believe that the idea was not to bribe faculty to teach FOI. But there was the idea that FOI was a new kind of course that asked faculty to deal with interdisciplinary issues and to teach critical thinking. Faculty were being paid for the exceptional amount of preparation needed to teach the course effectively. I don't really want comment on giving money to departments versus giving money to faculty, but I think that the point of this partly seems to be a concern that tenure track and tenure line faculty keep teaching FOI. The various plans all give more money for tenure and tenure track faculty teaching than they do for other people in the University teaching FOI. I think that is the kind of differentiation they are trying to make between the amount of money for certain categories of people. I am not defending the idea of money going to departments rather to faculty themselves.

Senator El-Zanati: With these plans, most of the members of the committee want to give money to the departments without any incentive to faculty. My interpretation of this is that if the chair receives the incentive, then the chair is going to lean on its faculty to teach FOI.

Senator Kurtz: I have very serious misgivings about the whole notion of giving incentives for FOI. This seems to be a very timid approach to a very deep-seeded institutional problem. If we have a course that large numbers of faculty members are unwilling to teach, then we should change the course. Incentives don't seem the way to go about it either philosophically or fiscally. We are putting huge amounts of resources into this one course, resources that could perhaps be used more fruitfully to hire more faculty members who might be more interested in teaching the course if it were more attractively formulated. I also have a problem with the idea of dangling this money in front of chairs and saying that you can use this any way you want. This seems to be a strange way of going about giving resources to departments. If you want to make more resources available to departments, why not do it directly rather than filtering it through an FOI incentive program. I agree with Senator El-Zanati that giving incentives to chairs will put more pressure on their faculty members and this is going to lead to worse chair-faculty relationships. In the long run, we need to make FOI a course that people want to teach. It should then be understood that it is a course that everyone in his/her career will circulate through.

Senator Thomas: Senator Goldfarb, is there a deadline by which you would like to receive feedback because I would like to take this back to the people in my school?

Senator Goldfarb: I have asked to receive feedback by March 6th so that I can get a sense of what the expectations are.

Communications:

Senator Razaki: The College of Business and the Department of Accounting was reaffirmed in their accreditation after a ten-year period by the American Assembly of the Collegiate Schools of Business; this is a very big event for our college and department.

Senator White: Congratulations.

Senate Approved Curricular Proposals:***KNR Athletic Training Minor Deletion Proposal***

Approved by the Senate on February 7, 2002

Information Systems and Telecommunications Sequences for M.S. in ACS

Approved by Senate on the February 12, 2002

Physical Education Teacher Education Sequence Proposed Revisions

Approved by Senate on February 13, 2002

Art B.F.A Major Proposed Revisions

Approved by Senate on February 13, 2002

Teacher Education Sequence Proposed Revisions, Major in Art (B.S.)

Approved by Senate on February 14, 2002

General Art Sequence Proposed Deletion (Minor in Art)

Approved by Senate on February 18, 2002

Adjournment

Motion XXXIII-92: By Senator Bathauer, second by Senator Sass, to adjourn. The motion was approved by standing vote.

Academic Senate

Hovey 408, Box 1830

438-8735

E-mail Address: acsenate@ilstu.edu

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