

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Approved)

April 3, 2002

Volume XXXIII, No. 15

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 March 6, 2002

Motion XXXIII-115: By Senator Mitchell, second by Senator Albrecht, to approve the Senate minutes of March 6, 2002. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Approval of Minutes of March 20, 2002

Motion XXXIII-116: By Senator Mitchell, second by Senator Albrecht, to approve the Senate minutes of March 20, 2002. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks:

Senator White: Senate members were nominated in the faculty caucus prior to this evening's meeting for the Senate Executive Committee. The nominees are Senators Razaki, Fowles, Howard and Reid. That election will be held on May 1, 2002 at the first meeting of the new Senate. I would like to congratulate Professor Al Bowman, who has been chosen as the Acting Provost. I would also like to extend my congratulations to Provost Goldfarb, who will become the new President of another university. We wish you very well there.

You may have noted in the *Pantagraph* last week that the activities of the Council of Illinois University Senates (CIUS) made statewide news. There was a press release from Southern Illinois University that directly dealt with the resolution we passed regarding public monies to private institutions. We are continuing to work on that theme; in fact, I am working on an opinion-editorial piece that we hope to get out to newspapers in the state and I have already begun talking to some student leaders about the possibility of starting a letter writing campaign and lobbying activities with our state representatives.

Vice Chairperson/Student Government Association President's Remarks:

Senator Kording: On March 5th and 6th, the student body approved a referendum for a new on-campus recreation and wellness center. That measure was passed by 57.3% of the student body with the highest springtime voter election turnout in the University's history. We are transmitting the certified results of that referendum to the President. Also, on March 5th and 6th, the new student government administration was elected and it will take office on April 7, 2002. Senator Carolyn Bathauer is now the Student Body President-Elect, Senator Ryan Sass is the Student Body Vice President-Elect and Ann Zhubi is the SGA Chief of Staff-Elect. Also of note is the election of the Student Trustee-Elect, Nick Maroules, who will take office on July 1st. On March 27, the student government voted to extend voting privileges to six ex-officio members, who are not really senators in student government, but who are traditionally under-represented constituencies of registered student organizations such as the Black Student Union and Association of Latin Students. In addition on March 27, the student government approved the proposed revisions to the Student Code of Conduct that appears on the agenda tonight as an information item. We also note that we did receive from the Academic Affairs Committee, but at the very last minute, their proposed revisions to the Code. We have not

had a chance to review them in detail, but we are open to considering all of them on the Senate floor. This will be my last meeting on the Senate. I would like to add on a personal note that it has been a good time. The administration has just been excellent this year. Chairperson White and Secretary Crothers, thank you putting up with us.

Administrators' Remarks:

- **President Boschini:** I want to officially announce that I have asked David Borst to be the chair of the committee to choose the next Provost. On Monday, April 8, I will be going to Springfield for our budget hearing in the Senate. On April 17 at 4:00 p.m. in Schroeder Hall 138, I will have an open meeting for all employees of the University because I have received many questions on two issues. The two main issues that I want to talk about are the transition in the Provost's office and the budget. I have also notified the Student Body President about this and any student who wants to come is welcome.

Senator Razaki: Today I heard a news broadcast that said that the State must cut at least \$1 billion out of a \$24 billion budget, which is more than 4%. Are we expecting another cutback for next year?

President Boschini: I don't have a definitive answer for that, but based on my discussions with the IBHE in the last couple of days, I would say that I would not rule out another cut.

Senator Reid: At present, what is the percentage of cutback we are we expecting for the next fiscal year?

President Boschini: I am not expecting any cut; I am hoping that we don't have one, but based on State revenues not coming in, we may have one.

- **Provost Al Goldfarb:** I want to personally thank the Senate for all it has done. It has been a joy working with the Senate and an exciting time in terms of working with governance issues. I want to particularly thank our student leaders this year. They have been a pretty remarkable group. I am very proud of our students. I would also like to congratulate Senator White, who just signed a book contract with Harper San Francisco, which is a very prestigious firm. He will be doing a piece on social criticism.
- **Vice President of Student Affairs:**
Senator Mamarchev: I want to echo much of what Dr. Goldfarb said about all of our student senators. In particular, I want to thank Scott, Ziggy and Zoe for the excellent leadership that they have provided for us this year. I also want to thank Cori Brown for her leadership. They really went all out and made sure that the referendum for the wellness center was passed and I think that is really terrific. I want to congratulate all that were involved in that. I think that when we look back in future years, particularly at our student leadership, we will realize what a remarkable year this was, especially in a year of transition in combining the two student groups and all of the work behind the scenes that it took to make that happen. I am truly appreciative to all of you for laying a wonderful foundation for the people who will come after you.
- **Vice President of Finance and Planning: Excused Absence**

Committee Reports

- **Academic Affairs Committee**

Senator Borg: The Academic Affairs Committee met twice to finish its discussion on the Student Code of Conduct. We have summarized all of our comments the document found in your Senate packets.

Tonight, we dealt with the repetition of course requirements, a.k.a. the Benefit of the Better Grade Policy, a name we are no longer going to use for the proposed policy. We will bring that to the attention of the Executive Committee and hopefully we can deal with that at the next Senate meeting.

· ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: No report.***

· ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

Senator Deutsch: Faculty Affairs met twice this week with the Rules Committee to discuss final revisions to the policy on integrity and research.

· ***Planning and Finance Committee***

Senator Kurtz: Planning and Finance met two weeks ago before the previous Senate meeting. At that time, we met with the chairs of the various college councils or equivalent bodies to discuss the final report from the Planning and Finance Committee on collegiate restructuring.

· ***Rules Committee***

Senator Reid: I would like to thank Senator Kording for all he has contributed to this campus. I think there has been a greater involvement of students in shared governance this year than I have seen in the past. The Rules Committee met with Faculty Affairs at which time we completed our revisions to the integrity policy. Additionally, we have almost completed work on the Academic Freedom/Ethics and Grievance document that combines the two committees' policies and procedures. We still have a couple of issues to discuss and, unfortunately, it will have to come up in the fall.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Communication

Senator White: Gretchen Knapp is the representative for the non-tenure track faculty organization that announced its existence yesterday. I would like to ask the Senate's indulgence in granting her request to address the Senate concerning non-tenure track (NTT) faculty issues. Although, this is not ordinary, it is certainly relevant to our business. We will be coming forward with recommendations regarding non-tenure track faculty in the very near future. Unless there are objections, I would like to invite Professor Knapp to the table.

Professor Knapp: I am here on behalf of the ISU Non-Tenure Track Faculty Association. We launched our organizing drive yesterday morning. We were really surprised that non-tenure track faculty are over 40% of the entire of faculty here. Like you, we were really dismayed to discover that since 1996, the number of NTT faculty has increased almost 70%, while the number of tenure/tenure track positions has remained practically the same. This disturbing trend certainly concerns all of us. Last week we hope you received an open letter to all faculty, which introduced our organization and our concerns. Included with that mailing was a copy of an e-mail that had been sent to several senators about a month ago. On behalf of the NTT Faculty Association, I would like to request the Senate's action in two matters as follows:

1. We ask the Senate to consider the following resolution or a version thereof: "The Senate will not interfere in any efforts of non-tenure track faculty to form an independent organization to advocate for their academic and professional interests. The Senate directs the university administration and encourages all faculty members to join in this ideal."
2. We ask the Senate consider increasing the number of non-tenure track senators to seven, one from each college and from Milner Library. This would be in order to increase the total representation of Illinois State University's faculty on this body.

As your colleague, we are proud to share the teaching mission of this University. On matters of faculty well being, we hope to add our collective voice to yours and uphold academic integrity and the principles upon which this University was founded. And finally, we ask all faculty to respect the right of NTT faculty to decide whether or not to organize a union and we look forward to maintaining an open, informed and colloquial dialogue, both with our tenure and tenure track faculty, our students of course and our administrators.

Senator White: It would be appropriate for you to give any resolutions you would like the Senate to consider to your representative, who can then give them to the Executive Committee.

Information Items:

04.01.02.01 Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Policy (Rules Committee)

Senator Reid: I would like to invite Nancy Latham and Pat O'Rourke to help us understand the proposed Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Policy. I will note that this covers any type of misconduct in carrying out research by any member of the University community, and as such, is not limited to faculty. The policy has been in development since October of 2000 by the University Research Council. In the summary that was sent to us by the Council, you will see that they consulted with many bodies and asked for quite a bit of feedback. Page 1 explains the policy's general provisions. Oversight of integrity in research and scholarly activities is the primary responsibility of the Associate Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies. There would also be an academic integrity officer, who would be a faculty member or an administrator. This person would be responsible for the correct observance of the policies and procedures within the document. This individual would not be a voting member of any of the committees, either an Inquiry Team or an Investigative Panel, but would be there to advise them.

Page two contains the definition of misconduct. This includes fabrication of data, plagiarism, abuse of confidentiality, falsification of research, deliberate violation of regulations, property violations, retaliation against someone who has reported you and finally failure to report observed major offenses.

The flow chart illustrates the procedures that would take place after the reporting of an alleged violation. The report would go to the chair, director or appropriate supervisor of a particular unit. The report is then forwarded to a dean or the appropriate supervisor, who determines whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant an inquiry. If the dean or appropriate supervisor decides an inquiry is warranted, he or she will appoint an Inquiry Team, whose purpose is to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to conduct an investigation. Three members are appointed at that time, one from the person's unit, one from the University and one may be appointed by the dean or appropriate supervisor. The combined Senate internal committees suggested that at least one member of the team should be a faculty member, as the faculty are essentially at the center of research at the University. The team would hold an inquiry or if the respondent agreed to a statement of facts before hand, a decision could be made in place of the inquiry by the Associate Vice President of Research. Otherwise, an inquiry would be held. The Inquiry Team would compile a report and the respondent would have a chance to comment on that report.

If there were a call for an investigation, the Associate Vice President of Research would make a decision based on the report and the comments of the respondent to either go to next step of an investigation or dismiss the case. If it goes on to an investigation, a three-member Investigative Panel is appointed, consisting of members who were not members of the Inquiry Team. Both in terms of the appointment of the Inquiry Team and the Investigative Panel, the respondent has a chance to challenge a member. This means that even though the supervisor would try to find team members who are nonbiased and have good judgment, the

respondent has the opportunity to say that a certain individual on a team may be biased or that there is a conflict of interest. A judgment may be made to replace that person. We tried to build in as many protections for the respondent as possible, both by giving the respondent a chance to challenge the inclusion of a member of a team or panel, as well as having different members on both the team and the panel.

Once the investigation takes place, a report is filed and once again the respondent has a chance to comment. If the respondent appeals the decision, a three-member Appeals Committee is formed, also composed of members other than those from the Inquiry Team and the Investigative Panel. After the appeals process or if there is no appeals process, the case goes to the Provost, who decides upon sanctions and corrective action.

I would like to point out one misunderstanding within the document. On page nine, it talks about termination of University employment. This is not included here as a sanction option. All this means is that if the respondent is terminated or decides to resign, that individual will not escape the committees' actions.

Senator Armstrong: How many years do you envision it would take to get through that flow chart?

Senator Reid: This could be done within a four or five-month process. However, this is very serious and we want to give as much recourse as possible to the respondent to prove that there is no reasonable cause.

Senator Crothers: I think it is a very impressive document, but how common is this problem such that this process could potentially overwhelm the system?

Dr. O'Rourke: My understanding is that it is not a common problem at all. As we developed the document, we tried to keep in mind protection of individuals from false allegations and protection of the rest of us from those who are guilty of misconduct.

Senator McGinnis: It does happen, it has occurred 15 to 30 times at universities per year. It is federally mandated so if we have a problem like this, most research and funding are shut down. It will take four to five months under the best of conditions, but could take a year.

Senator Fowles: If a person were reported, are there any services or advocacies to support the respondent or do they have to seek legal council on their own.

Ms. Latham: That is not written into this policy. It would be their responsibility to find that support. The policy was written in a way to be as protective of due process as possible. I would like to respond to the question earlier about how often this occurs. We are required to report annually to the Office of Research Integrity any allegations of misconduct on our campus. We have not had any documented cases of misconduct in the last four years.

Senator Landau: There are many exemplars of misconduct specified in this document, which would also serve as a focus for the faculty ethics and grievance procedure. Can Senator Reid make a comment about the distinctions there?

Senator Reid: We have talked about this. I consider this to be an ethics issue, but a very particular type of ethics issue. It also has a very different procedure in that rather than having a claimant and respondent, the claim goes to the administration and the administration carries it through. What we will be proposing for the Academic Freedom/Ethics and Grievance document is a clause that says in such cases they would go through this procedure and not the other. Some people feel that both should be available and this is something we

would have to debate when the Academic Freedom/Ethics and Grievance document comes up next year.

Senator White: Does the Ethics document have any language related to research ethics?

Senator Reid: The ethics part of it is based on the Ethics Code and the Ethics Code deals with ethics in research. Someone is going to have to decide whether an issue goes through this process or the Ethics and Grievance process; we are proposing an "either or" rather than an "and" so that you cannot go through both processes.

Senator White: Is it wise to have parallel processes?

Senator Reid: We don't think so.

Senator White: So you would remove the language in the Ethics and Grievance document having to do with research ethics?

Senator Reid: We would not remove it because it is part of our Ethics Code and the Ethics Code is a separate part of the document, but we would include a statement in that document that in the case of an integrity in research claim, it would go through this procedure.

Senator White: The documents need to refer to each other in some way.

Senator McGinnis: If we have a report, we have to report it to the federal government. They actually have oversight in this if it is a federally funded project.

Senator White: So from your point of view, that is a compelling reason for having a separate ethics procedure for research matters.

Senator McGinnis: We really have no choice.

Senator Armstrong: In the fourth paragraph of the introduction, the mentoring relationship that occurs in research and scholarly activities is addressed. A great deal of the research that we do involves students and yet that relationship doesn't seem to be mentioned under the different categories of misconduct. Very often, you are in the position where you can foster misconduct in those that you are mentoring. This is where I see these two particular documents getting mixed up and I think that this has to be straightened out.

Senator Reid: First of all, the Academic and Freedom and Ethics document only applies to faculty. The integrity policy applies to everyone in the University community. I do, however, have a question. If a mentor tells a student to conduct certain research and that turns out to be misconduct, who would be liable under this document?

Ms. Latham: I can't think of any example of research in which the principal investigator is not defined as a faculty member or administrator. If there were a violation in how a student collected data, it would go back to the principal investigator on that protocol. They both are held responsible, but the principal investigator is in more of a responsible position.

Senator McGinnis: The faculty member is the one who signs the contract as the PI, so the faculty member would bare the major responsibility, but it depends on the particular case.

Senator Anderson: The question I have concerns the faculty-student mentor relationship and how both would be at fault. If a faculty member told a student to do inappropriate research, would there be separate hearings for the faculty and the student?

Dr. O'Rourke: The document is formatted to deal with each person individually. To allay some of the fears that may be welling up about what possibly misconduct could include, the list that is in the document will probably be the list that guides us in that respect.

Senator Armstrong: I agree that the faculty member is the ultimate person who is responsible and that would seem to be an omission in this document.

Senator Ballard: Would a student be placed on the Inquiry or Investigative Panel if the incident involved a student?

Senator Reid: Not as presently written. It has to be either a faculty member or an administrator.

Senator Ballard: So in the court system, we can be judged by our peers, but not in the University system?

Dr. O'Rourke: I have a number of students who consider themselves to be my peers. Also, we need to consider if we want to have such weighty matters made the responsibility of students and I don't think we do.

Senator Reid: I would just like to add to that that there is a question of expertise as well in research that might come up.

Senator Kording: I thought Senator Ballard's question was a good one. I am sure that Professor O'Rourke did not mean the comment about the weighty matters for students as it sounded, because in our office we often joke that the weighty matters of the University shouldn't be decided by the faculty. In all seriousness, I think that Senator Ballard was encouraging the Rules Committee to consider including at least one student member on an Inquiry Team in the case that a student had to come before such a team.

Senator White: Is there any need in this document to limit its scope or to clarify its relationship to creative activities?

Dr. O'Rourke: I think the purpose of this document is to deal with times when research is taking place.

Senator White: Would it be wise to have a disclaimer within the document that says this is intended for use in certain areas and not others?

Senator Reid: I guess the question is whether there is a clear distinction between research and creative activity. The document seems to be saying there is.

Senator McGinnis: The decision has to be made by the initial committee that looks at the information.

Senator Landau: I think that this was discussed at one point and it was concluded that scholarly activities and creative works would come together as they are considered in the ASPT document, so even your good works would count for scholarship.

Senator White: I was more concerned about how it related to ethics.

Senator Reid: I don't think this would apply to this document, even though it applies in ASPT.

Senator White: That was my question because frequently when we talk about research, we almost always use the standard phrase "research and creative activities".

Senator Reid: Yes, for the purposes of evaluation and reward, but I don't think it is so in this document.

Senator White: In the ASPT document is where we see them, but we don't see them here. I am wondering if that is deliberate.

Senator Goldfarb: I think there is the potential for plagiarism in creative work. There has been, for example, the theft of directorial productions, in which the actual means of presentation has been cited as plagiarism. I think that Senator McGinnis' point of view is that you would need to trust the initial Inquiry Committee to look at the charge and make a determination of whether it is artistic appropriation.

Senator Reid: How are we going to distinguish between our regular procedures dealing with plagiarism and dealing with it in this document?

Ms. Latham: It would depend on the particular allegation.

Senator Reid: I think that one might want to develop more specific criteria for where one policy leaves off and the other starts.

Senator Lawhun: If there is an allegation, does the research stop at that time?

Ms. Latham: It would depend on the nature of the allegation and the results of the Inquiry Team.

Senator Coliz: Much of the discussion has been about funded research. Would you comment on the other types of research that would be covered under this document?

Senator McGinnis: You have to have a consistent document. You can't do one thing for funded research and have a different policy for research that is not funded.

Vitae for Panel of 10, Academic Freedom Committee and Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee Elections at Faculty Caucus of April 17, 2002 (Rules Committee)

Senator White: Contained in Senate *faculty* packets are the vitae for the nominees for the Academic Freedom Committee, Panel of 10 and Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee. This is for your information only. We will hold the elections for these committees at the next Senate meeting. (***Additional vitae that arrived late to the Senate office were distributed at this evening's meeting.***)

01.29.02.02 Student Code of Conduct-Revised (SGA and Academic Affairs Committee)

01.29.02.02A Recommendations from Academic Affairs Committee

Senator White: SGA is going to be the principal committee responsible for bringing this to the floor. As we have discussed before, the Academic Affairs Committee was asked to provide a detailed response so that we had adequate faculty and community input for this document as well.

Senator Kording: We would like to invite Mr. Olshak, the Director of Student Dispute Resolutions Services

(SDRS), in case we have questions. In the document that was sent forward by the SGA, there was also included a four page comparison document that was prepared by SDRS that explains how the rewrite of the Student Code compares to the Student Code currently in effect. A few of the major proposed revisions fix a number of loopholes in the Student Code that make it sometimes more difficult for students who are going through the disciplinary procedures.

The proposed revisions also address an issue that Mr. Olshak brought to student government with respect to parental and public notification in cases of severe disciplinary cases. Student government has looked at that question and is pleased to see that our recommendations are included in the rewrite. There is also an important definition section that has been added that helps to clarify some things that are unclear in the current Code.

There are a few new procedures that would be incorporated into the disciplinary process, one being mediation. A particular case might be referred to the mediation program in SDRS as an alternative to resolving an issue. The proposed Code recommends the notation on student transcripts if a student is found in violation and receives a failing grade in a course because of academic dishonesty. Also, in the event that a student is suspended from the university, that would be noted on the student's transcript while the suspension is occurring and a permanent notation would be listed on the transcript in the event that the student is dismissed from the University.

Senator Borg: The Academic Affairs Committee took a very close look at all of this. The comments that we made are summarized in the four-page memo that we produced for this. The types of suggestions that we made range from those that are purely editorial and a few that are substantive. One of them has to do with the notation on the transcript. Another has to do with the implications of the definitions, especially the definition of faculty. We have not had the opportunity to talk to Mr. Olshak and Dr. Mamarchev about this, but I think that we might want to deal with some of these issues before we pass the document.

Senator White: I think it would be really useful if the two committees could meet and come to as much of an agreement on your concerns by the next meeting so that we might be able to offer revisions as part of the original document without the need for amendments on the Senate floor.

Senator Borg: We went through and made a number of suggestions and, as a committee, had we been in charge of this, we might have made those revisions before it came to the Senate floor. This is a somewhat interesting procedure. My question is did SGA make any revisions to the current draft that was forwarded to the Senate?

Senator Kording: No, we offered a number of editorial changes and substantive changes to Mr. Olshak as the document was being drafted. However, we made no revisions to this draft (draft 8) before sending it to the Senate. We did receive your proposed changes and we would be happy to work those out, but we are not sending forward any changes yet.

Senator White: In the interest of efficiency at the next meeting, it would be very useful if we could know which suggested revisions from Academic Affairs were acceptable to SGA and which were not. Then Academic Affairs might then know which ones it needs to offer as amendments that can be debated. Senator Borg, would you point out the items as most consequential.

Senator Borg: The first one is on page 2, number I., concerning the University Mission Statement. The second would be on page 3, III. F, the definition of University official and/or revising page 9, V. C.2., which

has to do with student compliance issues. We have questions about page 12, VIII. D.1. The faculty require a three-quarter time appointment, yet only a single semester hour creates eligibility for a student. There is the point of logic having to do with page 17, X. C.2b & c. How can a faculty member provide a summary and then later be satisfied that the incident has been resolved? The other very serious matter involved the issues having to do with placing the notation on a transcript, page 27, XI. E & F.

Senator Lindblom: On page 20, X, E. 7, our committee finds that a University Hearing Panel can be made up of all student members.

Senator Howard: The question I have refers to page 29, XIV.A. How can the University determine if a student is financially dependent if the method of discovery is as noted on tax forms and the student does not chose to apply for financial aid?

Senator Mamarchev: In the interest of efficiency, when we received this memo from Dr. Borg to Dr. White, I asked Mr. Olshak to go through item by item and prepare a response, so if it would be helpful to go through these more substantive ones, we are prepared to do that.

Senator White: What would be most useful, especially for the ones that are not substantive, is if you could meet before the next meeting. Since there seem to be questions on the more substantive ones, it might be indeed useful now to address some of those.

Senator Boschini: I submitted a letter to you on, I believe, Thursday, March 14, with a subsequent suggestion that I received from Dr. MacDonald. It was an idea to reorder a section because basically the compliance of the wishes of faculty and staff was important enough to be first in that section. I don't see that referenced in this document.

Senator White: I don't recall receiving that letter.

Senator Boschini: I will resend that to you.

Senator White: Mr. Olshak, would you like to address some of the issues where there are questions about a matter of understanding of what you intend in certain sections? Can we take them in the order that we introduced them? The first one would be the Mission Statement on the page one.

Senator Mamarchev: When we sent this draft 8 around, the Senate was still working on the Mission Statement, so that one can be resolved.

Senator White: The next item is III. F.

Mr. Olshak: "University official" should include faculty, so we agree with that. I think that is clearly in the spirit of the discussion that we had in putting the Code together. We will add that.

Senator Borg: We were very concerned at one point because you defined faculty members in point E and then you defined University official without referring to faculty members in point F.

Senator White: V. C.2 is the next one, but that was related to this one, so you have just answered that question as well. The next was VIII. D.1.

Mr. Olshak: That was something that was retained from the previous document that had been approved by the Academic Senate. There was no true rationale for that definition other than to maintain consistency with the previous Code.

Senator White: So, you don't have a problem with changing that?

Mr. Olshak: Not at all.

Senator Borg: We have a question as to what we are changing it to and the concomitant question of a student requiring only a single semester hour to be eligible.

Mr. Olshak: It seems like an adjunct faculty member or anybody teaching a course would qualify.

Senator White: The next item is X. C.2b & c.

Mr. Olshak: Informal disciplinary resolution only indicates a lack of a formal hearing. What is being determined through the disciplinary process is the disciplinary penalty. The faculty member is left to determine the academic penalty. Faculty members are not serving in the capacity of disciplinary officers for the University and would be unaware of whether or not a student had a history of academic dishonesty that was on file with SDRS.

Senator White: Page 20, X. E.7.

Mr. Olshak: The rationale for having a University Hearing Panel made up solely of students is a well established practice among colleges and universities to use different compositions of hearing boards, including all students. Most hearings, historically and currently, conducted at ISU are heard by all-student boards. This is not a departure in practice. Students that are selected to serve on the hearing panel have gone through multiple interview selection processes and are required to attend significant training sessions. In addition, students have expressed a very clear sense of fairness in having students on the other side of the table.

Senator White: Page 27, XI. E & F.

Mr. Olshak: There are a couple of different issues here. One is whether or not there ought to be notation on transcripts of disciplinary records. It is our position that a notation of disciplinary ineligibility to return to the institution is an academic notation. It does indeed state whether the student is academically eligible to attend ISU. Additionally, we feel that the University has a moral obligation to warn people about the types of students that have been told to leave the University.

Senator White: This sounds like one that may end up being a subject for greater discussion at the next meeting. We are just looking for clarification now.

Senator Kording: For clarification, right now, under current practice, if we did not make this particular revision, would there be any way that other institutions would be aware if we had a problem with a student?

Senator Mamarchev: No, not unless they contacted the SDRS here. That would just be totally happenstance.

Senator White: The final one is on page 29, XIV. A.

Mr. Olshak: In the case of determining if a student is financially dependent if a student does not apply for financial aid, other universities have instituted parental notification policies that address this issue and we are going to look at best practices.

Senator White: You may want to provide more detail on that at the next meeting. We really want to thank both committees for the hard work that they have done on this document. This was time consuming and detailed, but it was what I hoping that the committee would do--give us a real foundation for probing this document.

Senator Armstrong: I suggest that using the entire Senate as a subcommittee to work these things out is very inefficient. This parallel submission of documents to the Senate just doesn't work. It seems to me that we have a logistical problem that has not worked out as a result of the new organization of the Senate.

Senator Borg: I think it has been determined that we should get together, but I don't know if it has been agreed on who should initiate it.

Senator White: The two committees should try to get together with the Vice Presidential area and Mr. Olshak and synthesize as much of this as you can before the next meeting.

Senator Borg: Shall I initiate it?

Senator White: I would very much appreciate it. I do have one additional concern. The last section of this proposed Code is the Interpretation and Revision Section, but there is nothing in the language there that indicates that the final oversight for the Student Code is with the Academic Senate. I personally think that it is important and that it be said very clearly in this document.

Mr. Olshak: I am not aware of this being discussed prior to this meeting.

Senator Kording: I think that it is not in the current Code because other governing documents for the University specified that the President is the one who revises the document. It is not in the current version and that is why it is not in the proposed revisions now.

Senator White: It has certainly historically been the case that the Senate has had authority over the Student Code of Conduct. If for some reason it was not stated in the previous document, I think it should be stated in this document.

03.07.02.02 **Recommendations For the Following Information and Advisory Items**
(Academic Affairs Committee):

Information:

02.12.02.01 **College Level Examination Program Policy Revisions**

Advisory:

- 11.16.01.03A** *Dean's List Policy*
11.16.01.07A *Final Exam Policy*
11.16.01.08 *Grading Practice Policy*

Senator Borg: You can see noted on my memo concerning the Academic Affairs Committee's recommendations for five policies that one of those policies (the upgrade of web site policy to reflect the Baccalaureate Degree Document adopted by the Senate February 1999) has been taken care of by the Executive Committee. The four policies above were up for the three-year review. The cycling seems to be working very well. We found little of substance to do, but we appreciate the efforts of Senator Eric Thomas in revising these and making them clearer. The only one that the Senate needs to pass is the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Policy revisions and these are based on certain issues that are beyond the University's control.

02.12.02.02 *College Level Examination Program Policy Revisions*

Senator Eric Thomas: How Illinois State University has always handled the CLEP is that we determine a cut off score for passage on the examination based upon how students perform nationally. With the new exam, we don't have the data of what the cut off scores should be. The data is just not available. What we did in the catalog was basically make a change saying that we would not take CLEP test scores until we could establish a new proper passing level. Now we have come back after the fact to approve this officially. When we made the change in the catalog, the change was not made on the web site, which is also official policy. I would act in haste in taking action relative to this issue because we need to make sure that our web site is consistent with our catalog and I think that it is a straightforward issue.

Motion XXXIII-117: By Senator Lindblom, second by Senator Mitchell, to move the College Level Examination Program Policy revisions to an action item. The Senate unanimously approved the motion.

Motion XXXIII-118: By Senator Borg, second by Senator Armstrong, to approve the CLEP revisions.

Senator Ballard: Referring to the copy in our packets that has "University Undergraduate Catalog 2001-2002" written at the top, do we now have sufficient data that can warrant setting a score of 570 on Humanities, 610 on Natural Sciences and a score of 550 on Social Sciences and History, as referred to in number seven.

Senator Eric Thomas: No, we don't have the necessary data yet. It depends on when we can get sufficient information from the college board. They are collecting the information and it will be at least a year and perhaps as long as two years before we can have a large enough sample size to make a reliable judgment.

Senator Ballard: So, we are eliminating these tests for a couple of years?

Senator Eric Thomas: There are University proficiency exams in various courses. CLEP tests are used very sparingly by students, so it is not something that is heavily utilized. What you find used much more commonly are proficiency exams.

Senator Borg: The page Senator Ballard is referring to, item seven is only relevant for students who have taken the CLEP examinations prior to July 1, 2001. You are right that we are suspending this until we have enough information to make a determination for the new CLEP test.

Senator Eric Thomas: It is not our intent to do away with accepting credit under CLEP. We just want to be

able to define at what level we should accept that credit. The change in the test is what prompted all of this. We need a large enough sample size to determine student performance.

Senator Landau: Any norm referenced standardized test will have data and I don't understand why future administrations of the test need to be made in order for the distribution of data to be known to ISU. As soon as the test has been normed, means and standard deviations are available.

Senator Eric Thomas: I tried to be faithful to what the faculty of the University had done in the past. Every standardized test has norm referenced data and the college board can give us a cut off for both the old test and the new test; but in the past, the University did not follow that. It set its own cut off based upon student performance. Now if we want to change the way in which we do things, that's fine, but in the past, we did not accept the norm referenced standards.

Senator Landau: I don't understand the need for additional administrations. The data are available for the first administration of a new form of a test.

Senator Eric Thomas: CLEP is an individually administered exam. It is not like the ACT that is given nationwide. Therefore, you have to wait until enough students take the different individual exams to be able to have a large enough sample size to determine a cut off point. If it were the ACT where nationally all students took it, in six months or a year, you could have that sample size, but not so with CLEP because it is individualized.

Senator Landau: That answers my question.

Vote on Motion XXXIII-118: The CLEP revisions were unanimously approved.

Advisory Items:

11.16.01.03A Dean's List Policy

11.16.01.07A Final Exam Policy

11.16.01.09 Grading Practice Policy

Senator Borg: All of the suggestions the Academic Affairs Committee had for the three advisory items are included in the memo referring to these items in your packets. The Dean's List Policy was changed to update the names of units and to clarify what a dean's list is. For the Final Exam Policy, the editorial changes had to do with updating the names of units. No changes were made to the Grading Practice Policy.

Communications:

03.13.02.01 KNR Athletic Training Education Major Proposal

Approved by the Senate on the Consent Agenda March 28, 2002

Adjournment

Motion XXXIII-119: By Senator Mitchell, second by Senator Albrecht, 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>