

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**(Approved)****April 17, 2002****Volume XXXIII, No. 16*****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 April 3, 2002

Motion XXXIII-123: By Senator Mitchell, second by Senator Albrecht, to approve the Senate minutes of April 3, 2002. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks:

Senator White: As you are all aware, this is my last meeting as chair and I have a lot of thank yous, if you will indulge me for a few minutes. I certainly want to first thank the Senate secretary, Cynthia James, for her hard work over the last three years. She is really substantially responsible for the quality of work that I was able to do and I think that we owe her a round of applause. I really want to make a point also of thanking President Boschini and Provost Goldfarb for the way in which they have worked with me over the course of the last three years. It was really very constructive and actually a lot of fun working with them. I also want to thank the staffs of the President and Provost, Jill Call, Georgia Bennett and Nancy Hiltibidal, in particular, for being so kind to me on the fourth floor. I want to thank the deans as well. I also want to thank the members of this Senate and Senates over the last fifteen years. I will look back upon the years I have spent on the Senate as being my richest experiences here at Illinois State. I thank you all very much for the way in which you have worked with me and for the friendships I have because of the Senate. In relationship to tonight's business, I want to thank the Faculty Affairs Committee for the extraordinary job that they have done with the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Report. This report is one of the best reports I have seen in my time on the Senate and it in some ways brings me full circle. When I first joined the Senate, I thought that it might be a place where I could do something about non-tenure track faculty and their role within the University.

Vice Chairperson/Student Government Association President's Remarks:

Senator Bathauer: We have been busy these past few weeks transitioning and getting the newly-elected members acquainted with the student government. Some of the new students members are in the gallery and I wanted you all to recognize them. They will be seated on May 1st. To those of you not returning to the Senate, thank you for a great year and for those who are returning, we are looking forward to working with you all. The SGA will be electing its assembly officers this evening after the faculty caucus, so we will forward those names onto the Senate, as those are the students who will sit on the Executive Committee of the Senate.

Administrators' Remarks:

- **President Boschini:** Tomorrow evening at 7:00 p.m. in the Student Center, we will have the installation of our newest Distinguished Professor, Dr. Butler.
- **Provost Al Goldfarb: Excused Absence**

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

Committee Reports

- *Academic Affairs Committee*

Senator Borg: The Academic Affairs Committee did not meet this week. However, I would like to thank the committee members for the work that they have done. I am especially pleased with the student involvement. This has been the best group of active participants that I have seen in my years on the Senate.

- *Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:*

Senator Wells: We met this evening to just to tie up some loose ends and to pass on recommendations to the next iteration of the Administrative Affairs Committee. I would also like to thank the members of the committee, particularly the student members, who participated very impressively.

- *Faculty Affairs Committee*

Senator Deutsch: Faculty Affairs met this evening to finalize the Report on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. We have worked very hard on that, but most of the credit should go to Senator El-Zanati. It is coming up as an Advisory Item this evening. I would like to thank the members of the committee for their hard work and I would like to say farewell to Senators Chang and El-Zanati who are leaving the Senate and the Faculty Affairs Committee.

- *Planning and Finance Committee*

Senator Kurtz: Planning and Finance has no report. However, I, too, should like to take the opportunity to thank the members of the committee for their work, particularly during the fall semester. It was a particularly difficult and even brutal semester. We were meeting two hours every week during the entire semester and the eyes of the campus were on us. I think the members of the committee worked extremely hard, with good humor and even I would say courage to carry out our charge. I want to extend particular thanks to the Provost's staff, Georgia Bennett, Jan Shane and Betty Chapman, who took notes for us and who kept track of the oftentimes extremely complex discussion. Also, thank you to our student member, Adam Corelli, who attended every single meeting and was always a voice of reason and sanity. On a personal note, I would like to extend my thanks to my good friend and colleague, Curt White. It has been an enormous pleasure working together over the years and we have stood together in many a difficult time.

- *Rules Committee*

Senator Reid: The Rules Committee met this evening at 6:00 p.m. We, hopefully, made final revisions to the academic freedom and ethics document, which we have been working on all semester. I also want to thank our committee. It has been an enormous amount of work this year and there is a lot that we didn't get done; but we spent the semester meeting every week working on the integrity in research and the academic freedom documents. These are really important documents. The academic freedom document will come before the Senate in the fall.

Illinois Board of Higher Education-Faculty Advisory Council Report

Senator Crothers: We met on April 5 at Rend Lake Community College. The meeting was mostly dominated by a discussion on how the University of Phoenix has come to Illinois and what implications it has. One of the IBHE staff members joined us to talk about how programs are approved in the State of Illinois. Private and out-of-state institutions, who wish to offer programs in Illinois, are essentially evaluated under Illinois law as kind of a consumer protection process. The underlying variable is 'do you get the education you are paying for?' Once they meet that standard, there is very little to prevent a program from coming to Illinois. Toyota National University is seeking to offer programming in Illinois. It seeks to admit 20 students a year, has an endowment of \$100 million and is likely to be approved. The Career Education Corporation is apparently buying private campuses in Illinois and offering programs in Illinois. In some Illinois programs, private schools are 'grandfathered' and don't have to go through any approval process at all. The city colleges of Chicago have privatized almost all of their support functions through, interestingly, a contract with American Express. The competition is pretty intense. Also, apparently, there is the problem of buying fake degrees on the internet; some of these degrees are actually from Illinois State University. The State is trying to tighten those standards. The next FAC meeting will be at Eastern Illinois University at the end of this month and future senator Ken Jerich will be my substitute there.

Action Items:

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

Senator Reid: I would like to ask Pat O'Rourke, Chair of the University Research Council, and Nancy Latham, the Assistant Director of Research, to join us in this discussion. We went over the document in reasonable detail at the last Senate meeting, so I am not going to repeat it. If you have any questions about the content of the document, please just ask those questions.

Motion XXXIII-124: By Senator Reid, second by Senator Crumpler, to accept the proposed Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Policy.

Senator White: Can you clarify where this policy will be located?

Senator Reid: I believe that it goes into the Policies and Procedures Manual.

Senator White: Is there a section of policies and procedures that is relevant to research conduct or ethics in the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Policy?

Professor O'Rourke: There is a current policy on misconduct.

Senator White: Is that policy in the Policies and Procedures Manual?

Ms. Latham: No, the current policy is not in the manual, but that is where it should be.

Senator White: Does this document replace a section of the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Policy?

Ms. Latham: No, the current policy is very brief and refers to Ethics and Grievance Policy and the Student Code of Conduct.

Senator White: The Senate should understand that should this policy be approved, it can be found at a later date in the Policies and Procedures Manual. I do want to comment on the document. It seems that definitions of misconduct lend themselves to certain areas and to certain disciplines more than to others. What would a

failure of integrity and research in scholarly activities in the fine arts look like or does this document simply not relate to the fine arts?

Senator Reid: Fabrication of data could apply to the social sciences or the hard sciences. Plagiarism could apply to all areas.

Senator Borg: In the fine arts, there are distinct areas in which we evaluate ourselves. One is more traditional, research-oriented writing in which we share all of the responsibilities that the humanities generally do. The other area is called creative activity, to which I think Senator White is referring. To the extent that creative activity is not precisely research, I do not think that we have these definitions clearly embodied in the evaluation of a fine arts.

Senator White: Since we do usually group creative activities and research together in other documents, are we consciously excluding creative activities from the scope of this document?

Prof. O'Rourke: I consider research to be a creative activity and many times, what we call creative activity includes research. Over the last year, this document was made available to those that do research and those that are involved in creative activities and there were no specific problems brought up that would not be covered by this document. If there is such a category, then we should consider adding it to the document.

Senator Reid: There is always going to be an interpretative problem here, particularly in creative work, in terms of quoting. It is going to be up to the judgment of the committee.

Senator White: It might have been forward thinking for this document to reflect that.

Senator Orlando: I think all of these concerns could be addressed simply by stating that if it can be proven that there has been a copyright infringement, then it is obviously a violation of the policy.

Vote on Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Policy: The Senate unanimously approved the policy.

01.29.02.02 *Student Code of Conduct-Draft 9 (SGA and Academic Affairs Committee)*

01.29.02.02A *Recommendations from Academic Affairs Committee*

Senator Bathauer: We have looked at the changes to draft 8 of the document and have accepted those changes, which appear in draft 9.

Motion XXXIII-125: By Senator Bathauer, second by Senator Albrecht, to approve draft 9 of the Student Code of Conduct.

Senator Borg: We did arrive at a satisfactory agreement on the changes to the document. On page 19 of draft 9, the word "not", the third word on the page, should be deleted.

Vote on Student Code of Conduct-Draft 9: The Senate unanimously approved the Code.

Provost Search Committee Student Election (SGA)

Motion XXXIII-126: By Senator Crothers, second by Senator Mitchell, to elect the student nominees to the Provost Search Committee. The Senate unanimously elected the slate of nominees. Students elected: Carolyn Bathauer, Ryan Meister and Emily Hoerr.

Information Items:**03.04.02.01 SGA Resolution for Benefit of Better Grade Policy (SGA)****03.04.02.01A Repetition of Course Requirements Policy Proposal (Academic Affairs Committee)**

Senator White: The SGA resolution for the Benefit of Better Grade Policy was forwarded to Academic Affairs Committee and that committee has proposed specific language for a policy.

Senator Borg: This has come about as a result of the students endorsing "a benefit of a better grade policy" resolution. I propose that we change the current Repetition of Course Requirement Policy in the undergraduate catalog. Proposed revisions to that policy have come from the Academic Standards Committee and the Undergraduate Studies Office.

Senator Reid: The SGA resolution proposed the better grade, but are you proposing the latter of the two grades?

Senator Borg: That is correct.

Senator Albrecht: The entire Academic Affairs Committee is in support of the changes to the Repetition of Course Requirements Policy. The students are very much in favor of these changes.

Motion XXXIII-127: By Senator Albrecht, second by Senator Lindblom, to move the item to action. The Senate approved the motion by a two-thirds majority. Those that voted against the motion were Senators Razaki and Kurtz.

Motion XXXIII-128: By Senator Borg, second by Senator Lindblom, to approve the proposed policy.

Senator Razaki: I am leaning against this motion because I think it will lead to a deterioration in the quality of the academic standards on campus. Students might enroll in a course and give up rather quickly knowing that there is a second chance with no real penalty to be paid for the first try. There should be consequences to receiving a bad grade the first time a student takes a course so that they will do their utmost to do well.

Senator Albrecht: The reason that SGA first wanted the benefit of the better grade is because students might not want to try as hard the second time they take a course. However, we have accepted the benefit of the second grade proposal. By having this policy in place, students are forced to do better if they want to improve their grade.

Senator Bathauer: I think that students would be less likely to give up early the first time, because if they fail that course or need to repeat the course, they have to pay for it again.

Senator Fowles: I think to have early mistakes follow them is punitive and not beneficial to their academic success in the long run. It affects their acceptance to grad schools.

Senator Kurtz: I share Senator Razaki's concern about the impact of the policy on academic quality and rigor. Do we know what the impact of this kind policy will be financially and on staffing? If we face even a slight increase in the number of students who are repeating Gen Ed courses, we are going to be in a situation that leaves the institution exceedingly ill placed to handle.

Senator Albrecht: A student can retake a class now; the grades just get averaged together, so I don't

understand your concern about the overcrowding of Gen Ed classes.

Senator Lindblom: I strongly favor this proposal. I believe that allowing the students to repeat a course and get the second grade is actually more rigorous because it encourages harder work the second time. I think that keeping the first grade discourages them from trying again and if we continue to build up reasons for students not to try again, we are increasing the unfortunate role that colleges and universities play of weeding out students. I think that weeding out occurs very often for reasons that are non-academic and have much more to do with class, background and social status than academic ability.

Senator Kurtz: If this goes forward, I think it should have a sunset proviso in it that states that the University will reexamine the policy after three years.

Friendly Amendment

Senator Crothers: I am in favor of this proposal, but would the mover and seconder consider accepting a review of the policy after three years as a friendly amendment.

Senator Borg: The University policies are now on a regular three-year review process.

Senator Crothers: Many of those policies that come through the Senate get a passing glance, so would there we a better way to structure that?

Senator Borg: I would object to that characterization. The Academic Affairs Committee this last year took seriously the policies that were given to it and we actually did rewrite two of them, so I don't see that as an issue.

Senator Kurtz: My experience on the Senate has been that we look at policies and reexamine the rhetoric of the policy. There has not been much in the way of data collection in order to see how a policy has worked institutionally.

Senator White: It depends on the policy. In many cases, we are just being asked for advice. There is no limit to the nature of the review.

The friendly amendment was not accepted.

Senator Thomas: Our current policy on handling grades in repeated courses was adopted by the Senate in 1986. Prior to that, we used the procedure that is currently proposed. At the time that the change was made, the frequency of repeated courses was about 6%. Currently, the frequency of repeated courses is approximately 4% of our approximate total of 100,000 course enrollments. I would not say that it was all attributable to the change in how the GPA is calculated, because at the same time the change was made in 1986, a concurrent change was made that limited the number of times a student could take a course to two.

Senator Reid: What would be the economic impact on the University if there were an increase from 4% to 6%?

Senator Thomas: Given the total number of our course enrollments, it is hard to say exactly, but I am not sure that there would be a noticeable impact.

Senator Brown: This policy encourages academic risk taking. For a grade to be accurate, it must reflect the

student's learning and the work that the student has done. An averaged grade does not do that.

Senator Sass: A lot of students go through a learning process while at college. This allows students to fix mistakes that they have made and to show that they really received an understanding of the course material.

Senator McNaught: Had such a policy been in place when I repeated a course, I would have certainly tried harder to get a better grade rather than just a passing grade.

Motion XXXIII-129: Senator Sass called the question. There was an objection to calling the question and the motion was not approved.

Senator Reid: I want to give my strongest support to this proposal. I am really proud of what the students and faculty have said. What we are here for is to encourage students to do their best and to try to improve. I think that there is a risk of a substantial expense from this change in policy, but I think we have to put the academic goal ahead of the financial one.

Motion XXXIII-130: Senator Orlando moved the question. This was seconded by Senator Sass. This motion is non-debatable and requires a two-thirds majority to pass. The motion passed. Senator Crothers voted against the motion.

Vote on Approval of Policy: The Senate approved the proposed Repetition of Course Requirements Policy. Those senators who voted against the policy were: Senators Kurtz, Magnabosco, Kwitkowski, Razaki and Dave Thomas.

Advisory Items:

04.12.02.01 NTTF Report (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator El-Zanati: There are a few minor editorial changes that need to be made in the report. On page 13, item 13, in the last sentence, there are two words missing. The sentence should read, "This is a matter of some urgency." In the conclusion section on that same page in the middle of the fourth line, the word "promote" is missing. The sentence should read, "Implementing a sensible policy guiding the use of NTTF at Illinois State University is a means to protect and promote the high quality of academic instruction." I think that Table F within the report (copies also distributed) reveals a great deal about the issue of non-tenure track faculty at Illinois State University. It is an extremely complicated issue. There are no easy solutions.

Senator Crothers: I would like to thank the committee and Senator El-Zanati for addressing what is an extremely difficult and sensitive issue. Was there a discussion within the committee regarding "trailing spouses"? Trailing spouses is a phenomenon in which you hire a faculty on a tenure line and also try to accommodate the spouse, who could also appropriately be hired, but there is no tenure line available.

Senator Deutsch: We did not isolate that particular type of case. It raises issues other than those concerning NTT faculty.

Senator Crothers: My thinking was particularly in relation to the five-year rule. There may be a circumstance under which it is inappropriate or impossible to hire another tenure line. Under that condition, I was curious about what implications this document might have.

Senator Deutsch: I don't think it has any direct implications except, as you say, because of the five-year rule, it might be necessary for one party to find another job.

Senator El-Zanati: Last year, the Senate endorsed a recommendation allowing the five-year rule to be set aside under special circumstances to allow us to deal with such issues.

Senator Reid: Many people may not realize that the five-year rule maximum only applies to people with a terminal degree in their field, which is a reasonably small percentage of the NTTs. There is no limit on the other NTTF. Also, where is this document going?

Senator White: This document is a report only. It is purely advisory and if there is anything to come of this report, we will have to see to that. This is not a policy document, but an effort by a committee to think through a problem and make recommendations.

Senator Reid: Would there be actions that we might take?

Senator White: There could be recommendations coming out of this document that are then sent to the Executive Committee of the Senate and then forwarded to the appropriate committee for action related to a specific University document. The other route would be to do a Sense of the Senate Resolution emphasizing certain parts of this document.

Senator Reid: So this report should be reconsidered by Faculty Affairs next fall in terms of actions to be taken?

Senator White: I certainly hope so. This document is not just about the conditions of employment of NTT faculty; it is about the threatened conditions of employment for tenure-track faculty and goes to the heart of whether the University is living up to its commitments to General Education and *Educating Illinois*. To not follow up on this report is to our own peril.

Senator El-Zanati: For the report, we chose to focus on full-time equivalent faculty, students and staff at the University rather than simply head counts. We believe that is more telling. We also chose to focus on the years 1995 through 2001. Referring to Table F, T/TTF refers to tenure/tenure-track faculty. Looking at the T/TTF totals, you will see that there was a change of 0.3% between 1995 and 2001. If you look at the NTTF totals, which refer to full-time equivalents as well, the number has increased by 86.6%. The total number of all FTE faculty has increased by 15.6%. Figure 1, which is on the page after Table F, shows the proportion of tenure track faculty of the full-time equivalent faculty. In 1995, it was 82.2% and has decreased each year, going down to 71.3% in 2001. With this trend, this proportion will continue to decrease and, based on the data, by the year 2007, tenure-track faculty will represent less than 60% of the total FTE faculty. The problem is that the proportion of tenure-track faculty is decreasing and the numbers of NTTF are increasing at an alarming rate.

Senator White: Can we relate this growth in the need for NTTF to the beginning of the Gen Ed program?

Senator El-Zanati: I can't say that with certainty. The survey of the department chairpersons, which is summarized in the report, and the information contained in Table F are extremely important in understanding the facts of the situation. Gen Ed has created a huge problem for many departments.

Senator White: I think that is worth emphasizing, especially for the students, that when the General Education program was approved, there was a great deal of conversation about the philosophy of that program. One of the most important issues that came out of those discussions was that tenure-track professors

would deliver the vast majority of the General Education instruction. If we are seeing that the need for instruction for that program has been filled by allowing NTT areas to grow, then we have a fundamental discrepancy with the original philosophy. Courses that the tenure-track are no longer teaching because they are now teaching Gen Ed courses are being filled by non-tenure track faculty. That is a fundamental flaw in our programmatic state

Senator Reid: What this means for students is that more and more of your courses are being taught by NTT faculty who, in most cases, have only been at the University for a few years.

Senator Borg: As I recall, the philosophy of Gen Ed made no statement about tenure-track faculty. The statement was, in essence, that the courses would be taught by full-time faculty as opposed to part-time or temporary faculty.

Senator Reid: Actually, 'temporary', at that time, was the term used for non-tenure track faculty, so the statement was made that they wanted to make an effort to not have NTT faculty teaching those courses.

Senator White: It is important for the students to understand that the faculty are not just worrying about their own condition. We are principally worried about the quality of education at this University.

Motion XXXIII-131: By Senator Deutsch, second by Senator Hampton, to approve a Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing recommendation 7 on page 12 of the report. Recommendation 7: "The University must initiate in FY03 a five-year plan to increase both the number and proportion of tenure-track lines."

Senator White: This resolution asks the Senate and administration to create a five-year plan to address the issues as they are reflected in this report.

The Senate unanimously approved the resolution.

Communications:

NCAA Report (Jude Boyer)

Dr. Jude Boyer, Chairperson of the NCAA Certification Steering Committee, presented the Senate information on the NCAA self-study certification process, which began last fall. The committee's findings were that ISU's Intercollegiate Athletic Program is in substantial conformity with the current NCAA operating principles and standards. The final report, along with appendices, may be found on the web site accessible through the Athletic Department's home page. Copies are available as well in many administrative and academic offices across campus, including the SGA and Senate offices.

An onsite evaluation by a peer review team will be conducted from June 4 through June 7. At the end of the evaluation process, the NCAA certification committee will make a final finding of certification, certification with conditions or not certified. Dr. Boyer may be reached by e-mail at jboyer1@ilstu.edu if there are questions about the certification process or the final report.

Sense of the Senate Resolution

Senator Crothers: As Senator White has indicated, this is his last meeting and I felt that it was particularly appropriate to honor him for his many years of service on the Senate and as chair of the Senate.

Motion XXXIII-132: By Senator Crothers, second by Senator Hampton to approve the following Sense of the Senate Resolution: "The Academic Senate of Illinois State University thanks Senator Curtis White for his

many years of service on the Senate and for his distinguished service as chairperson from 1999-2002." The Senate unanimously approved the resolution and gave Senator White a standing ovation.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIII-133: By Senator Albrecht, second by Senator Mitchell, 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>