

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, November 5, 2003**  
*(Approved)*

**Volume XXXV, No. 5**

***Call to Order***

Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

***Roll Call***

Senator Borg called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of October 22, 2003***

**Motion XXXV-28:** By Senator Roberson, seconded by Senator Dutton, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of October 22, 2003. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Chairperson's Remarks:***

**Senator Crothers:** Reported on the status of former Senator Jack Howard, Department of Management and Quantitative Methods. His military deployment has been extended at least through June 2004. Senator Crothers also reported on a former student, who is also among the many young soldiers deployed in the conflict. Her unit has completed its mission; unfortunately, the unit will be retrained as a force protection unit and redeployed at least through next April.

***Student Government Association President/Student Body President's Remarks: No Report.***

***President's Remarks:***

**President Bowman:** There continues to be strong interest in attendance at the University. We have had record attendance at some recent open houses. To date, we have received just over 3,000 freshman applications and have admitted just over 1,300 students for fall 04. The ACT for the admitted profile is 25.1. Minority applications are running about 5% ahead of where they were this time last year.

We have raised just under \$70 million in the Capital Campaign. There have been a number of campaign events recently. The College of Fine Arts had a concert series that was named in honor of the first Dean of Fine Arts. We had an individual on campus today who has pledged \$3 million to the institution. There is a donor dinner scheduled for Saturday evening in recognition of those who have contributed to the campaign. There are a number of cultivation events being planned.

I have continued my meetings with legislators around the state and I have been emphasizing several themes during those meetings. First and foremost, the institution cannot absorb additional cuts. Tuition cap legislation that was introduced a year ago will probably resurface and I reiterated how critical it is for the institution to retain flexibility on tuition. In addition, we have talked about income fund retention and I have expressed thanks for the capital support that we have been given, but also indicated that we have significant capital and renovation needs. The Lieutenant Governor has accepted our invitation to visit the campus on November 20. He is scheduled to speak in the Old Main Room at 5:30 p.m. I encourage you to attend that lecture.

I received an e-mail last week from an individual who was concerned that the FY05 URG program had been eliminated. I want to assure everyone that that has not happened and, in fact, there has been no discussion at

the cabinet level about eliminating that program. There are ongoing conversations about what would happen if the institution faced a catastrophic cut, which I don't believe will happen; certainly URGs are one of many revenue streams that have been discussed. I understand how important that program is. The institution, in comparison to institutions our size, really offers limited support for faculty research. These funds are important for retaining and recruiting young faculty and in general supporting our research enterprise. Since this misunderstanding occurred, the Provost and I have discussed URGs. We both believe that the program should continue in its present form and that there should be a discussion about any opportunities that we could embark upon that would improve it.

The *Pantagraph* reported that the Riverboat Casino license might not be sold, which will leave a \$3 million deficit in the state budget. There are some additional costs that are in this budget that were not built in. They include some Department of Corrections over-expenditures in terms of overtime, as well as \$6 million in costs associated with raising the minimum wage. The thinking now is that the federal windfall money from 03 and 04 that was intended for Medicaid costs will likely be used to cover the Riverboat license loss. There is support in Springfield for passing a hospital provider tax and that could be used to leverage more Medicaid money from the federal government. There are also some bills that would put additional fees into place. At this point, the best information is that it is too early to speculate on what the General Assembly might do. It is likely that it will wait until spring before it takes any action.

Senator Ken Jerich has been involved in the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council statewide group in a dialogue on faculty productivity. The IBHE is beginning a conversation about faculty productivity and FAC has been asked to weigh in on that issue.

**Senator Razaki:** Is the average ACT of 25.1 expected to go up or down?

**President Bowman:** We expect it to go up because we have such a strong applicant pool.

**Senator Rinker:** What was the average ACT last year?

**President Bowman:** It was 23.4 for the students enrolled.

**Senator Crothers:** Won't it probably decrease as we admit more students?

**President Bowman:** You are correct; it may decrease.

**Senator Koutsky:** How does ISU compare with other schools in the state with the ranking of ACT scores?

**President Bowman:** Only U of I in Urbana has a stronger freshman admission score than we do.

***Provost's Remarks:***

**Provost Presley:** The reaccreditation by NCATE went extremely well. In its exit interview, NCATE reported that all standards were met and that there were no areas in need of improvement; in fact, they used the term "exemplary". ISU may be recommended as an exemplar next year. The team is going to recommend that ISU be a site for training NCATE teams. The Unit Accreditation Board will discuss their recommendations in the spring.

***Vice President of Student Affairs' Remarks: Excused Absence***

## ***Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks: No Report***

### ***Committee Reports:***

#### ***Academic Affairs Committee***

**Senator Armstrong:** A complete report of the General Education Program Five-Year Assessment will be placed at the reserve desk in Milner Library to increase its access. The committee discussed the revisions to the Council for Teacher Education Bylaws as well as the guidelines for school designation. We will bring those things before the Senate fairly shortly.

**Senator Crothers:** The Senate will discuss General Education in the spring; he strongly encouraged Senate members to review the assessment, particularly a number of the appendices, which are deeply informative.

#### ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

**Senator Hampton:** Administrative Affairs again discussed consensual relations this evening. Senator Rinker will represent the committee's point of view at the upcoming Senate Executive Committee meeting. The committee will bring the Flag Policy to the Senate again soon. The committee's next agenda items will be the Administrator Selection Policy and the University Alcohol Policy.

#### ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

**Senator Wylie:** One of the committee's charges was to look at the textbook royalties issue. After doing some research and looking at the policies we already have, we have determined that there is no need for another policy. I had responses from five deans who stated that there was no problem. We could find no issues and are, therefore, recommending that no policy be written on this.

**Senator Crothers:** I believe the initial concern was whether or not it was appropriate for faculty to assign their own texts in classes.

**Senator Wylie:** There are some policies that address some other sorts of things, but the textbook issue is not a part of those and hasn't been a problem. We don't see the need to write a policy.

**Senator Armstrong:** From where did the impetus to examine this issue arise?

**Senator Crothers:** A particular question was raised by a faculty member and submitted to me. The Executive Committee assigned it to Faculty Affairs for consideration.

#### ***Planning and Finance Priorities Subcommittee***

**Senator Kurtz:** The Planning and Finance Priorities Subcommittee discussed the request that we send forward *Educating Illinois* to the Senate this semester in order for the Senate to give its endorsement of the document. Our subcommittee concluded that *Educating Illinois* is not quite ready to bring forward to the full Senate for consideration. We also discussed our potential recommendations on the prioritization of the 16 action items in *Educating Illinois*.

#### ***Planning and Finance Majors and Sequences Approval Subcommittee***

**Senator Plantholt:** The Majors and Sequences Approval Subcommittee is looking at the question of new proposals—making sure that their budgets are accurate and in line with the University mission. We discussed with Dr. Betty Chapman and Professor Joe Trefzger what additional questions need to be posed when these proposals are going through and who would have the primary responsibility for checking them out.

### ***Planning and Finance Program Review Subcommittee***

**Senator Borg:** The committee dealing with review of academic programs met and agreed that we are ready to forward changes in the Blue Book concerning membership of the Academic Planning Committee and a few items concerning its function. We are ready to forward the revisions to the full Planning and Finance Committee, the Rules Committee and subsequently to the full Senate.

### ***Rules Committee***

**Senator Coliz:** The Rules Committee has agreed on a draft of the Consensual Relations Policy, but still needs to reconcile its proposal with the Administrative Affairs Committee. Senator Coliz will attend the upcoming Senate Executive Committee meeting to discuss the status of the policy.

**Agenda Change:** Senator Armstrong requested that the information item on the Senate agenda come before the action items. There were no objections to the change in the agenda.

### ***Information Item:***

#### ***10.01.03.02 Food Industry Science Sequence Proposal (Academic Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Armstrong:** The Food Industry Science Sequence Proposal was removed from the Senate's web site Consent Agenda. One of the questions was whether all of the courses in this sequence were approved and being taught. The answer is yes. The second question was how an increase in enrollment, which was anticipated, would be dealt with. The Department of Agriculture is under its targeted enrollment and so there is room for additional students without an increase in faculty.

**Motion XXXV-29:** By Senator Armstrong, seconded by Senator Dutton, to move the Food Industry Science Sequence Proposal to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Motion XXXV-30:** By Senator Armstrong to accept the Food Industry Science Sequence Proposal as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

### ***Action Items:***

#### ***College of Fine Arts Dean Search Committee Student Representatives Election (SGA President)***

The nominees for student representation on the College of Fine Arts Dean Search Committee were Antonello Di Benedetto, Elisabet Varga and Moriki Tomihara. By ballot, the Senate elected Antonello Di Benedetto and Elisabet Varga.

#### ***10.02.03.01A Repetition of Course Requirements Policy Revisions (Academic Affairs Committee)***

**Motion XXXV-31:** By Senator Armstrong to approve the revisions to the Repetition of Course Requirements Policy.

**Senator Jerich:** The revised policy says that courses can be repeated; might they be repeated 10 times, 15 times?

**Senator Armstrong:** That is theoretically possible. We would hope that the approval would not be given unless there was some extraordinary circumstance. Students must seek approval for more than one repeat.

**Senator Plantholt:** I assume with this new policy, more students will want to repeat a course. If a student tries to register for a class and has an X, will the system not let them register?

**Senator Armstrong:** No, it would not stop them.

**Senator Crothers:** As I understand the process, you can retake it once without approval. It is the subsequent repeats that need approval.

**Senator Armstrong:** Actually, the policy as revised says with their advisor's approval.

**Senator Crothers:** So, you are going to need a waiver from the advisor even for the first repeat?

**Senator Armstrong:** No, it would not actually require a waiver, just their advisor's approval. There is no way to actually check up on that.

**Senator Plantholt:** At the time when they are supposed to have an advisor's approval, would there be an automatic block in the computer?

**Senator Armstrong:** No.

**Senator Plantholt:** So, what would happen if a student registers for it?

**Senator Armstrong:** Nothing.

**Senator Crothers:** But, would it not be the case that when they have their graduation audit, if they had not had the waiver, their graduation might not be approved?

**Senator Armstrong:** After the first repeat, it gets blocked; but we were talking about the first time you repeat a course.

**Senator Plantholt:** So, eventually, it gets blocked.

**Senator Armstrong:** Yes. There actually has not been a significant change in withdrawals from courses since 1990 when the current policy was put into place. That resulted in a 50 to 75% reduction in the number of withdrawals and repeats.

**Senator Kurtz:** I am a little dubious about the advisor's approval. I am assuming you are referring to the academic advisor?

**Senator Armstrong:** Yes, a departmental advisor or an academic advisor in the University College.

**Senator Kurtz:** Those academic advisors, in my experience, differ enormously in the amount of knowledge they have about the actual implications of letting students in and departmental staffing. I can see this as being extremely problematic if you have high-demand Gen Ed courses that academic advisors are allowing students into without any kind of oversight from someone who actually has responsibility for budgeting.

**Senator Armstrong:** Presently, there is no oversight at all. Students need no permission to repeat a course once.

**Senator Hampton:** Could someone else more appropriately approve course repeats?

**Senator Armstrong:** There are all manner of options. No one, in the Graduate School at least, could ever

remember any request coming forward so that is the reason it was dropped and left with the University Registrar.

**President Bowman:** Senator Kurtz, I think you are referring to whether a U-College advisor could approve an override for a department's course.

**Senator Kurtz:** Not necessarily. It doesn't seem to me, particularly when our budgets are so extraordinary tight, that we want academic advisors letting students into courses with no oversight whatsoever by the people that actually hold the purse strings. I personally would not want a student repeating a course for the third or fourth time without my knowing about it.

**President Bowman:** The system would ask for your department advisor's authorization of the override.

**Senator Kurtz:** My question is, is that really the most appropriate person?

**Motion XXXV-32:** By Senator Kurtz, seconded by Senator Hampton, that department chairpersons approve course repetitions rather the students' advisors.

**Senator Fowles:** Are you wanting to say that every second and third repeat has to be approved by the department chair? Do department chairs think that is reasonable?

**Senator Kurtz:** I want to do it. If this goes through, I would tell our department advisor that those had to come to me.

**Senator Barone:** The current policy requires the approval by the Undergraduate Studies Office, so this is actually a step backwards in terms of approval. Obviously, the other part of this policy is that the previous grade doesn't count. I agree with Senator Kurtz. My preference would be, though, to have the student's advisor review it first and make the recommendation, because often at that level, these things can get resolved. I would certainly want the advisor's opinion on this.

**Friendly Amendment:** By Senator Barone that repeats be approved by the department chairperson on the recommendation of the student's advisor. Senators Kurtz and Hampton accepted the friendly amendment.

**Senator Bowman:** I think that having the chair weigh in is consistent with our other policies on things like substitution waivers for courses. Really, to clean up the language, I think you should take the academic advisor out of the document and let it rest with the chair.

**Senator Rinker:** By adding a department chair and our academic advisor, how many more hoops do students have to jump through to repeat a course?

**Senator Crothers:** With the proposal as revised, we are adding one.

**Senator Rinker:** So, that's two, the advisor and the chair. Will the department chair have the time to deal with such requests?

**Senator Crothers:** It's a fair question, but it is their job.

**Senator Rinker:** For clarification, is it just the department chair's decision or is it only upon the

recommendation of the academic advisor.

**Senator Crothers:** With the revised draft, it is the department chair's decision upon the recommendation of the advisor, but that language is sufficiently vague in that a chair can overturn an advisor's recommendation.

**Senator Rice:** It is not a problem of understanding the policy but of collaboration between the department chair and advisors. I feel that the advisors should be knowledgeable enough about what is going on in their departments and be communicating with their chairs enough that they should be able to make the decision without going to the department chair.

**Senator Foster:** There are times when department chairs are inaccessible to students, especially when they are not in their own major. Is this really an accessible path for students?

**Friendly Amendment:** By Senator Jerich to replace "department chairperson" with "department chairperson or designee". The friendly amendment was accepted by Senators Kurtz and Barone.

**Senator Fazel:** When we are talking about the department chair, is it the department chair that offers the course or the department chair in which the student is a member?

**Senator Crothers:** It would be the department offering the course.

**Senator Fazel:** But the advisor for the student may belong to a different department and so the communication may not be there.

**Senator Rice:** It is not easy to contact the chair of a department. You call and send e-mails and they are not returned. You may not think it is a big deal to get that approval from the chair, but it is very difficult.

**Senator Garrison:** If we left it to the advisor, could the department chair make the policy that the advisor had to go to the chair before granting an override. Then we could leave it up to each department on how they wanted to do it instead of forcing all departments to do it that way.

**Senator Crothers:** When you are dealing with advisors dealing with students in their own departments, that process seems quite easy. The problem emerges when you are dealing with an advisor from one department and a chairperson in another.

**Senator Fowles:** Would the student's advisor be the one responsible for contacting the department chair in another department?

**Senator Crothers:** That, in my opinion, would be true.

**Senator Reid:** It is not at all clear in the document to which advisor you are referring. If it is your intention that they must go to the chair of the department in which the course is being offered, then we had better include that.

**Friendly Amendment:** By Senator Reid that course repetitions would be approved the department chairperson or designee of the department offering the course on the recommendation of the student's advisor. Senators Barone and Kurtz accepted the friendly amendment.

**Senator Razaki:** It would be very difficult for the department to have control over the number of students and the courses being offered, because that control would pass to advisors of perhaps other departments. Ultimately, the control has to lie in the hands of the chair of the department offering the course.

**Senator Barone:** It is sometimes hard to come up with a solution on the floor if the committee's recommendation does not seem to be working. My preference would be to send this back to committee.

**Motion XXXV-33:** By Senator Kurtz, seconded by Senator Jerich, to send the proposal back to the Academic Affairs Committee for revision.

**Senator Fowles:** What other problems are there with this policy other than the ones that have been addressed by friendly amendments?

**Senator Crothers:** Perhaps the committee could survey the department chairpersons on their opinion of the approval process.

The Senate, by majority, approved the motion to return the proposal to committee. Those senators voting no were Senators Fowles, Hampton, Armstrong, Pereira, Fazel, Darden, Woods, Chinderle, Rice and Garrison.

**President Bowman:** In response to Senator Rice, if you encounter a department chair or anyone on this campus who is unresponsive to a student's request, please let the Provost or me know.

**Senator Rice:** Thank you very much.

***10.16.03.01A College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws Revisions (Rules Committee)***

**Motion XXXV-34:** By Senator Coliz to approve the revisions to the College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws. The committee feels that we need to give great deference to the College Councils and only in extreme cases do we think we would have a problem with their changes. There was only one with this particular set of bylaws; the council deleted the limitation of the number of committees on which an individual within the college could serve. We did not approve that deletion. Everything else that the College Council recommended, we approved.

**Senator Crothers:** I requested clarification regarding some language in Appendix B, section 3A, regarding who controls the nomination process. The question emerged about why in some cases it appears nominations can be done however the department wants; but in other cases the nominations seem to be structured by the College Elections Committee, which led to a nonsensical situation in my college last year. I see no language in this document responding to that.

**Professor Chris Horvath, CAS College Council Chairperson:** I spoke to the Chair of the College Elections Committee about the language in the first sentence in Appendix B, 3A: "The committee will ordinarily supervise elections conducted by the college, though special rules for particular elections may be established." It is her view that that was a particular election in need of special rules and thus special rules were established. The rest of the document would apply unless the Chair of the Elections Committee deems it a special case.

**Senator Crothers:** Is there language in the College Election Committee guidelines that specify when they can declare special circumstances?



**Professor Horvath:** There is not. On another issue, Senator Adams asked me about non-tenure track faculty. I was unclear about the status of the eligibility of non-tenure track faculty within the college. It is the case that NTT faculty are ineligible to serve on the College Council, though they are eligible to serve on some college committees. If you pass these bylaws tonight, I will establish a bylaws review committee and ask them to address this issue this year and bring a recommendation back to the College Council.

**Friendly Amendment:** By Senator Reid to reverse the words “special” and “particular” in Appendix B, Section 3A, so that the sentence now reads “particular rules for special elections”. Senator Coliz accepted the Friendly Amendment.

**Senator Crothers:** I would not accept this document, even with Senator Reid’s friendly amendment; it needs far better specification.

**Senator Reid:** We need a very careful definition of what “special” is.

**Senator Razaki:** If there is no specification of what is “special”, then the person in charge of the elections can deem any election as special and impose his/her own rules and regulations. The language about special rules should be stricken.

**Senator Trites:** I encourage the Senate to uncouple the problematic appendix from the rest of the bylaws and take action on them separately.

**Motion XXXV-35:** By Senator Coliz to approve the College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws without Appendix B. The motion was approved. There was one no vote from Senator Armstrong.

**Motion XXXV-36:** To approve Appendix B of the College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws.

**Motion XXXV-37:** By Senator Razaki, seconded by Senator Jerich, to approve Appendix B of the CAS Bylaws with the clause in 3A referring to special elections deleted.

**Senator Wang:** I oppose the deletion of the clause referring to special elections. We should leave that to the discretion of the College Council.

**Senator Coliz:** Rather than dictating their bylaws to them, I would prefer that we simply reject Appendix B and ask the College Council to go through its process again of consulting the faculty within Arts and Sciences regarding revisions to their bylaws.

The motion to delete the clause in Appendix B referring to special rules for particular elections was not approved. Those voting to approve the motion were Senators Razaki and Armstrong. Senators Pryor, Fazel, Dutton, Woods, Foster, Garrison and Gamage abstained. All other senators voted no.

**Vote on Approval of Appendix B - Motion XXXV-36:** Senator Borg requested a roll call vote. There were 30 nay votes, 13 ayes and 5 abstentions. Appendix B was not approved and was returned to the College Council for revision.

#### ***10.16.03.02A Senate Bylaws Revisions (Rules Committee)***

**Motion XXXV-38:** By Senator Coliz to approve the revisions to the Senate Bylaws. Senator Coliz noted that the revision of the term limitation for committees of two one-year terms to three one-year terms applied to

*internal* committees only. There were no changes to the term limitations for external committees. The Senate bylaws were approved. There was one no vote from Senator Waterstraat and an abstention by Senator Adams. The remainder of the Senate voted in favor of the revisions.

***Advisory Item:***

***10.22.03.01 Salary Adjustments for Promotion in Rank (Provost Presley)***

According to Section XXII.A.5 of the ASPT document: “Salary increments shall be paid to individuals promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (\$2250/yr minimum) and from Associate Professor to Professor (\$3000/yr minimum) with the effective date of the promotion.”

***Adjournment***

**[ATTENDANCE/MOTIONS](#)**