

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
Wednesday, December 8, 2004
(Approved)

Volume XXXVI, No. 6

ATTENDANCE AND MOTIONS

Call to Order

Chairperson Crothers 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 November 10, 2004

Motion XXXVI-27: By Senator Evernden, seconded by Senator Mahoney, to approve the minutes of November 10, 2004. The minutes were unanimously approved.

11.19.04.01 General Education Revisions Summary

Jon Rosenthal, Associate Dean of CAS: I want to touch on the process that has brought us to this point in the revision of the General Education Program, the nature of the changes and the program enhancements that were a result. General Education was implemented in the fall of 1998 with a mandated review after five years. Much of that review took place during the 2002-2003 academic year, involving student and faculty focus groups and surveys organized under the auspices of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee. Assessment results were reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee in the 2003-2004 academic year and a proposal for revisions was presented and approved by the Senate on April 22, 2004 with the understanding that there would be ongoing work to implement the spirit and the letter of those reforms. The 2004-2005 Academic Affairs Committee received a report detailing our progress early this year and endorsed both our direction and the supporting implementation material that we provided. The University Curriculum Committee unanimously approved the package of curricular reforms at its meeting today. That package was prepared by the Council on General Education, a standing subcommittee of the Senate.

There were two kinds of changes proposed, which were approved by this body last spring. First were those changes that simply make permanent the changes that had already been introduced provisionally. Second were the changes that were genuinely new. Among the latter was increased flexibility for students in their Global Studies requirement; a category exemption based on expertise acquired in the major and the deletion of Foundations Inquiry as a separate course and corresponding changes to English 101 and Communication 110 in order to capture some key components of Foundations of Inquiry. These changes have the affect of reducing the total hours in the programs by six, aligning our General Education Program with the majority of those in the state and nationally and helping our students with timely completion of degree. On the deletion of Foundations of Inquiry, I want to thank the members of the faculty committee that has been working to implement the mandate of the Senate. I would like to thank Professors Machina and Heggie from Foundations of Inquiry, Neuleib and Lamonica from English, Hunt and Simmonds from Communication and Hootman and Kahl from Milner Library. These faculty members spent countless hours over the summer and fall to make significant and substantive changes to English 101 and Communication 110, re-titled, Composition and Critical Inquiry and Communication and Critical Inquiry. Among the many changes within your summary, I would like to highlight the agreement on consistent presentation across a yearlong sequence

of courses of a common vocabulary for and an approach to critical thinking that is reinforced in later courses, as well as a yearlong curriculum in information literacy and library skills. These are significant enhancements to the first-year curriculum that will serve as a consistent foundation for further study. FOI was an important commitment for this institution. I believe that we have captured its key academic components in a yearlong sequence in composition and communication that is absolutely unique in the state. We retain an intentional and well-structured first-year experience for our students. The Council on General Education continues to work collaboratively with the Foundations of Excellence in the First Year Committee and we look forward to launching a pilot of a redesigned Connections Program in the fall that will further contribute to a smooth transition from high school to college. In conclusion, I will just reemphasize that the Senate review process has been a very open, thoughtful and collaborative one, from the gathering of initial assessment data, through review and discussion and of the revision process. The revised program is both more flexible for our students and still very much distinctive in the state in keeping with Illinois State University's specific mission.

Senator Simon: Has this move of critical thinking into English and Composition done anything but really put FOI into a different, much more questionable disguise? What are the qualifications of those who will be teaching this new and unique course? How do you intend to staff this with people who are qualified to do it?

Prof. Rosenthal: We will be recasting the training of those who teach English 101 and Com 110. There will be a spring version of English and Communication that will be slightly different from the fall version. There will be training for those who teach the fall course and additional spring training for individuals teaching the spring course. Because this is a yearlong curriculum, there will be separate trainings. In English 101 and Com 110, we will be able to deliver a more consistent approach to critical thinking than we were able to across 105 sections of Foundations of Inquiry taught by 80 different faculty members, often with 80 different perspectives of exactly what critical thinking is.

Professor Jan Neuleib, English Department: We have very carefully been working to plan specific ways that critical inquiry will be stressed. In both courses, we are going to make consistent assignments in ways that we have not been able to do with various faculty teaching across departments. There will be a very clear thread that runs throughout both courses throughout the entire year. We will have two weeks of training with the graduate students working together from both departments. We will have much more consistency in training and delivery.

Senator Simon: What has given those disciplines, English, Speech and Communication, particular expertise to be able to pursue this?

Professor Steve Hunt, Department of Communication: Communication and English are disciplines that have been tied in their development and have really emphasized critical thinking as an integral part of the communication process in speaking and writing. Our graduate students come to us having taken undergraduate classes in critical thinking and are prepared to teach students how to develop argumentation skills.

Senator Borg: I am interested in this reconfiguration of the inner core essentially. One element of effort by the University Studies Review Committee, which developed the entire General Education Program over ten years ago, was that we provided an overall faculty ownership, rather than a departmental ownership, of any particular element. I am very concerned that the faculty at large will disengage if they are not involved.

Prof. Rosenthal: The Council on General Education and the General Education Coordinating Committee are both faculty committees with representation from all colleges. The faculty have to own the whole program,

not any specific course. Part of my frustration with FOI is that it has absorbed 98% of our attention over the years and we have not done any sufficient faculty development on the links across categories. It has always been part of our emphasis of how our skills and knowledge acquired in the inner core are reinforced elsewhere. We simply have not done a very good job of making sure that is happening. I think when we have a consistent vocabulary and a consistent approach to some things that we can build upon, we can get faculty together in meaningful ways to talk about the interconnections between courses and colleges.

Senator Borg: So we can be assured that that developmental process will continue and expand?

Prof. Rosenthal: A specific example is the January 12th symposium at which we will have a presentation on some of the details that faculty can count on. I have been working with the Provost's office to try to get faculty development dollars to bring faculty together on an ongoing basis to have this discussion.

Senator Borg: The University, over the past five years, has used the new General Education Program in its marketing. Among the important features noted is that virtually all freshman students have contact with a faculty member in a class of 30 or fewer. Am I to assume that that will no longer be a guarantee?

Senator Crothers: The assessment information demonstrated that it was not entirely true in the old program.

Prof. Rosenthal: I would rephrase the freshman experience to say that Foundations of Inquiry is one-sixth of the inner core and to remind people that we continue to be very intentional about how we provide those other five courses. Some of them may have large lectures, but if that is the case, they will have break out sessions. We are trying to be mindful of the concerns about class size, but there can be no absolute guarantee.

Senator Borg: Then I would suggest that we not advertise it as such any more.

Senator Tolchin: Given the fact that one of the biggest problems with FOI was the inequality with which the class was taught and the inequality of the professors who were teaching the class, how would you plan to combat a yearlong assignment that would transition not only classes, but departments as well?

Prof. Neuleib: There are going to be a variety of ways of linking the assignments with a thread that runs through both training and implementation. The first semester English and Communication courses will not be the same as the second semester courses. Each of them will build upon the first semester course. There will be a clear understanding that they are developing and that they are interacting across the whole year.

Senator Adams: Will the two courses be taught by only graduate assistants?

Prof. Hunt: We have non-tenure track faculty in the department who teach 110 and would continue to do so, but the majority of the sections will be taught by graduate students.

Prof. Neuleib: It would be the same in the English Department. Non-tenure track faculty who have taught FOI will continue to teach the writing courses, but the majority will be taught by graduates. In our case, many of them are doctoral students with years of teaching experience.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: This will be Senator Simon's last meeting with us. He was a replacement for Senator DeSantis, who will be returning from sabbatical. This will also be the last meeting of the year for Senator

Fazel, who is going on sabbatical. Victor Devinatz will be taking her position.

Former Senate Chairperson Curt White, who is with us tonight, put together an organization called the Council of Illinois University Senates. We met last month and ten of the twelve public universities Senate Chairpersons/Presidents attended the meeting here. It was the first time that we had representation from several of the universities. There was a very good discussion running across a broad range of issues, coordinating our common concerns across campuses.

One of comparative things most evident was a single explanation for why some campuses seem to be relatively coordinated and coherent and why others are not. Those campuses that are doing well are the campuses wherein shared governance is working well. The campuses where shared governance is not working well are the ones that are doing quite badly. On one campus in particular, which is a great deal of chaos, the Senate Chairperson has been told by the President and the Chancellor that under no circumstances whatsoever may Senate members have any contact with any state elected officials in their official roles. By contrast, we have extensive contact. Indeed, last year Dan Brady came here to speak to the Senate; I am hoping that we will be able to work out something like that again during the upcoming year. Similarly, the array of points of contact that our Senate has with the administration and the community, even just the simple function of the liaisons, is something that is quite innovative and quite unheard of in many of the other Senates. The Council is hoping to meet again in April, probably in Springfield during the state legislative session to connect with some officials at that time.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Rinker: I would like to introduce you to our three newest student senators, who will be joining us for the remainder of the year. I am very proud to introduce you to Alvin Medina, Candace Teague and Jermain Griffin. We still have one more student senator slot to fill in Fine Arts and we are making an appeal to the Fine Arts majors to get involved in student government. Next semester, SGA has some exciting things going on. We are looking to be a more visible student organization. In our last Student Government meeting, we finally settled on a gazebo style, similar to the style of that in Student Health Services, which will be out on the quad distributing information. It will be a great opportunity for senator and constituent contact. As I have previously reported, SGA has a mass e-mail list of all students. We would like the faculty to encourage all of your students to be courteous when replying to messages distributed on this list serve. We have had a few students utilize it in not necessarily the most professional manner. Please tell your students that this is an opportunity for them to know what is going on within the University and to get involved. There are opportunities for student advocacy. Student Government Association and Student Affairs are all here to be student advocates. Encourage your students to seek this help.

SGA will also do some lobbying on behalf of Illinois State. Next semester, we are hoping to take a few trips to discuss our concerns. Also, the visits will be to show our support as students for what the administration is doing and planning to do. When it comes time for the legislators to vote, we hope that they will take into account that the students are behind the initiatives at ISU.

President's Remarks:

President Bowman: We are down to the last 23 days of the Comprehensive Campaign. Before we hit our \$88 million mark, I was fond of saying that we were one check away from our goal. I have recently been saying that we are one check away from \$100 million. We are actually working on a number of large gifts right now that are in play. Several of those will be included before the end of the campaign. One of them may be one of the largest private gifts that the University has ever received. We certainly haven't taken a break since reaching the goal; in fact, we are already scheduling meetings and strategies for the spring semester.

Looking at where the money went, one thing I do want to emphasize is that this campaign bucked a national trend, which is that the majority of the funds that we took in were actually cash. Less than half of the funds are in deferred gifts and that has allowed the institution to actually spend \$30 million during the four years that the campaign has been under way.

One project under way for Athletics is the Strength and Conditioning Center. It is a \$1.5 million project and should be done by March 1. Looking at the amount of funds that flowed into a variety of colleges, obviously the College of Business took in the lion's share of the funds with the State Farm gift. Surprisingly, Arts and Sciences raised \$10.2 million, College of Education, \$9 million and CAST, \$4.5 million. Gary McGinnis has been in close contact with the Provost and me about our federal earmarks. I don't believe that the President has signed the Omnibus Bill yet, but that will probably happen in the next couple of days. We have some federal earmark funds in that Omnibus package that we will be able to announce once that bill has been signed.

We have reached the 99.7% compliance rate in our ethics training. Every faculty member, except one, has taken the training. The training concludes on December 16th and we have 19 students left to take it. You may have read recently that the Governor's Commission on State Pensions met in Chicago to look at remedies for offsetting some of the large pension obligations that that system faces. One of the proposals is to reduce the cost of living increment for retirees from 3% to 2%. Over 40 years, that saves about \$20 billion and would lower the system's liability to \$70 billion from \$90 billion. Some other proposals that are in play include cutting the interest rate credited to members, limiting annual salary increases in final years of service to 5%, increasing employee contributions by 1%. These are all just proposals at this point, but it is something that we are watching closely. The Annuity Association is very active in this area. Senator Rinker mentioned that students are playing a role in lobbying at the Illinois Board of Higher Education meeting in Chicago on Tuesday. There was some discussion about organizing student lobbying efforts in a systematic way and involving student governments across all the campuses. That is something that will happen early in the spring. We will be in conversations with SGA about that.

I want to compliment the students on some things that have happened this semester. First, we enrolled the freshman class that came in with the highest ACT average in our history. We have had far fewer complaints about our student body in the President's office than at anytime anyone can remember. The graduation rate is at an all time high; the retention rate is at an all-time high. Many very good things have happened this year and I want to compliment the students for what they have done for the institution. I also want to congratulate and thank the students for supporting the Athletic Department. Lastly, I want to wish the students a safe and relaxing holiday break. Good luck on finals!

Senator Koutsky: This issue concerns recent news articles about campuses successfully being able to bar army recruiters on campuses due to the gay right's issue, such as the army's "don't ask, don't tell" policy. I believe that now universities have the option, provided by the federal court, to reject or bar army recruiters on campus. Illinois State has had the army recruiters on the quad. Is there an agreement with the armed services that there is going to be ongoing recruitment on campus, beyond the ROTC program? How much money do we receive from them when they do come on campus?

President Bowman: I can't tell you specifically how many students are involved in ROTC, but it is in excess of 100 students and is an important source of support for a number of them.

Senator Jerich: How long does the ethics certification last before we have to be recertified?

President Bowman: It is for one year and the training will have to be done annually.

Senator Jerich: Would it be advisable that we could lobby for certification of perhaps a two or three-year period? A lot of time, effort and resources are involved in the certification process.

President Bowman: The University has spent an enormous amount of staff time administering this program. This governor has made this a central issue and I would be surprised if there was any change in the program. One thing that I think might happen is that an Inspector General may be assigned to higher ed and that might lead to a training that is more appropriate for what we do.

Senator Jerich: Since you mention that we have taken in the best and brightest undergraduates, which really brings pride to our University, I wonder if there might be any thinking about the connection now to graduate level education. We have many graduate level programs and perhaps a concerted effort could be under way to think about ways in which we could retain our students to continue with their graduate education at Illinois State.

Senator Crothers: I am going to suggest that that is a question that is within the Provost's venue and he may chose to answer it.

Provost's Remarks

Provost John Presley: I have continuously updated you on the application status of our next incoming freshman class. After the priority filing period for applications ended, things settled down quite a bit. Our total applications received are still up 4%, which is a very good sign. They are not up those huge percentages that we saw during the priority period, which I think meant students are anxious to compete for places in our freshman class. The number of students not admitted is up 34%. Even with that increased denial rate, we still have approximately 2,700 freshman applications to consider. We have 356 applications submitted by minority students that have yet to be processed. I can report to you the status of that when processing is complete. We have appointed a task force on advising out of my office. That includes representation from advisors in the transition programs, departments and in the University College. I am very grateful to Professor Tim Hunt, the Chair of the English Department, who has agreed to chair that task force.

Senator Jerich: Would you entertain the question that I posed to the President?

Provost Presley: Any number of us feels, and the point made in the first version of *Educating Illinois*, that there was insufficient attention paid to graduate study. We are undertaking an analysis of the costs both to the institution and to the students of our graduate programs. We are going to try to combine that with some assessment of what students do when they leave here. We don't have, at this point, a very firm or specific handle on cost, aid, support, waivers, etc., but we are pulling that information together to do exactly what you are talking about.

Vice President of Student Affairs' Remarks

Vice President Mamarchev: We are exactly ten days out from commencement for fall 2004. Our ceremonies are on Saturday, December 18. The first is at 9:00 a.m. for Arts and Sciences, Applied Sciences and Technology and the College of Fine Arts in Redbird Arena. At 1:00 p.m., we will have Business and Education, also in Redbird Arena. We have made a lot of improvements to our web site for commencement, so if anyone has questions or concerns, I would invite you to look at www.commencement.ilstu.edu. To our students, good luck on finals; to everyone, safe travels during the holidays.

Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks: Absent***Committee Reports******Academic Affairs Committee:***

Senator Reid: The Academic Affairs Committee had two visitors this evening, Galen Crow, Executive Director of the Extended University, responsible for our distance education programs, and Doug Hesse, Director of the Center for Advancement of Teaching. We asked them to come to speak to us about both the state of distance education in the University and to help us devise a philosophy for distance education that will support its strengths with sufficient caveats to make sure that these courses are taught where appropriate.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee

Senator Brockschmidt: Dr. Dammers and Dr. Stanford spoke to the Administrative Affairs Committee about the Disestablishment of Academic Units Policy. We are in the process of reviewing that, as well as the Alcohol Tailgating Policy. If there are any recommendations or concerns for the Administrator Selection Policy, please e-mail me (bjbrock@ilstu.edu) or Senator Gamage (jina@ilstu.edu) so that we can address them before the next time it is brought to the floor.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Wylie: First, I would like to thank Tom Simon for serving on our committee for one semester. He contributed very generously to us and we appreciate his efforts. The committee discussed several of its agenda items tonight. This committee has oversight of the Faculty Review Committee, which finally has a chairperson. I have been in contact with that chair and we are hoping to get in a meeting next week. I have already met with the Chair of the AFEGC. We went through all of their procedures and there are many changes. We are hoping to get those finalized.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Plantholt: Planning and Finance met with Dr. Susan Kern, Vice President of University Advancement. She gave us an overview of University Advancement, the different pieces of it and their priorities and budget concerns. The committee is going to meet with the other three vice presidents next semester to help make recommendations on university priorities.

Rules Committee: No Report.***IBHE-FAC Report***

Professor Curt White, IBHE-FAC Representative: I have actually been to two meetings since last we spoke. The first fruit of our advocacy work has been appearing around the state in op ed columns and letters to the editor. It appeared in our *Pantagraph* on Tuesday, November 23rd, under the heading *Illinois Tuition Increases Pricing Poor Out*. The byline is Alan Karnes, who is the chairperson of the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council. This article is available online.

The November 12 meeting of FAC took place at the College of Lake County, which is in a very remote corner of the state. Most of the meeting was taken up with a very long and frustrating conversation with the political representatives who joined us there, who were very concerned with the idea that their constituents think that faculty members don't work enough. So, we spent an awful lot of time explaining why a 15-hour or 18-hour course load actually equals full-time employment. These are not conversations you would think that we would still need to be having, but apparently we do. In many ways, we need to start taking that conversation seriously. We make a number of errors in the way in which we approach it, but it is a

conversation that isn't going away.

At the December 3 meeting of FAC at the Crown Plaza Hotel in Springfield, we met only with IBHE representatives. We met with Dan Layzell, Deputy Director of the IBHE. He reported the following things to us. The new *Illinois Commitment* is available on the IBHE web site as of this Tuesday. What I think is going to be important in the revised commitment is that there is new language about the importance of universities providing for an enhanced quality of life. Dan Layzell also talked to us about the budget priorities for the year from the IBHE. The budget priorities are 1) affordability; 2) faculty/staff salary competitiveness; 3) aging facilities. The frank assessment of Dan Layzell was that if there was any money at all for enhancing the higher education budget, it was probably going to go to the affordability issue, probably increasing monies available for MAP student aid. He reported to us that last year, there were 50,000 eligible students who were denied MAP assistance; that is up from 16,000 two years ago. Economic conditions in the state and rising tuitions have had a really radical affect upon student affordability. That has been reflected in the number of students who are eligible for those MAP grants. It has also increased the number of students who, even though they are eligible, have been turned down. The state as a whole received a "D" in affordability in the recent national report card on higher education.

I asked Mr. Layzell if he thought that the State would be doing anything this year to interfere with the university's ability to manage its own tuition growth or if the state would do anything to act on health care costs. He didn't think so this year. He emphasized, though, that the Pension Review Board is likely to consider a range of cost-cutting measures, including health care benefits for retirees. This Pension Review Board has been meeting and some of the things that they are considering are rather frightening. I think the thing that makes it the most frightening is that, in my experience, it is rare that a body meets in order to kick around ideas that are never acted on. Our own Senator Brady is serving on this commission, so it might be time to let him know that we are paying attention. It might be time, in fact, to invite him back to a Senate meeting to find out from his point of view just what is going on with that commission.

We then talked to Tom Lunt, the IBHE Acting Executive Director. From what I could tell at that meeting, we should all be hoping that he will be the permanent Executive Director. He is a very forthcoming, smart and supportive man. He talked to us about a number of things very generally. The most important thing I came away from the conversation with was his general support of the idea of being very proactive in terms of political advocacy and that we should be garnering that support wherever we can find it. He is very supportive of the FAC becoming more of an advocacy group. He thinks, in fact, that we should be broadening our reach. We should be talking to the State Chamber of Commerce and local Chambers of Commerce. I think, in general, it is very interesting that the IBHE is so interested in groups that are supposed to be serving a kind of advisory role to it, completely changing their directions and becoming advocacy groups that essentially lobby the state government for support for higher ed.

We then spoke to IBHE Board members Gil Rutman and Proshanta Nandi; both men were former academics. The information at some length that we received from them had to do with the future of the so-called Priorities, Productivity and Accountability Task Force, which is similar to PQP. The PPA process right now is in complete disarray and no one knows what it is doing, even though they are meeting. No one knows whether it really has the political will to have the campus by campus accountability that they had during PQP, but most people sense that it is not going away. Right now, it is mostly talking about the criteria for for-profit higher ed in the state. Most people have a healthy skepticism about the role of for-profit higher ed in the state, so I am not too concerned about that. They have not yet turned scrutiny to the thing that I think will be the most troubling, which is faculty productivity. There, I think we will have to be very alert, because it is at that point I think that the conversation about 'lazy professors' will come back to haunt us and we may want to

have a very cogent way of responding to those kinds of concerns, including, perhaps a different way to describe our workload.

Senator Reid: You mentioned that perhaps we were not going about explaining our workload sufficiently. How would you suggest we go about it?

Prof. White: Personally, I think we concede too much of the battle before we even start it by assuming that what we have to show is that we are busy in a kind of visible way 60 or 80 hours a week. In my opinion, it shows a real absence of understanding of what it means to be an intellectual, a scholar or an artist. Rather than wondering with great suspicion why it is that faculty don't work enough, I would have the conversation be about why Americans in general have no time for thought.

Senator Reid: What is the chance of getting a public that will give a value to thought?

Prof. White: I am perennially optimistic. There have in the recent history been very serious proposals in, for example, the U.S. Senate for every ten years of participation in the Social Security System, a worker would be eligible for a work sabbatical that would be essentially funded by the Social Security System. Now that is the direction we ought to want the conversation going. Rather than making the life of academics more like the life of exploited workers, let's make the life of exploited workers more like the life of academics. That is to say, life in which there is more time for creativity and thought built into ordinary working lives. That is not a comment that strikes many people as having much real politic about it, but I am not sure that the functions of academics and scholars and artists ought to be always to cow tow to real politics.

Senator Jerich: Professor White, given the memo you recently sent out to us, I am wondering what your belief might be about whether it should go out to all employees at the University regarding the SURS notion. The second point is perhaps the FAC could look at this over zealously of us being recertified every year for ethics.

Prof. White: I certainly think that all of the employees at the University should know what work is being done by the Pension Review Board. If you are asking me if I think it is a good idea for the Senate to send that to all faculty and staff members by e-mail, I think that is a good idea. I will make a note of bringing the ethics test to the council.

Action Item:

12.01.04.01 Elimination of Foundations of Inquiry-IDS 101 (Senate Executive Committee)

(The above item came before the Senate as an Information Item on 4/7/04, Document #04.01.04.01)

Senator Crothers: You have in your packet an Action Item distributed by the Executive Committee. This is intended basically to clarify a few points of confusion about what we had or had not agreed to. What you have now is an Action Item stating that we do, in fact, agree to eliminate FOI from the General Education curriculum. This is a follow up to a discussion to that of last April.

Motion XXXVI-28: By Senator Crothers, on behalf of the Executive Committee, to approve the elimination of FOI. By majority voice vote, the Senate approved the motion. Those senators voting "No" were Senators Borg and Simon. There were no abstentions.

Information Items:

11.10.04.01 Mass Electronic Communications Policy (Rules Committee)

Senator op de Beeck: The Rules Committee has been working since last year on bringing forward the Mass

Electronic Communications Policy. The policy covers channels for mass e-mail communications when someone in the campus community wants to contact various groups on campus or off campus. We have with us tonight Mark Walbert and Carla Birckelbaw from Technology, who are ready to answer any questions you might have.

In the policy before you, revisions consist mostly of wording changes. We did have a discussion concerning page 7, number 4.8. We were concerned that if the e-mail communication referred someone to a web site that the content of the web site might change. We, therefore, added 4.8 which states that the content of the web site referred to by the message, approved by the administrator at the time of the request, will not be substantially altered after approval has been granted. We also discussed the President's mass e-mail, headlined as "President Alert". Any vice presidential mass e-mails, which were previously known as "Vice President Alert", have been changed to "Vice President Communication" to suggest a less emergent tone.

Mark Walbert, Associate Vice President of Technology: One of the other changes was to number 11 at the bottom of page 10. The Rules Committee discussed who the appeal would go to if one of the Vice Presidents denied access to a mass electronic communication. So, we added the sentence "Appeals concerning the use of Vice-President-controlled communication channels also may be made to the University President or the President's designee."

Senator Simon: What extent are our University e-mails considered private?

Professor Walbert: The University has been put on a "black list" in the past. One particularly active black-listing group is called SPAM Cop. Members who receive e-mail that they think is SPAM report them to SPAM Cop and other agencies like that. Then any e-mail message sent from the University's IP address is automatically blocked. That has happened on a number of occasions very recently. This semester, there were several communications out of one of the official offices on campus that was brought up as potential SPAM by one of the internet service providers, who received the complaint presumably from one of its client. It turns out that that was an official communication from the University and they agreed to not treat it as SPAM any further. Our job is to make sure that you don't get stuck in positions where you can't send e-mails to individuals because their ISP has put the University on a black list.

Senator Crothers: Is it true that the University does not have a policy or practice of screening the content of e-mails sent from University machines on an individual basis?

Professor Walbert: No, we do not look at the content of your e-mail messages. Any messages that you send out to groups of less than 100 we don't screen at all.

Senator Simon: The question is not do you, but can you. Is there any policy about the privacy of electronic communication?

Senator Crothers: I think that the point that Senator Simon is trying to make more broadly is it prohibited under the law? Since ISU owns the computer, ISU has the right to get information even though they do not, unless there is a subpoena. It is not your machine and is not fully protected, private communication.

Professor Walbert: This policy does not promote that and it would never be on my list as a wise use of our resources.

Motion XXXVI-29: By Senator op de Beeck, seconded by Senator Darnell, to move the proposed Mass

Electronic Communications Policy to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXVI-30: By Senator op de Beeck to approve the Mass Electronic Communications Policy. The Senate unanimously approved the policy.

09.29.04.01 University Library Policy (Rules Committee)

Senator Fazel: The current University Library Policy is a very brief statement of what the library does and what is required to check out items from the library. The library has submitted a new policy to the Rules Committee that is more comprehensive and states what services are available at the library, who can use the services and how the services can be used. The Rules Committee made no revisions to the proposed policy. The library also requests that the policy be categorized under Services instead of within its current category of Facilities and Campus Grounds in the Policies and Procedures Manual online. The Rules Committee also agreed with this request.

Senator Adams: This is a very long policy. Is it actual policy or is it more description? Can you shorten the policy and perhaps have a link to a description of what is involved with it?

Senator Wylie: The library has changed a great deal since the current policy was written. Because the library is much more complicated than it was, we felt that we needed to have this more elaborate policy. We have a lot of different kinds of patrons who can use the services that we offer.

Senator Barone: I also prefer short policies and the separation of policies from procedures. Did those who wrote this look at other University policies, because I don't recall any of them written into this sort of frequently-asked-questions format?

Senator Wylie: We were not sure that everyone understood all of the policies for the library because there are policies for so many kinds of things. So we felt we needed more information contained within this policy.

Senator Wang: This doesn't look like a policy, but more like a description. The old one is a policy. I think it may need to be rephrased.

Senator Crothers: Might I suggest that this now be returned to Rules and, in particular, if the decision is made after consulting with representatives from the library that they wish it in this form, that Dean Elzy be invited to make sure that there is someone here who can fully articulate why it is framed the way it is.

Senator Fazel: This policy talks about who can check out books and other resources from the library and what is required to do that. It also explains what resources are available and the Rules Committee felt that this was information that is important for the community to know.

Senator Crothers: I think both sets of arguments are reasonable. That is, it may be appropriate in this case to have the long version. On the other hand, it may be appropriate for it to be more consistent with our other policies, having the policy language with the policy and a link to frequently asked questions. Rather than answer that tonight, lets invite Dean Elzy perhaps to come and answer these questions more fully.

Communications:

12.01.04.02 Sense of the Senate Resolution: Endorsement of General Education Revisions (Senate Executive Committee)

Senator Crothers: This Sense of the Senate Resolution concerning the endorsement of the revisions to the

General Education Program is from the Executive Committee. This is more or less part three of our discussion of General Education tonight. This is in the form of a Sense of the Senate Resolution because under the rules of the Senate, we do not have the right to approve, as a full Senate, course content, but we do want to express our opinion as to whether or not we think the changes that have been outlined in the General Education Program are appropriate so that we can maintain Senate ownership and the broadest possible recognition of the responsibility of this program. Crucial variables of the Sense of the Senate Resolution are to endorse the changes as Dean Rosenthal described this evening and also to note the other part of what we approved in the past. That is that one of our commitments was make sure that we integrated the experiences throughout the General Education curriculum into the majors. We also agreed that this needed to be done through a committee structure that has not yet begun that work. So, the Sense of the Senate Resolution will also remind everybody that work needs to begin soon now that we have agreed to a particular path. This is being brought to you on behalf of the Executive Committee.

Motion XXXVI-31: By Senator Crothers, on behalf of the Executive Committee, to approve the Sense of the Senate Resolution. The Senate unanimously approved the resolution.

11.12.04.05 Distinguished Professor Designation (Provost Presley)

Provost Presley: You have before you a memo from me to Senator Crothers indicating that this year the process of Distinguished Professor selection did not identify an individual that the review panel felt should be recommended to receive that title.

Senator Crothers: The reason we have asked Provost Presley to announce this directly is that, typically, if the process identifies someone, the administration brings the names to this body which then votes to endorse or not endorse those names. Therefore, to maintain that tradition of reporting the results of the process, we have asked this to be done. This is not open for discussion because the creation of the Distinguished Professor Rank and the process leading to the appointment of Distinguished Professors is outside the Senate's authority. They simply bring it to us as a courtesy.

11.23.04.01 Team Excellence Awards – Request for Nominations

Senator Crothers: You have a brief communication saying that there is a request for nominations for the Team Excellence Awards. If you recall, last time, you elected Frank Waterstraat to join me on the awards committee. This is simply an opportunity for those of you aware of extraordinary projects going on on campus to nominate them for consideration.

Adjournment