Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, February 23, 2005
(Approved)

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

Roll Call
Senate Secretary Paul Borg called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of February 9, 2005
Motion XXXVI-42: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Mahoney, to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of February 9, 2005. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Educating Illinois Update
Dr. Joe Rives: Each year, the Director of Planning and Institutional Research comes to the Senate and gives an update for *Educating Illinois*. This is first report for *Educating Illinois 2003-2010*. You, who were on the Senate last year, will remember the structure of *Educating Illinois*. The goals are the BOT goals for the institution expressed in their vision statement and we as a campus community work together to get action statements behind those goals. The first goal given high priority by the institution was to recruit high-achieving and motivated students. The mean ACT score for new freshman at ISU was just about 24, which very much eclipses the State of Illinois average, as well as the national average. The second action statement under this goal was to increase faculty salaries. You may remember last year when I came to you that we were at 91.6% of our peer group median as defined by the Board of Higher Education. We were certain that that would go up because the institution had internally reallocated money to faculty/staff salaries and we are continuing to make progress in this area. We are now up to the average for all ranks of about 94.4%. In previous years, you have asked me about non-tenure track and AP salaries. We are very close to having peer groups published and make that information available to you. I usually report to you, too, the average civil service salary as compared to the statewide average. However, there is a problem with the statewide data, so I don't want to present it to you until the state revises that data.

The second goal that the BOT established for us was to be the national leader in graduate and undergraduate education. This is data, which I have presented to you before, is from the National Survey of Student Engagement. *Educating Illinois* has a goal that we will exceed the published criterion for all other national doctoral, research-intensive universities. What we see is that we exceed national comparisons in 8 of the 10 categories. The comparisons in which we do not exceed our peers are in the levels of enriching educational experiences. A common problem nationally is that students filling out the survey don't know what "enriching educational experiences" are. So that is part of the problem, but, indeed, we need to get our students more engaged in learning inside and outside of the classroom as a core value of Illinois State University. I think that our partnership with the Student Learning Accreditation Team has brought forth some innovative strategies, as well as with the American Democracy Project. Our freshmen retention rates continue to escalate. We are at 84%. Illinois State University has never been that high before. The same story exists for graduation rates. We are at 62%; again, the institution has never been this high before.

I also wanted to illustrate another way of looking at national leadership in undergraduate and graduate education as the work that you do with students, both inside and outside the classroom. To illustrate our core value, I chose our participation in the Graduate Research Symposium. We had a record number of participants last spring. The number of students seeking awards for excellence in their instruction and research is also at a record number. The third goal that the Board of Trustees established for us was to provide an educational environment. We have maintained the percentage of small classes and the student-faculty ratio has remained constant during these trying

budget times. The great work that you have done in raising the level of external grants and contracts brought in to the institution resulted in a record $20.6 million for scholarship support. That is really due to faculty and staff alike going out and seeking in record number more external funding. Last year I reported that state and corporations were not giving. The faculty and staff at ISU responded by being more aggressive and seeking more revenue in more venues.

Value expectation is another goal that the Board of Trustees established for us and there is just so many ways that you can think of value. Some of the measures of academic quality are a proxy for value. We have been recognized by the National Policy Center on the First Year Experience and we remain in Kiplinger's Top 100 Colleges and Universities. Value is also affordability. Our students are graduating with low-levels of debt. The IBHE recognized the University for internally reallocating money to the Monetary Assistance Program and we were commended. Value is also remaining accountable to your strategic planning process. Senator Borg was on the committee that worked with each of the vice presidents to help define how they plan, budget and access divisional progress towards the goals of *Educating Illinois*. We, as a campus community, updated *Educating Illinois*, and I would also come to you in the fall with an update of the Performance Report, which is the University's progress in the six common goals for all of Illinois higher education.

Value expectations are also defined as promoting a healthy, safe and environmentally sustainable campus. The example that always strikes me is the request of $1 million for power replacement in Milner Library. Milner Library opened in 1976 before the day of personal computers. At that time, they could not even imagine the amount of energy that would be needed. Value is also actions that the BOT took with the energy management and utility infrastructure improvement plan. The BOT approved the northwest chiller project, which is good news for residents in the Turner area of campus. This project will also lay the foundation for air conditioning in Redbird Arena and Horton Field House. Value is progressing on the Master Plan. As we know, Schroeder has dramatically changed and will continue to change as the renovation progresses. Our new College of Business building was constructed and transitioned into by students, faculty and staff ahead of schedule. The Facilities Conditions Assessment contains examples of other construction projects going on within the buildings and it ranges all over campus from Old Union to the heating plant to Horton Field House. Value is also our housing plan. The BOT approved roof replacement for Watterson Towers. We currently have one residence hall off-line so that it may be renovated and we are having increased student demand for that residence hall. Another residence hall will come off line this fall and we have a dining center plan for renovation as well.

Our next goal was diversity. The data shows a mixed message. Enrollment is up in terms of diversity; retention is down slightly. There are several new initiatives going on on campus to increase the retention of all students. The MASAI Mentoring Program is a new program and cosponsored by the Division of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs specifically targeting minority students. It is a program of transition into ISU and then in culturation through peer mentoring for academic training. There are very good preliminary results of this program in that students at midterm had a much higher GPA than students not participating in the program. Diversity is also democracy. It is hard to believe that it was in November that Milner Library helped 500 students register to vote on campus and 2000 students waited in line, in some cases over three hours, to vote.

Another goal that the BOT established for us was to be the first choice of employers in recruiting our students. The data shows how our students compare on national averages on licensure and certification exams. Three-fourths of the time, our students do better. For the last two administrations of the alumni survey, for those students responding, over one-third are pursuing additional education after graduating from Illinois State University and over 94% are employed with 90% indicating satisfaction. Over 92% report that they have employment in their field. The Board also asked us to be partners with business, industry and government. One example is Teacher Education as a university-wide phenomenon. We are only one of five national board resource centers that prepares individuals choosing, after teaching for awhile, to go back for the highest level of certification a teacher can get in the discipline. We are the state's leader in this area and Illinois has the sixth highest number of master teachers.

ISU is the state's largest preparer of teachers and is working with the state's largest school district in terms of educational reform.

Partnerships can also take the form of public service and has many definitions. Examples include conferences. We had more than 31 conferences that worked through our Conference Services Department. The Extended University also worked with academic departments and schools to form more off-campus cohort initiatives and faculty and staff from across the institution provided extended learning courses to help place-bound students. The community also benefits from our Gamma Phi Circus and our athletic events. Partnership is the outstanding work that you have done to help us to fulfill our core missions of instruction, research and service. Partnerships among ourselves was evident as we celebrated the University Family Campaign and the over $5 million that we as a community gave back to the institution. Partnership is also *Redefining Normal*; many academic initiatives would not have been fully funded without the $96 million dollars raised in the campaign.

That is a look at *Educating Illinois* in the last year. We will continue to be a successful institution if we remain committed to the core values because it is our daily interactions with students, faculty and staff and in the enactment of those core values that is truly *Educating Illinois*. The institution will also be successful if it remains true to its highest priorities that you have helped shape and form. *Educating Illinois* will only be successful, as well, if you hold us accountable to reporting back to you.

There is a new *Educating Illinois* web site. The old "Report Card" for Educating Illinois was considered to dense and many just wanted to know the bottom line. The new Report Card gives three years of data history and the performance indicators for all the actions in *Educating Illinois*. It should take you two minutes to read from top to bottom. Annual changes are easily seen indicating whether goals moved in the desired direction, remain the same or go in the opposite direction. This is available on the web at: http://www.educatingillinois.ilstu.edu.

Using the report card methodology, this is where we stand this year. Approximately one-third of our goals are in the achieved/maintained category. Next year, you should ask to have a bar graph illustrating the direction the achieved category has taken. You should ask the same for the no change, opposite direction and not started columns. This is a legacy that can build over time for you as we look towards the institutional progress. I have also developed a scoring rubric that gives every performance in *Educating Illinois*, all 138, two points possible. Two points means it's achieved, we're done, or it's ongoing. One point means we moved in the desired direction. No points means no change from year to year. Negative points mean that we went the wrong way. So, for each of the seven goals I just talked about, all of the performance indicators are scored and summed. The scoring methodology is really a tribute to Senator Rossman because it is an adaptation of the balance score card methodology that he has been a strong proponent of. It is, also, a great tribute to you, Chairperson Crothers, because you have been the one saying, 'keep it simple'.

Chairperson's Remarks
Senator Crothers: I wanted to extend my deep appreciation in thanks for everybody's efforts last week, whether it was participation in the NCA meeting, Founders Day, Board of Trustees meeting, or any of the unbelievable number of other things that everybody was asked to do.

Student Government Association President's Remarks
Noah Conrad, Student Body Vice President: Josh Rinker, Student Body President, would like to express his regrets for being unable to attend the Senate meeting. SGA elections are next week. We would appreciate it if you would, not advocating for any particular party, but just spread the word that elections will be taking place. They are from Tuesday, March 1, at 12:00 noon through Thursday, March 3, at 12:00 noon. Whoever the new Student Body President is, Josh will bring that individual to the next Academic Senate meeting.

Redbirds 4 Relief is also having continued success as we strive towards the goal of $20,000. The goal set forth by this organization is a dollar from every student, which would give us our grand total. The kickoff is planned for next Monday from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Schroeder Plaza. Last night, the Delta Chi Fraternity and Redbirds 4 Relief teamed up and had a philanthropy event that raised $180 for the organization.

As the off-campus senators have their 1,300 to 1,400 constituents, we are currently looking at a way to represent our on-campus students in the same way. We are still working out the technicalities with CISS. As soon as that is up and ready, we will be able to fully advocate and hear the voice of all 19,500 on-campus students, in the same manner as the off-campus students.

Administrators' Remarks
President Al Bowman: Absent

Provost John Presley: Absent

Vice President of Student Affairs
Dr. Helen Mamarchev: I will just expand a little bit on what Dr. Rives talked about in terms of our long-range residence hall and dining plans. I am happy to report that Wilkins Hall, which is closed this year for renovation, is right on track with its renovation. A couple of weeks ago, we opened our online registration process to current students so that could sign up for where they would like to live on campus next year. Within the first couple of days, Wilkins Hall was 80% full with our current students and we have yet to open it up to the freshmen. We are extremely pleased by the response of the students to this work and we will continue to press forward. I think it is important to remember that the State Fire Marshal has put a deadline of the year 2013 for all public universities to have sprinklers in all residence halls. We continue to press forward in an effort to meet that deadline.

Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg: Absent

Committee Reports
Academic Affairs Committee
Senator Reid: The committee discussed the question of the 124 hour rule; that is, whether or not programs should be limited to 124 hours, which allows students to complete their work within four years. Over one-quarter of our programs have hours above 124; virtually all of them are Teacher Education. The accreditation requirements are such that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to meet the accreditation and General Education requirements within the 124 hours. The University Curriculum Committee has stated the procedures that they are going through to ensure that these programs have those accreditation issues and that similar programs in the state have a similar number of hours. We felt their argument was compelling. The concern about students only being guaranteed their tuition for four years has been allayed by a new procedure that has been proposed to the Provost. It would allow students, if the first major they declare requires more than 124 hours, to be guaranteed their original freshman tuition for five years. We will, in addition, have recommendations for steps to be taken to perhaps reduce the overlap between professional studies courses and courses with similar content within the department. The committee then began looking into the enrollment management issue and will continue this discussion. Approximately one out of eight to one of nine students is a General Student. We have large numbers of seniors and juniors who have no major and may never get into a major. This is a significant problem and we will be looking into possible measures to be taken.

Senator Crothers: Is the five years already in the Truth and Tuition Policy from the State?

Steve Adams, **Enrollment Management and Academic Services**: Yes.

Senator Crothers: So, it is not a matter for the Provost. If your program takes longer than four years, it goes the

length of the program.

Senator Reid: But it only applies to the first major that you declare.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee
Senator Brockschmidt: The committee met with Bill Cummins tonight and discussed the University ID process, which is an Advisory Item on the Senate Agenda. We also discussed the Amplification Policy, as well as the Flag Policy. We are hoping to bring those to the floor in the next meeting or so.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Senator Wylie: The committee had a speaker, Josie Evola, Diversity and Affirmative Action. She discussed some of the things her department is working concerning recruitment and retention.

Planning and Finance Committee
Senator Plantholt: The committee met with Helen Mamarchev and Brent Paterson from Student Affairs. They gave a presentation on where the money for Student Affairs comes from and how it is spent. They talked about their budgeting process, what kind of effects the cuts in the last few years have had on them and their priorities for the future. This is part of the continuing meetings with different vice presidents at the University that the committee is having to gather information. We have one more of those meetings scheduled and then we will work on making recommendations on University priorities.

Rules Committee
Senator Hammel: The committee met with Jan Paterson, Dean of Students about the issue of the external committee dissolution, potentially without Senate consent and we hope to bring this as an information item at the next meeting. Essentially, the committee determined that the request to dissolve the external committees, the Entertainment Committee and the University Forum Committee, was done in an appropriate fashion. In fact, they have been replaced with very active and very useful committees. We also began our discussion of the request to potentially reduce the number of faculty members on the Honors Council. After having some initial discussions with the new director of Honors, they are not particularly interested in reducing the number of faculty members on the council, but we will have some recommendations about how we populate that committee.

Action Item:
02.11.05.01   Ombudsperson Recommendations (Faculty Affairs Committee)
Senator Wylie: We made the changes that were suggested. Some things were already in bold, so the additional revisions are in larger bold. We would like to move this for action.

Motion XXXVI-43: By Senator Wylie to approve the revised ombudsperson recommendations from the Faculty Affairs Committee. The policy identifies the Vice President of Human Resources as the ombudsperson for the pilot year. There was no debate by the Senate and the recommendations were unanimously approved.

Information Items:
04.09.03.06   Academic Progress Alert Grades (Academic Affairs Committee)
Senator Reid: The Academic Affairs Committee received a document calling for the three-year review of the Academic Progress Alert System. We felt, unanimously, that this was a very positive addition to the University and I would like to ask Steve Adams of Enrollment Management to tell you a little more about the program.

Dr. Adams: This program was initiated in 1997 and took effect for the first time in the fall of 1998. The Academic Progress Alert (APA) is geared to impact students in 100 level courses, not just new freshmen. It is certainly not a perfect system; we have recognized that all along. But it is a part of the first year experience and it does provide timely feedback for those students who are in the 100 level classes. The level of faculty participation has increased

significantly. When it began in the fall of 1998, the level of participation by the faculty was 82%. For the fall of 2004, the level of participation increased to 93%. It has been since, along with the online grade submission, converted to an electronic submission through the ICampus Portal. That was the pilot, in fact, for submission of those grades, which took place for the first time after the fall of 2004 term. The impact, in my opinion, is very difficult to access; however, there are some figures which may be of interest. The grades assigned in the fall of 1998 averaged 2.34. The grades assigned in the fall of 2004 have increased to 2.67. The number and percentage of those students on probation has decreased as well. I certainly believe that the studies that have been done with regard to this program indicate that its continuation is valuable to the University.

Senator Gamage: What evidence do you have to say this increase in grades is due to the APA grade reporting?

Dr. Adams: It is certainly not a perfect system; the indicators that I cited were the only indicators that we have as evidence to show that it has improved the performance of students.

Senator Gamage: I did look into the data for 1999. I found that about half of the faculty members were not reporting the grades. I looked at the grade distribution for faculty members reporting and the grade distribution for faculty members who did not report to see if there was a difference in the distributions. I looked at 22 large classes. Out of 22 classes, 15 classes had no difference at all in the grade distribution. I looked at the average GPA for these classes. Four classes had no difference at all. Two of those classes had negative effect, meaning that the group that received the APA grade had a lower average GPA. Only two of those classes had the positive effect. Right now, almost 100% of faculty are reporting the grades, unlike in 1999, so there is no way to compare them.

Dr. Adams: I don't believe that that data matches mine. In the fall of 1999, 76% of faculty members submitted the grades for the APA.

Senator Gamage: I looked at the classes where about half of the faculty members did not report the grades. That way I could divide the groups into two groups and compare them.

Senator Crothers: Are you willing to share that data with the AAC?

Senator Gamage: Yes, I would be glad to. One other suggestion is that if you really want to see if there is an affect, temporarily stop the APA and see if there a drop in the distribution.

Senator Brockschmidt: When you were looking at the increases in passing rates, was it taken into consideration the rising standards, not only of the University, but also of the students who enter? Were the higher ACT scores and the rising quality of students factored in as a separate variable?

Dr. Adams: That was not taken into account. The grades were figured the same way each year.

Senator Borg: Have students been surveyed on whether they perceive this as helpful, especially first year students?

Dr. Adams: Not to my knowledge. However, the First Year Experience Committee has done a number of focus groups with students and there is a possibility to do that. I can suggest that to them.

Senator Crothers: The only concern that I have ever had with this is the default assumption that unless you filled out the blank for attendance, their attendance was fine. I did not want to signify that attendance was fine in large classes when I did not know if it was. Has there been any adjustment to the form?

Dr. Adams: Not to my knowledge.

The item will come before the Senate as an Action Item at the next Senate meeting.

02.10.05.01   Distance Education Recommendations and Philosophy Statement (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Reid: As you can read in our cover letter, the concern of the committee was to balance the need for the development of distance education with a philosophy, policy and standards that ensure these courses will enhance the nature and objectives of the courses and conform to the University's mission. We were presented first with the recommendations from the University Curriculum Committee. Those went to the Academic Affairs Committee back in 2001 and they came out with a report in February 2002. At the same time, the Extended University was developing a document. They made a very compelling case for the importance of the exploration of distance education. The Academic Affairs Committee report came out with a number of questions and reservations, many of which were addressed by Dr. Crow's report. We also felt that we wanted to respond particularly in terms of making sure that the University guided this. We were asked, in fact, by the Executive Committee to develop a philosophy of distance education, which we have done.

Galen Crow, Distance Education Executive Director: I think one of the interesting facts about distance education on this campus is that despite the fact that there are no particular incentives to provide totally online courses, the growth of distance education has been quite remarkable. We have gone from in 1999, I believe, 17 totally online courses to last year when we had 60 totally online courses. Totally online courses are the ones that do not require rooms on campus; the courses are virtually entirely online. We started working on this four years ago and part of the impetus to provide some oversight and guidance was that we were actually looking towards the NCA visit. At the time, we felt that the NCA was going to be very concerned about how we provided oversight for distance education on campus. The recommendations strike a balance between the interests of the institutions and faculty and students. Where the recommendations finally fall is that it is really up to departments and colleges to define their own strategic goals for distance education in that the institution as a whole has no strategic interest necessarily in promoting growth of distance education. Colleges and departments would define for themselves what those strategic aims are and are best able to define the content and quality of those courses.

Senator Reid: The UCC changed the definition of distance education. I want to emphasize that this is a work in progress. We understand that some of these proposals are going to be controversial and we are bringing them to the Senate as our sense of the committee, but we want reaction back on these. The committee decided to change in the UCC recommendations that if an existing course is changed to a distance ed format, that there needs to be some oversight as to whether or not that course is maintaining the nature of the course and achieving the goals and objectives. This is in section A.2a. So, we have suggested that such courses would not stop with the department, but would go to the college curriculum committee, which would just determine the question of whether or not the goals are being maintained and met. I would add that our concerns for at least one course at the University where large numbers of students be required to take it online. Many students do not want to do so and feel that the quality is not what it should be. We want to make sure that such courses are looked into. We understand at a time like this when there are economic concerns that there is going to be a real temptation to switch to online and, perhaps in some cases, reduce the work. In many cases, online courses increase the amount of work, but it is possible to put something online with less oversight and have just the opposite.

The UCC also recommended that any new distance education courses that are being transferred be evaluated according to the NCA distance education guidelines, which take into account both quality and outreach to communities. The other recommendations have to do with the scheduling process. The sixth recommendation is that the Provost help create a mechanism for formative evaluation of ISU's distance offerings. Right now, they may be seen in the curriculum process, but there is no mechanism for the overall offerings in a regular process, so we added every five years and we put in a number of documents that we feel should be taken into account.

As for the recommendations from Extended University, once again, we added that distance education goals should be reviewed in terms of the NCA distance education criteria, the philosophy of distance education, if we come to a final draft that the Senate agrees upon, and relevant *Educating Illinois* themes. We also added a concern that effort be made to ensure that all students are taught how to, essentially, operate in an electronically- mediated world. The Extended University recommended that we accept the UCC recommendations. We just added, "as revised by the Senate."

In action 3, the essential recommendation is that an ad hoc committee be appointed by the University from relevant constituencies and be empowered to develop templates, standards and policies. The AAC added "to be used by departments, colleges and the University in the evaluation of proposed distance education courses". This is critical. If we are going to guide the development of distance education, we have to have not just a philosophy, but specific standards. We also suggested some standards that reflect the values of our committee, "that distance education courses will not replace courses that are taught in the classroom nor will the technology replace in-class meanings of a course unless a strong case has been made that they will improve the learning for the majority of students." This is precisely a means for dealing with the pressures that might be put upon us when we have fewer and fewer professors. It also responds to the problem that some professors are replacing their Friday courses with online Power Point presentations, which we felt was not necessarily justified. The actions also include a recommendation that the University designate the outreach fees to be allocated to an account utilized for outreach or distance students.

Dr. Crow: The outreach fee is a little obscure. Students who are in extension courses or an internet course and are in no "residential" courses, that student would not pay general student fees. Instead, they would pay an outreach fee. That outreach fee is supposed to be exactly the same as the amount of the general student fees. It turns out that occasionally when student fees have been increased, inadvertently, those fees are not increased. The intention always had been that those fees were to be used for purposes of providing services to those students remote from campus; currently, those fees just into the general fee fund and not used for that purpose.

Senator Reid: Our committee added another recommendation that not only the University, but the departments, review their distance education courses every five years. We feel, as a committee, that this is a very exciting domain to develop. We hope that we can use it in a way that won't threaten the small college atmosphere of the University and the quality of education within the University. The philosophy draft reads, "The development and maintenance of distance education courses at ISU should be supported, but only to the extent that its use is pedagogically appropriate and conforms to the NCA guidelines. The primary purpose of distance education is to serve students who do not have access to traditional on-campus classes. Distance education should be used to target on-campus students only if they provide educational opportunities that cannot be provided in the classroom."

Senator Jerich: I would like to pose an inquiry from the financial perspective. When distance education was launched here, there was a facility which provided audio and video. Do you have a sense of how many courses are using A/V transmission from site to site as compared to perhaps Web CT, if that is a part of it? And, if so, what is the expense for that and given the fact that the State of Illinois provided significant funding to the University and initially launched this and then they reduced that funding extensively, have other resources internally been allocated to it and is it taking away from other programs?

Dr. Crow: The State, a number of years ago, divided this up into regions to provide distance learning across the state and produced what is called compressed video or interactive television. That is essentially a room-based technology and room-to-room requires dedicated telecommunication lines. It is a relatively expensive technology and labor intensive to manage. The way the State developed it, they didn't require standards from region to region, so distance education was ok within the region as long as you did not cross from region to another, which further complicated the issue of distance learning. So, one of the recommendations that we had regionally was to

investigate ways to move out of compressed video technology. We had about five or six rooms operating on campus capable of this technology. The technology was funded by the State, but the State provided no program funds. We made recommendations to move into internet protocol video, meaning that if there is going to be video, it would stream over the internet instead of these dedicated telecommunication lines with the compressed video technology. We purchased some equipment with external campus funds and we experimented with that. Right now, Campus Technology Support Service has that equipment and some of our distance education courses are using that equipment. This equipment is very flexible and cost efficient. Some courses use this equipment, some use Web CT or Mallard or other tools. Actually, we have a number of courses that are probably still labeled as extension courses that are really a hybrid in that sometimes the faculty member will go to the off-site and sometimes they will stay on campus and deliver the course through the internet protocol video facilities.

Senator Riegle: On the next to last page, the second bullet from the top, you talk about maintaining high quality so as to discourage students from taking online courses to get a better grade. Quality may not be the same as difficulty. You could have a high quality course that was easy. You might want to consider phrasing that differently. Also, it is not clear to me if you want to evaluate these courses to see if they are still distance courses or if they are still quality courses? I don't see the need for a review just because they are distance education courses. I could see the need for review of every course or I could see the need for review to see if they are using technology appropriately. There needs to a more instructionally-centered philosophy to the evaluation.

Senator Reid: Would you be comfortable with a statement that said, 'review on whether they are using technology appropriately in terms of the goals of the course'?

Senator Riegle: I will leave that up to the committee. In the distance ed philosophy statement, the primary purpose of distance education is to serve students who do not have access to traditional on-campus classes. Actually, that is not the same as the next statements which talk about providing educational opportunities that cannot be provided in the classroom. That seems to me to be philosophically sound. The statement about serving students who do not have access is not necessary. Most of my distance education students are here at ISU. I am trying to provide an educational opportunity experience for any student no matter where they are. To the bigger point, this entire report seems to be a negative, suspicious kind of thing. We have this thing that is growing and we think we have pressures from the administration to use distance education to produce revenue, etc, so we will try to develop certain kinds of safeguards. Some of those things are real; however, there is another dimension to this and that is that many of our students prefer to learn this way and many of the national surveys support this perspective. This report, in addition to those negative kinds of statements, should include some positive aspects where we should investigate, as a University, the opportunities to convert courses that would be better done in a distance education aspect.

Senator Reid: Since the recommendations were originally proposed in that spirit of exploration, I agree with you and that we can better express the excitement of exploring. I think that we have to be careful, however, since the evidence seems to show that your average student is not going to do better in these courses. That is why we wish to have some of the caveats in here.

Senator Borg: I hear in both statements and in the discussion occasionally an equivalence between an online course and a distance education course. Am I correct in that all online courses might be distance education courses but not the reverse?

Dr. Crow: The only courses that we are tracking are those that are virtually 100% online, primarily over the internet.

Senator Borg: With this definition proposed, you say instruction *may* employ electronically mediated methods.

Dr. Crow: Perhaps "may" should be revised. We certainly wouldn't include correspondence courses in that; however, some might argue that a student in an extension course in which a faculty member literally goes to the remote location and meets with the students. Those students are remote from the campus. They need the same library access. They need the same access to advising and placement services that students on campus need and we still put those students in a category not as distance students. But I would argue that we should be sensitive to the fact that those students have exactly the same needs.

Senator Reid: Do you wish then to eliminate any notion of a distance education course that is not electronically mediated?

Senator Borg: No, but I think that if we are still including the older, traditional ways of doing it, somewhere we need to make that distinction.

Senator Crothers: Speaking to the budget question in action 5, has this gone through PAC and the fee supporting areas to dedicate a fee to this purpose?

Dr. Crow: That request has gone to the Vice President for Finance and Planning on several occasions. My understanding is that this is one of those things that pretty much everybody who looks at this agrees that this is what should happen. To my knowledge, it has not gone to PAC.

Senator Crothers: It seems that the Senate is being asked to support dedicating a fee and I would encourage the committee to look at that question. I would like to make sure that the people who actually control the money have talked about it and agree that it is a good idea.

Senator Hammel: Do we have a policy for determining credit hours for distance education?

Dr. Crow: We do not. I would certainly argue that that would be within the purview of the department or college.

Senator Crothers: That is inside the curriculum committee processes. I believe that we have provided the Academic Affairs Committee with a number of things to consider. If there are other items, please send an e-mail to Senator Reid.

Senator Reid: We will take your comments into consideration, try to consult on the economic implications of action 5 and bring this back to you.

02.10.05.02   Withdrawal from Course Policy Revisions (Academic Affairs Committee)
Steve Adams, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and Academic Services: This request is a request for a change in procedure in the Withdrawal Policy for dropping a course or courses. It originated with Carolyn Bartlett, who retired as the Registrar at the end of 2003. It came out of the Registration Advisory Committee. I think the intention here was to eliminate inconsistencies for course withdrawal after the tenth day of classes through the end of the eighth week. There were several instances cited that some faculty members required students to go to department office for the signed form. Some faculty members required the student to see the faculty member during office hours. The intention now is to basically do away with the form during that period of time. This would convert this withdrawal process to an electronic process. When a student withdraws, there would be no signature of a faculty member or chairperson required under the new procedure. Instead, the ICampus Portal would enable a student to do this online. The faculty member and department chair could easily gain access to the class list through the portal and review the list of those students who withdrew after the tenth day of class through the end of the eighth week. After that period of time, the student would go to the office of the University Registrar. The Registrar would contact the faculty member for a grade at that time.

Senator Reid: We agreed with this change and our committee made only one slight wording change to clarify.

Senator Adams: Would the policy also hold for half semester courses?

Dr. Adams: Yes, on a compressed timeline.

Senator Seelinger: There is the aspect of a faculty member being informed when a student withdraws from a course. You say that you can review the list online, but is there an active mechanism to inform the faculty member of a withdrawal?

Dr. Adams: Not under this procedure. The only thing that I can suggest is that I could have the Registrar at periodic times notify the faculty members, if that would be the sense of the Senate.

Senator Reid: I think faculty would like to know who has dropped the course.

Senator Smith: Just presuming that we are all now able to use ICampus, I would imagine that if ever a question arose, we could just check there.

Senator Reid: If you have 300 students in your class, it might be a problem. Also, some faculty do not use computers.

Senator Crothers: It does sound to me that Senate at least desires a conversation about whether an active mechanism would be useful.

Motion XXXVI-44: By Senator Reid, seconded by Senator Darnell, to move the revised Withdrawal from Course Policy to action. The Senate voted approval of the motion with the exception of one no vote from Senator Jerich.

Motion XXXVI-45: By Senator Reid to approve the Withdrawal from Course Policy.

Senator Hammel: This is probably not a friendly amendment, but I will pose it; that is, that we will notify faculty of withdrawals from classes by appropriate means, hard copy or e-mail, unless it becomes financially prohibitive to do so.

Dr. Adams: I am not sure of what the definition is for financially prohibitive, but I would say that it would be a pain to notify all faculty.

Senator Reid: I would accept the friendly amendment with the condition of when it would be carried out.

Senator Crothers: That would be contrary to the original friendly amendment. I do not accept that addition to the friendly amendment. If you wish to offer your own friendly amendment, you can do so.

Senator Evernden: Next year, it is going to be required of students to have computers. I think it would be silly to tie a policy around the fact that faculty are not using computers when students are required to do so.

Senator Holland: Don't we have the ability to flag the withdrawals so that notification immediately goes to the faculty by e-mail?

Dr. Adams: I do believe that that is a matter of resources. As far as programming is concerned, it is very difficult to get some of the programs that we want done now. That would be adding yet another problem to the entire situation.

Senator Jerich: I have a wonderment about what percentage of students are we talking about would be involved within this withdrawal process.

Senator Crothers: I don't see that as germane to this debate. That is well beyond the question. To clarify where we are, you have before you the policy now moved to an action item with its two main points, plus a third point regarding appropriate mechanisms of notification. I am not sure what the point of the financial concern was in terms of the matter, so if you can clarify that for me, we can decide whether or not that is potentially a friendly amendment.

Senator Reid: Let's say we were to pass it as amended without any financial restriction and the University comes back to us and says that we really can't afford to do this, what exactly would happen?

Senator Crothers: Among the many reasons I resisted moving this to action was these kinds of questions. The President might reject this policy as it stands now with the friendly amendment on exactly those grounds. The President is not here tonight so we don't know that. So unless we wish to table this until further review, we will not get those questions answered.

Senator Reid: I see no problem with tabling it until the next meeting.

Motion XXXVI-46: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Mahoney, to table the proposal as amended until it can be further considered. Without debate, the Senate unanimously voted to table the policy.

Advisory Item:

02.10.05.03   Social Security Number/University ID Process (Administrative Affairs Committee)
Senator Brockschmidt: Basically, what you have before you is a policy that the University is going to institute for the replacement of social security numbers with university ID numbers. Some basics concerns from our committee were the memorization of the numbers. The new numbers will be on the ID cards. There was also the point of graduating seniors who might need to access something after they leave and if they would use their social security number or a new ID. There would be a change over where they would give their social security number and then their new ID number would be used even after they left. If there are any questions on this, you can e-mail Senator Drew at amdrew@ilstu.edu. If she can't answer your questions, she will forward them to Bill Cummins, who came and spoke to us about this tonight.

Communications:
Senator Borg: On behalf of the Self-Study Reaccreditation Steering Team, I would like to thank the Senate for its participation, for many of you, participation in multiple venues, last Monday through Wednesday. We were very pleased with the response by the site visit team and look forward to the written draft of their recommendations.

Adjournment