

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, March 8, 2006
7:00 P.M.
(Approved)

Call to Order

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

Roll Call

Senator Fowles called the roll and declared a quorum.

Attendance and Motions

Approval of Minutes of February 8, 2006

Motion XXXVII-54: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Cutbirth, to approve the Senate Minutes of February 8, 2006. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Prof. Crothers: This is Josh Garrison's last meeting as SGA President and I want to thank him for his long service. While the other student representatives retain service on the Senate until the end of the year, the Student Body President always changes in March. Ross Richards has been elected as the new Student Body President for 2006-07. Josh will be going to law school in Southern Illinois. Additionally, I wish everyone a healthy and safe spring break.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Garrison: Last week, Student Government held its elections on Wednesday and Thursday. On the election ballot was a referendum about the smoking ban that is proposed in Bloomington/Normal. The students passed the referendum supporting a ban in workplaces, including bars and restaurants. The vote was 3,552 in favor to 1,814 opposed. The newly-elected Student Body President and I will be going to the Town-Student Liaison Committee for the Town of Normal to relay that information. Zach Koutsky, the Government Affairs Coordinator, has started to make contact with the mayors and various town council members. The newly-elected Student Body President is Ross Richards. His Vice President is also another Academic Senator, Brad Kaufman. The newly-elected Student Trustee is Brett Schnepfer. I would like to thank everyone, especially the students, for their participation this year. This will be my last Senate meeting as Student Body President, but I have asked Ross Richards to appoint me to his position that would be left vacant. He has agreed to do that so we do not lose a student vote.

Administrators' Remarks:

· ***President Al Bowman***

President Bowman: Monday was Kasmir Pulaski Day and we had an open house on campus. It drew over 2,000 students. Applications continue to come in by the bucket load. We have reached a record number of freshmen applications for next year already; there are 12,200 applications, which is 14% more than last year and last year was also a record. Even though the pool is bigger, the quality has remained the same and the ACT composite of the admitted students so far is 24.3. We have received almost 1,800 enrollment deposits so far and are moving along on target to reach our goal for the freshman class for next year.

I want to compliment the College of Nursing for two things. One was announced a few months ago. They received a \$1.4 million grant from the Illinois Department of Public Health to do some aging work in collaboration with Heritage Enterprises for the Joe Warner Teaching Nursing Home Project. Illinois Department of Public Health Director Eric Whittaker was here today and I had a chance to visit with him. He is a physician from Chicago and is very interested in ISU and some of our efforts in health care. Also, students and faculty may want to attend tomorrow night's public lecture by a visiting professor here on a grant that was funded by Pfizer. Professor Kagan of the University of Pennsylvania is an international expert on aging. She will do public lecture here in this room at 7:00 p.m.

Senator Borg: Given the success that we have in applications, how has this taxed our admissions area? Do we have enough resources there?

President Bowman: They would tell you that they don't have enough resources and that is probably true. It is taking a little longer to process the applications and that has been the net impact. We did add some additional staff when we added the essay requirement. It is time intensive and every application is evaluated by hand as opposed to some of the other systems that large universities use.

I would like to mention one other item. We testified before the Senate and House Appropriation Committees in the last couple of weeks; Vice President Bragg will talk more about that. For the most part, the reception we received was very warm. People recognized the changes that have occurred at Illinois State. No one promised us a lot of money, but we do think that the Governor's proposed capital projects, if they do pass the General Assembly, will be beneficial for Illinois State.

Senator Crothers: At my request, the President did invite State Representative Brady to meet with the Senate. He will join us at the next Senate meeting, barring any kind of legislative crisis.

· *Provost John Presley – Absent*

· *Vice President of Student Affairs Helen Mamarchev*

Senator Mamarchev: I want to thank Josh for his leadership this year with the Student Government Association. It is almost time for spring break, so let's hope it's a safe one. A few weeks ago, we had another student death due to natural causes, which is very tragic and unfortunate. Josh and others are well aware of it; it was one of his fraternity brothers. We have been working with the family. Several of us went to the visitation and then we chartered a bus so that the fraternity could attend the services.

On another note, I wanted to give you an update on some information that we received today during our Student Affairs Council meeting. The director of our Counseling Center is Dr. Sandy Colbs. She reported that for the second semester in a row, we have a fairly significant waiting list of students wanting to see the psychologists in the Counseling Center. It is important to understand that this is a very typical phenomenon and that other colleges and universities across the country have experienced the same kind of issue when their student ACT scores go up and the affluence level of the student body increases. So, this is not an anomaly, but it is something new for Illinois State University.

Right now, we have 30 students on our waiting list and while we are screening people for initial appointments, we are looking to use outside referrals as much as possible. We have added group counseling sessions. We have also increased the size of the group session memberships. We understand that there are limited resources and that there are no easy answers, but we are continuing to work on this issue and we are

benchmarking with several other institutions. In addition, we are very fortunate that Dr. Colbs is on the National Board of Directors of one the international counseling center associations. This group is looking very carefully at this issue across the country and trying to come up with suggestions and ideas on how to deal with this ever-growing problem.

In terms of FTE, we have about 10 psychologists on staff. The national norm recommendation is to have one psychologist per 1,000 students, so you can see where we stand in terms of that. We are going to continue to be very aggressive in getting students seen as quickly as possible. For those of you in faculty roles, it is important for you to understand that this is a very challenging experience for us and we have limited resources, so we appreciate faculty support and patience in helping us deal with this situation. We are going to continue to monitor it and if we need to make significant changes in terms of reallocation, we will do so, which means that we will have to drop some other things that we are doing in the division in order to meet this challenge.

Senator Fazel: Are there any types of patterns or issues that are commonplace among the students that faculty should be aware of and could help the student in? Or, are they mainly individual issues that vary from student to student?

Senator Mamarchev: We encourage faculty, who for example, have not seen a student attending their class for several days to please give us a call so that we can follow up. We have had a significant increase in calls of that nature to my office and we are really grateful to people who will take the initiative to do that.

Senator Campbell: You said that you have the FTE of 10 psychologists. Do students have access to a psychiatrist? Do you use clinical social workers or do you only use psychologists?

Senator Mamarchev: The 10 FTE is a combination of a variety of people, some of whom have clinical social work backgrounds. We have a psychiatrist for .2 FTE for the campus.

**Addendum: From Dr. Brent Paterson, Student Affairs
(Received 3/9/06)**

Student counseling services staff includes 12 full-time professional staff persons, including the director and associate directors. Of these 12 staff members, 10 staff members are licensed psychologists, one is a licensed clinical social worker and one staff member is a licensed professional counselor and certified alcohol and drug addiction counselor. Student Counseling Services also employs five part-time licensed professional counselors (1.95 FTE). It employs one psychiatrist at 0.2 FTE and a psychiatric nurse at 0.6 FTE. Student Counseling Services has an American Psychological Association Accredited Predoctoral Internship Program. We have four of these interns who have completed their coursework in an APA accredited doctoral program and participate in the year-long internship.

Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg

Senator Bragg: Last month, the BOT authorized the university to borrow another \$45 million for our auxiliary facility system. We did that in the form of selling General Revenue Bonds. We sold those bonds last Thursday in a competitive sale. We got a very good rate, 4.28%, which is very attractive. That would yield about \$47 million in proceeds when you add in the interest. \$40.5 million will be used for new initiatives. The remainder will be used to retire some older bonds. The bulk of the new initiatives will be for the ongoing, long-range housing and dining plans. The BOT also approved the next phase of that program at their meeting, along with some athletic facility improvements. We will close on those bonds on March 21st.

The President mentioned the appropriations hearings in Springfield last month. He is far too modest; he did an excellent job in answering the questions that the Senate and the House put to him. I very much appreciated it, because they did ask me a single question and I did not have to answer anything. As he said, we are very hopeful that we will not be cut this year and actually get a small budget increase. The Governor has proposed a million dollar increase for Illinois State University, which is just a little over 1%. It is, however, symbolic; it is not a cut and maybe it also symbolic that better economic times are returning and we can start to restore some of the \$16 to \$17 million we have lost in appropriations over the last four or five years.

Committee Reports:

· Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Borg: The committee met two weeks ago during the Academic Senate meeting time, since there was no Senate meeting. We cleared our agenda at that meeting as it existed at that point, the results of which are open to us for discussion tonight. We have since received a couple of other items and they may or may not receive attention before the end of this semester, but we will be working on them.

· Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee

Senator Smith: We did not meet tonight. We have one remaining item on our agenda, which is the Academic Calendar, which we are due to discuss before the next Senate meeting.

· Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator DeSantis: The committee did meet tonight, though we have no new business to report. We hope that everyone had a chance to read the report we prepared based on the survey on faculty retention, which is an Information Item on the agenda tonight.

· Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Burk: The committee met tonight with Dean Olson to discuss planning and budget processes and how to make them more open and transparent. Our annual priorities document that will come before the Senate is now in draft form. We hope to have that done by the next meeting and before the Senate in April.

· Rules Committee

Senator Holland: The committee put the finishing touches on the Faculty Code of Ethics, which we hope to bring to you at the next Senate meeting. We were given one additional item to look at and we will need external input to gain a better understanding of the proposal.

IBHE-FAC Report

Professor Curt White, IBHE-FAC Representative: The Faculty Advisory Council met at the University of Illinois at Chicago on Friday, February 24, 2006. We had one major action, the *Eight Theses on Higher Education in Illinois*, which was circulated to you. These theses, as you know started with a set of rather flamboyant and larger set of theses that I started around in the fall. I think that there is one sentence from that original piece that made it into this final version. Nonetheless, this document was surprisingly controversial even on the Faculty Advisory Council and it led to the only spirited debate on that body that I have experienced in the two years that I have been on it. So, that, I think, is a good sign.

The document was approved by a solid majority and it will be presented to the Board of Higher Education at its next meeting. Our intentions with the document are to circulate it among Senates and circulate it in the media. We hope to have an educational impact upon politicians and IBHE members. We have already heard

from Glenn Pushard at Southern, who has endorsed the document and thanked us for the concision of our work. I would ask you to consider endorsing this document, not necessarily tonight, and forwarding it to our own Board of Trustees. I could send it to the board, but I think it would be better coming from this body.

We will be meeting in Springfield on March the 24th and we will be speaking with Emil Jones. We have been asked by the Board of Higher Ed to comment on its priorities for HECCA grants for the next year and we will be discussing that. I think it is an important document. If you have any questions about the theses, I would be happy to hear them.

Senator Crothers: You say that there was contested debate on that body. What was the nature of the debate?

Prof. White: It is interesting; the body has kind of divided politically. It is an unusual kind of political division. There is a contingent on the body that we are now referring to as the “terminally timid”. They are just afraid of doing things that might bring too much attention to us. They are afraid that the body will be eliminated for some reason. At some point, I was even personally insulted by one of our members who called me a Piped Piper and said that I was leading the council to ruin. There is a growing number, interesting enough, of English professors on this body, which has really kind of changed the tone of the body in the last two years, and other people as well, like Alan Karnes. We are just kind of impatient with being bureaucratic paper pushers. Last year, we were aggressive in bringing politicians to our meetings and talking to them. After they lied to us and betrayed us, we decided to do something else this year and this document is one of those things. I have, for the first time, hope for this body, now that we have actually done something.

Senator Borg: I appreciate the work that has been happening there and I am interested in this timid batch who are afraid of things. I am especially happy with statement number three about public perception and also statement number eight about the university not being a profit-seeker. I think that the language crafting is very good. I would encourage this body, if you have not already read it, to consider it very thoroughly. I would enthusiastically support the endorsement of it and to do what we can to provoke the kind of comment that this invites. I applaud Professor White on his activities in this regard.

Prof. White: In a word, concerning the group, with this action, hotter heads prevailed.

Information Item:

02.27.06.01 Report on Faculty Retention (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator DeSantis: I really don't have much to add to what is here. This is the result of two or more years of discussions and then a long process of preparing a survey. I think that we had a pretty good response to the survey—312 faculty members responded. The report that you have is the work of the Faculty Affairs Committee sifting through many, many pages of responses and trying to boil everything down to a document that is readable and that we can now discuss.

Senator Crothers: I have read it very closely and want to flatly thank the committee for an enormous amount of work and thoughtfulness, but I do have lots of questions. I first want to open the floor to others who might have questions. If I understand your process correctly, in the first three sections, A, B and C, you are simply describing the actual process and general interpretation of the data. Section D is what you are calling for endorsement of.

Senator DeSantis: Right.

Senator Crothers: So, Section D is the section on which the Senate should concentrate because we don't know about the correctness or incorrectness of the other sections.

Senator Campbell: Once this runs its course in the Senate, does your committee have plans as to how to disseminate this very important information to key players?

Senator DeSantis: We do. We would like the Senate's endorsement of the recommendations and once we get that, we will present the recommendations to the Provost and add an additional recommendation that the Provost give periodic updates to the Senates on how these recommendations are being addressed. In terms of making the data available to the ISU community, once the final draft of this is endorsed and approved by the Senate, we do plan to put up a web site where everyone can access the information.

Senator Fazel: On page 8, you talk about the administrators serving multiple terms. Can you explain what you mean by that?

Senator DeSantis: This was a concern of some faculty members responding to the survey. There is a perception from some that administrators do serve sometimes longer than they ought to.

Senator Crothers: The technical question is, are there any administrative, fixed terms by contract? I know that there is a review cycle for chairs and deans that is once every five years.

President Bowman: At some point in the early 1990s, the university went to a policy whereby every five years, a summative review would take place. At the conclusion of that review, the appropriate administrator would make a decision about whether or not the individual would be retained in the position. There also is a provision for faculty in a college or department to request an early summative review and when I was in the Provost's Office in 2002, that was done in Fine Arts, which, ultimately, resulted in a change in leadership.

Senator Fazel: In a couple of places you mentioned conducting a cost study of moving tenure track faculty to a 3:2 teaching assignment. Do you mean tenure track or tenured and tenure track?

Senator DeSantis: Tenure and tenure track.

Senator Crothers: You can designate that with "T/TT".

Senator Schnepfer: I wondered why that the committee believed that standardized attendance policies would improve the quality of students.

Senator DeSantis: The committee does not necessary believe that. This is a report on the survey and that was a recommendation that came up in some of the substantive responses that faculty members offered in the category of quality of students.

Senator Schnepfer: On page 20, in the recommendations for improving the quality of students, I was curious as to why the University Hearing Panel, number 4, is considered an issue.

Senator Crothers: The faculty perception is that that process is unduly biased toward students. That perception is broadly shared, at least in my experience, fairly or unfairly. Whether or not this is an appropriate rectification for it is a fair question to ask because it may not even be true.

Senator Schnepfer: There are faculty who sit in on all of the hearings of the University Hearing Panel. It is composed of three members; sometimes there is one faculty, sometimes there are two. It just depends on the case.

Senator DeSantis: Again, that came from substantive comments that faculty members made and again the perception among some is that individual faculty members who do initiate the process of challenging a student on issues of academic integrity would like to be more involved rather than have it go to a panel to decide.

Senator Crothers: I think that these questions get to may central concern, although I very much appreciate the work that has been done. I want to make sure that I understand what the Faculty Affairs Committee did. The survey went out and the committee received responses. You then wrote this report describing the nature of the responses and then developed a series of recommendations based on those survey results.

Senator DeSantis: That is correct. The recommendations that we made essentially come right out of the survey.

Senator Crothers: And that is the nature of my concern. I think that the committee should take that information through the first cut and then provide some broader context. For example, the people complaining about the University Hearing Panel may not be aware that there is faculty representation on it, so whether or not this is an appropriate response is a fair question. I was stunned by the number of times the recommendations asked for more money. I very much wish the Senate to produce realistic products here. We would have had \$65 million more to spend if the State had not reduced its support and had not taken away the \$18 million a couple of years ago. Those are real dollars and there is nothing we can do about that in the short term.

I think there needs to be a rethinking of these recommendations in light of connecting some other parts of the university and discovering what is and isn't going on. Similarly, there needs to be prioritization. I thought it was excellent in the first part where you had the percentages about who thought what was important.

One thing that came out in this document, and I am not sure that it is highlighted enough, is the crucial role of chairs. It may be necessary to create a separate section on that and to add additional language as you think about it more broadly. The department chair's job is hard and some kind of guidance would be something to think about more broadly. On page 16, Section D, Achieving a Positive Environment in Departments, the first item in that section reads, "Using *Educating Illinois* as a starting point..." In effect, it appears that you are saying, 'rethink the nature of the university's strategic plan and its foundation without any knowledge of what people want. Do they want us to be a research I institution; if they do, they are not going to get what they want? So, my question is, what is it that seems to be driving that recommendation.

Senator DeSantis: What is driving that recommendation were the numerous comments about the lack of an identity for ISU and that occurred numerous times in the survey.

Senator Crothers: That is an interesting response and I am sure that the senior administration will be shocked to hear that, but I think it's valuable for them to hear it. I think we need to think a bit about the way in which that gets framed.

The very next one refers to mentoring. I would suggest prioritizing these recommendations, because it seems clear in your earlier data that that one is not a crucial issue to most faculty. It may be crucial to the junior

faculty, so then perhaps it should be a high priority.

I very much like number 3, 'the evaluation system for deans and chairpersons should be closely reviewed and revised'. I think the significance of middle management to the faculty is very properly highlighted in this report and I think that it ought to be drawn out and focused on in more detail. Concerning number 5, 'leadership training programs for deans and chairs', did the Faculty Affairs Committee talk to Chuck McGuire, Assistant Provost, or anyone in the Provost's Office, and discover the fact that we are starting that training right now?

Senator DeSantis: No, we did not.

Senator Crothers: So, I think that that is another area where an outreach might be helpful, because the training programs are beginning. You are right to identify it, because they should have begun 20 years ago. Rather than saying 'develop it', we could say 'expand, monitor and evaluate.' The next one states, 'DFSCs and CFSCs should be closely monitored and a regular system of rotation implemented.' Closely monitored by whom and for what reasons? I know what the concern is, but I would be more direct more often than not. Some people think that a certain group runs those committees and they won't let anyone else in. If that is what the complaint is, then that is what we need to try to fix.

Senator DeSantis: That was the complaint. As much as possible, we tried to put this in a language that did not reveal individual identities.

Senator Crothers: Of course, but the statement, 'a regular system of rotation', is a broad statement. In nursing, they don't have enough tenured faculty to do that, so, there is an implication in that recommendation that you are talking about the College of Arts and Sciences with the vast array of bodies that we tend to have. I think that, again, connecting to the appropriate authorities would be helpful.

Number 8 reads, 'the ombudsperson program should be broadened both at the university and college level'. I don't know what that means unless you are suggesting that every college ought to have an ombudsperson; the ombudsperson exists for everybody. Number 9 refers to funding colleges and departments to increase staffing. Again, that is particularly important in the question of priorities. Planning and Finance last year committed to the salary improvements, *Educating Illinois* committed to salary improvements and we had the midyear salary adjustments. Tying those things together would be more effective than just listing consistent desires.

Number 10 states, 'hiring standards and practices should be closely monitored.' Again, the questions are by whom and for what purpose? We have an Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action. We provide departments with broad discretion because they know better what the appropriate standards are. Number 11 states, 'search committees should be empowered to end searches if qualified candidates are not available.' Is there evidence that does not happen now?

Senator DeSantis: Not evidence, but this is based on the survey. People responded that they feared losing the line if they did not go through with the search and some searches resulted in undesirable hires.

Senator Crothers: I will stop there, but I would encourage the committee to do that kind of outreach.

Senator Smith: It sounds like a lot of what you are saying is that the original survey was simply to ask for faculty opinion. What is happening with this document is that faculty opinion, be it informed or ill-informed,

is being summarized and used as the basis for Academic Senate recommendations. It seems to me what is happening here is a step too far, too quickly. In fact, this should not be a set of recommendations, but should simply be a summary document of the content of the survey and then we take that and respond to that appropriately by saying that that perception is inaccurate or by saying that that perception reflects a real problem that needs to be addressed.

Senator Crothers: Strategically, I think that you are right and I think we agree that these are recommendations built off the survey. Just because someone thinks something is a problem doesn't follow that it actually is. That said, I don't think in the absence of these recommendations that I would have done a lot of this thinking, so I found the report very useful, if only because it forced me to think through some things. I agree, however, that we are not ready to endorse this material yet.

Senator Alferink: My concerns are a little different in terms of exactly how the recommendations are driven from the survey. You had a pretty good turn out in terms of the return, but it is still less than half of the faculty. Also, there is no information provided in the document that tells how many are concerned about the specific points in the recommendations. If, for example, you were to put these recommendations out there for the faculty, what percentage of the faculty would endorse the recommendations that you have made? If they had to prioritize things where budgets are involved, how would they prioritize those items, instead of 'we want everything'?

Senator DeSantis: These are all excellent questions. In the first section, Section A, on page 4, these general issues and categories are listed in the order in which faculty found them to be most important. The recommendations that were based on substantive comments are also listed in order of importance as linked to Section A. I don't think that answers all of your questions, however.

Senator Crothers: There is no frequency data, but there is a scale, which I found meaningful.

Senator Alferink: But much of this is not driven by the scale. My read of it suggested that the comments were really important in the implementation aspects, more so than just the scale. Is that accurate?

Senator DeSantis: Yes, we did try to preserve the spirit of the comments as much as we could, which is why we asked for them. We did not want faculty members to feel that they were taking the time to do this survey and then those comments would just disappear.

Senator Alferink: I think that it would be very helpful to have a frequency of comments as that would be more helpful in terms of the implementation than just reporting on a scale.

Senator DeSantis: In Section C of this report, starting on page 7, in most, if not all of the categories, we did try to give some sense of the number of faculty offering substantive comments. For example, that first category had 52 responses and our summary was based on those 52 responses.

Senator Alferink: I appreciate that in that section, but I don't see it in others and I don't see it tied as readily to the recommendations.

Senator Mahatanankoon: Perhaps you can also try to dissect the demographic variables. I am sure that you may get a different response when you compare a tenured faculty member versus the pre-tenured faculty member. I am sure that we would have a different ranking with that.

Senator DeSantis: That is a good point.

Senator Ellerton: My comment and question reflects the discussion that has taken place and I believe that that level of discussion would be reflected also in the general university faculty if they were given the opportunity. Has any consideration, once there has been more discussion and more background work on the existing reporting, been given to the next stage in which a revised and approved version, whatever form that might take, be released as a discussion document, and only with that status, so that that would encourage more discussion and debate across the university and so that, ultimately, a much more balanced document in terms of general responses could be presented?

Senator Crothers: I suggest a slight tweak on that recommendation, which is that I think that Faculty Affairs will eventually get a fairly sophisticated white paper done, which the Senate could easily endorse. The problem of faculty recruitment and retention does not go away, so that could be the foundation of a broader series of university conversations, which would be like our continual updates to *Educating Illinois*. This could certainly be continuously updated.

In number II, 1, it reads, ‘administrator searches should target high-quality, ethical administrators who are true leaders of vision’. Did you not think about the fact that we just changed the Administrator Selection Policy? So, those of the kind of recommendations in which the broader perspective would be helpful.

Senator DeSantis: Again, we changed the language slightly, but the comments themselves are right out of the survey. So, this is not the Faculty Affairs Committee trying to make comments on the different areas. This is the committee trying to recommend what the faculty said in the survey.

Senator Campbell: Some of your comments are kind of resonating with me. It seems that the document itself, the survey that was done and the data that was compiled are very useful, but how we use it is really the question we are pondering right now. As I read it, I found great thought in the first part of the document, the survey, and then struggled a lot with the recommendations. It seemed to me that if just the survey itself and the results were disseminated, with the encouragement of different levels of the university to discuss this, that out of that would come many ideas for changes. I think that that could be the benefit of this document. It is clear that there is a desire on the part of faculty to have a positive culture, an environment in which they feel valued and appreciated. How do we achieve that? Just the survey, without the recommendations, may be the beginning of conversations to continue what I see as the very positive evolution that we are in right now.

Senator DeSantis: I think that that is an excellent suggestion and the committee met numerous times trying to decide the best way to present the information so that it wouldn’t get lost. In these recommendations, however premature they may be, the point was exactly this—to get people to notice the survey and begin talking about it.

Senator Crothers: It struck me in reading it that there is not a word in there about faculty obligations. If you want your chair to be hard working, dedicated and loyal, you have to be respectful to your chair, too. The question about the pension fund was really surprising. If you don’t know what the State contributes, pay attention. It is against the law for the State to give me direct financial advice about how to invest. Faculty have an obligation in this mix, too.

Senator Borg: I wonder how much of this discussion isn’t a result of the fact that faculty are independent individuals with very strong minds and to try to negotiate the collective discussion by giving examples of the individual concerns is the problem here.

President Bowman: I also want to thank the committee for pulling this together. You had a large number of faculty respond. Despite the fact that I disagree with some of what they said, I still think it reflects the feelings of a large number of faculty on the campus. The survey confirms something that I have believed to be true for a long time and that is, faculty satisfaction is largely driven by the environment in the department, the relationships among their colleagues and the ability of the chair to be a good manager. If those elements are not there, most faculty won't be happy and they will leave. I think that has been our experience here and is probably true at most places.

We put a lot of information out about ISU in all kind of forms, on the home page and in the *ISU Report*, but there is still a lack of information in the campus community about some basic, important things that are going on here. One of them is *Educating Illinois*. We just had an accreditation visit last spring and *Educating Illinois* is seen as a model; it has gotten a lot of national attention. It probably represents the first time since we became a comprehensive university that we have coalesced into an identity for ISU and *Educating Illinois* is largely responsible for our rise in prominence and the kinds of students that are attracted to us. But we have hired a lot of new faculty and a lot of the faculty involved in putting *Educating Illinois* together have retired.

One of the things that I got out of this is that we need to do a better job of getting out in front of people and talking to them about why we are doing what we are doing and what is in place. The *Educating Illinois* comment on achieving a more carefully defined identity really stunned me because I feel like for the first time since 1964, we finally have one. I also think that we should separate the recommendations from the survey results, focus more on the survey results and think about where we go from there. I think that there are a lot of different things that we need to do as a result of this. It also sounds to me like there is a certain level of dissatisfaction with the way some departments are managed and that is something the administration needs to pay attention to. We do respond, but probably not as quickly as people like. We responded in the College of Ed this fall and made a change rather abruptly, but clearly there are places that people feel more attention is needed. So, if we delve into this further, we will identify where that is.

Senator Fazel: I have a suggestion for Section D, "Recommendations of the Academic Senate". I think that it would be a good idea that if you are going to share this document with others, you should title that section, "Faculty Comments from the Survey." It is really the faculty's recommendations and not ours. Also, no one would disagree that we would like to have good colleagues, good administrators, good students, good facilities, good salaries. I think that the issue is, what are the top priorities that we should focus on?

Senator DeSantis: Is that the general sense of the Senate?

Senator Crothers: Why don't you and I sit down soon and process this and think about how we might want to go forward. I am hearing a number of different models that we might want to talk through.

Senator Campbell: I would just like to thank the committee for its work; it was a very large task and I think it will be very useful in guiding us.

11.10.05.04 Classroom Disruption Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.27.06.04 Withdrawal Policy-Administrative and Involuntary (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.28.06.02 Additional Amendment to Withdrawal Policy

Senator Crothers: All three of these documents, the Classroom Disruption Policy, Administrative Withdrawal Policy and the additional amendment to the withdrawal policy are all related.

Senator Borg: This is a series of documents that have come together sequentially with which the Academic Affairs Committee has tried to deal with over the past four months, with varying degrees of success. The initial charge to us was to consolidate the withdrawal policies. As we were coming to some agreement, there apparently was an impetus to develop the first of these issues---the Classroom Disruption Policy, which came to the Senate in December as an Advisory Item. It was finally forwarded to us for our recommendations. We forwarded our revisions to the Withdrawal Policy to the Executive Committee in either late November or early December. It was returned to us because of additional issues that were brought to our attention. The result of it all is what you have in front of you in a series of three documents. The Classroom Disruption Policy was developed by Assistant Provost Charles McGuire. I don't believe he is here, but Associate Provost Jan Shane is here this evening. It is important that we deal with this policy first because it is referred to in the subsequent policy.

Senator Garrison: Concerning the emergency suspension part of this document, is there anything in place right now or is this just now being developed?

Senator Borg: As with many policies, they are unnecessary until the situation arises for which there is no particular answer. This is a response to a series of incidents, as I understand it, for which there was no written policy, but there was a consensus that things needed to actually to be accomplished in this fashion.

Senator Crothers: The norm in every place that I have been is that if the faculty person were to call the police, the police would do as the faculty person asked. This is codifying practice.

Senator Dagers: Must those prohibited acts be outlined in a syllabus that is given to the students before hand or can the professor just wing it as they go?

Senator Crothers: If this policy is passed, the answer to that question would be no. A faculty person will be able to say that that is disruptive behavior and if you continue to behave inappropriately, they will call the police. If you have difficulty with that, that is when you go to the department chair and through the appeals process external to that.

Senator Alferink: Is it accurate that the student who is disruptive would not have to be enrolled in the class for this policy to apply?

Senator Borg: I don't know; I don't quite understand how a student who is disruptive would be in another class.

Senator Crothers: It is an interesting question. We might consider changing the word "student" and say "persons" instead. The classroom environment clearly covers everyone in the room, but it does presume that everyone, other than the faculty, in the room is a student.

Senator Borg: It is not a question that came up during committee discussion.

Senator Crothers: I think we should consider whether or not we want to insert "persons", because it is at least imaginable that the faculty person has gone a little wacko, and it is the department chair removing the faculty.

Associate Provost Jan Shane: We have to think about two different things happening. One is the ability to remove a disruptive student from a classroom, whether or not they are enrolled in the class. The other part of

this is then actually a due process that allows for the suspension of the student from the class, so I guess my answer is, yes, it is allowing the removal of a student. To address another question, no, we would not necessarily outline all of these things in a syllabus.

Senator Brockschmidt: I have a question on the emergency suspension—suspending the student from the class for up to ten days. Is that just ten regular days or ten academic days?

Senator Borg: I believe the presumption is that ten days means ten working days, so its two weeks. We are not talking about ten class days because there could be a disruption in September of a class that meets once a week and that suspension would last until December or perhaps even after the semester was over.

Senator Brockschmidt: Did the committee look at setting different guidelines for night classes that meet once a week and are usually equal to classes that meet three times a week?

Senator Borg: No, because if that happens, there is a two-week period in which the student would lose no more class time than the student would in a three-class per week situation; in terms of hours, it is identical.

Senator Garrison: If after ten days, Community Rights and Responsibilities has not taken action, then is the student allowed to come back to the classroom?

Senator Borg: Yes.

Senator Daggars: During the emergency suspension period, would students that are suspended be allowed to make up work or at least be allowed to make up work if CR&R clears up the situation?

Senator Borg: I believe that would have to be negotiated between the CR&R Office and the faculty member.

Senator Crothers: I think that there are a couple of questions that require resolution, particularly the question of whether we want to say “persons” instead of “students” and “students” for the withdrawal cases, because if you are talking about emergency suspensions, clearly those only involve students. If we want to say that a person can’t just walk in off the street and disrupt your class either, we might want to make that clear.

Senator Anderson: When you have the suspension, is that from all classes?

Senator Borg: Just the class in which the disruption occurred.

Associate Provost Shane: I have a comment about changing the word student. This is a policy about students.

Senator Crothers: No, it’s about classroom disruption.

Associate Provost Shane: If an individual comes into a classroom off the street, who is not a member of the Illinois State University community, and disrupts a class, we have a right to call the police; we don’t need a policy to do that. This really involves students and ultimately what we can do when we have a student disruption in the class.

Senator Crothers: I am not sure if the committee ever addressed that question. It was true until we wrote

this down that we all assumed we could just tell students to get out. We are now writing this down to codify that. The other hasn't been codified either.

Senator Borg: Does it need to be is the question, so is the term "student" the proper one?

Associate Provost Shane: I think that there are already other legal policies that cover us when somebody trespasses on our campus and disrupts our classes. I don't think that this policy is designed to be broadened to say that. I think we already have those other things in place and they are not going to be in the same policy area that this policy would be.

Senator Crothers: I intuitively agree with you; I think that that committee ought to at least ask and answer that question, because I am getting a sense that they did not. The other question was do you want to insert "working" between "ten" and "days".

Senator Borg: We thought not; we thought that any reasonable person would understand.

Senator Alferink: When this came before the Senate before, I raised the question about "person" for a specific reason. It relates in particular to a story related by a former Chair of the Academic Senate in which he asserted his authority in the classroom even over police officers, who showed up to arrest a student when there was no particular immediate danger or harm and it would have been in the middle of the classroom, which was highly disruptive. So the question here is really how disruptions by anybody affect the classroom and whether we should address that in a particular way. That disruption could occur from a variety of individuals and some of them have legitimate reasons, for example, when there is immediate danger. Clearly, that is a case that needs to be addressed immediately. There are other cases that are convenience issues and maybe they don't. I raised the question hoping that the committee would consider the question of "persons" not just "students".

President Bowman: Are you suggesting that if the police showed up to arrest someone in a class, let's say on a drug charge, that the faculty member would have the right to ask the police to come back when the class was over?

Senator Alferink: I can tell you that the Chair of the Academic Senate at that time did exactly that.

President Bowman: He would have been subject to arrest.

Senator Alferink: I am not suggesting that that is what we should do. I am just suggesting that we should think through this question.

Senator Crothers: President Bowman is correct; when you interfere with a police officer in the performance of his duties, it is a crime.

Senator Mackey: Can the policy of the title be changed to include the word "student"?

Senator Crothers: That is a fair question that I commend to the committee's attention.

Senator Maroules: I really think that it is worth adding "ten working days". Interpretation problems would need subsequent attention.

Senator Meister: Senator Borg, when Senator Dagers asked you earlier if the student was suspended for ten days and the disciplinary proceedings by CR&R did not happen within that time frame, if the student would be allowed back in. You answered, “yes”, but this policy says, “or until disciplinary proceedings may be held by Community Rights and Responsibilities.” So, that means that if CR&R did not get to it for two months, the student could not return to class until after it had been reconciled, according to this policy.

Senator Borg: As I read it, that is correct.

Senator Meister: I think, we could probably ask Vice President Mamarchev, that CR&R has to at least send you a letter within ten days; but I don’t know if they have to have a hearing in ten days. Do they have to take some action within ten days?

Senator Mamarchev: Yes, to charge people.

Senator Meister: My concern with that is if a panel would find in favor of the student, then the student has missed class for a month and a half because that’s how long it took to get a hearing.

Senator Crothers: I do understand the concerns you are raising and they are quite legitimate. It is worth pointing out that these are not really prioritized, but what you are looking at is a two-stage process here where the second stage is being handled at the college level rather than by individual faculty, so the college has already made a determination at that point in time that the acts are pretty serious.

I understand your desire to protect student interests and you should have that approach, but, effectively, this policy is intended to declare what happens when one student has had a really bad day and acts like a jerk. Now faculty do that too and so we can argue about including that. But, that is level one. By the time a dean or a designee has said that this is a serious problem, I think that you are dealing with a student that has severe mental difficulties or other things, which we are going to take up in the second half of our discuss and for which there is another policy. I think it is important to point out how rare what we are talking about is likely to occur.

Senator Borg: I do think that it is significant that the necessity for these three paragraphs has never arisen until about three months ago when this was drafted. These are things that go beyond the expectation of what I find reasonable.

Senator Crothers: Let’s put this policy aside and since they are all related, we won’t vote on any of them tonight. You have then before you the Administrative and Involuntary Withdrawal Policy. You have two pieces of it. The second is just an addendum to the policy.

Senator Borg: You have this color-coded document that outlines the history of the drafting of this and of the various points of contention. We do have with us Brent Paterson from Student Affairs, who is the primary author of the policy. The committee has agreed with all of these various changes and I think it has been negotiated with the various areas of the university on how this needs to work. The genesis, ultimately, is that we have two policies right now, the Administrative Withdrawal Policy and the Involuntary Withdrawal Policy, that do similar things and it seems quite unnecessary to have separate policies. The committee had not seen, before we received it in our packets, this additional amendment and I am unaware exactly who proposed it. I don’t have any particular objection to it, but I would certainly like to know where it goes in the policy.

Senator Crothers: This came out of Exec with a discussion with Jan Paterson, the President and the Provost and Brent Paterson asking if your committee will accept that language as a friendly amendment to the policy.

Senator Borg: Where would this amendment be inserted?

Brent Paterson, Student Affairs: It would be inserted as the last sentence of the first section on “policy” on page 1.

Senator Fazel: In terms of the membership of the committee, specified on page 2, there are no faculty or students involved on this committee. I understand it is an administrative withdrawal committee, but don’t you think that faculty or students would also provide insight into determining whether a student should be administratively withdrawn from the university?

Senator Borg: You will notice that this is a revision to a policy that already exists. If you read the strike out and addition correctly, faculty participation does not exist now.

Senator Fazel: Can it not exist?

Senator Crothers: It’s a fair question. Dr. Paterson, if these committees have met in the past, do you consider privileged medical and other kinds of information?

Dr. Paterson: Yes.

Senator Crothers: The answer is yes, so you don’t want faculty or students on it because they are considering medical or other kind of health information. Senator Fowles has raised very legitimate concerns about this. The access to that information has to be only to designedly, appropriate persons.

Senator Fazel: How would it be ok, for example, for the Director of University Housing Services to have access to that information, but not the faculty, who might be involved and who might have initiated this process?

Senator Crothers: This is the administration throwing a student off campus; this is not a faculty-initiated process.

Senator Fazel: So, faculty can not report that a student in class is acting in a strange way. If the faculty actually observed the student in class, it may have been faculty initiated. Wouldn’t that faculty member be able to play a role on this committee?

Senator Crothers: That person shouldn’t be on the committee under any circumstances. That person should be asked by the committee for their opinion and evidence, but you don’t put a party to a case on the jury.

Dr. Paterson: I think it is important to clarify what types of situations come before this committee. If you look on page one in the first paragraph, the section that is in green, it talks about “high probability of substantial harm to self or others”. This is typically students who have attempted suicide; it is students who have made a direct threat in some way to harm someone else. We are not talking about a student that just acts out in class. There could also be some medical situations where a student has an eating disorder and it has risen to the level that the student is in danger of harming themselves. It could be someone with a communicable disease who refuses to abide by medical recommendations and is putting the university

community at risk. That is the level of things that this committee hears.

Senator Borg: I think we also need to note that the policy does not imply the classroom as the venue, so the faculty are not necessarily privileged in this particular respect.

Senator Garrison: If this is only for instances of direct threat, is there a secondary policy if someone cannot medically or psychologically continue, for example, due to grief?

Dr. Paterson: The student can withdraw from their courses.

Senator Garrison: Without negatively impacting their transcript?

Dr. Paterson: Yes.

Senator Crothers: The Emergency Withdrawal Policy is a separate policy that addresses that.

Senator Fowles: I still have to bring up the question about access to mental health records. They are protected by law in Illinois. Particularly, mental health records should not have to be accessed. The State says that the person has the right not to release these records to anyone; that is protected. So, how do you get around that in this policy? It was explained to me, well, if the student wants to stay in the university or be considered to stay, then he has to sign a release of those records. To me, that is somewhat coercive. For the medical ones, there is some access allowed, but not for mental health records.

Dr. Paterson: The student would sign a release to those records, which we would identify before hand. There are obvious members of this committee that are consistent, and we may add another person, for example, the Director of University Housing, if the student concern is directly related to their living in housing. If the student chooses not to release that information, then we have to make a decision based on what information is available. I equate that to a disciplinary decision that the university would make. The student not wanting to release information is in some way related to a disciplinary case and you have to make a decision on the information that is available to you. In the cases that I have dealt with, the information from the psychiatrist or psychologist or other physician is helpful for the students in terms of the committee understanding what is happening. If we had to make a decision without that, it would probably be negative to the student. But the student may choose not to release that information to us and we have to act on what we do know.

Senator Crothers: I would like to ask Senator Fowles a follow up question since we have had this conversation and I think that it is a very important one. What alternative model do you have? The university has the right to protect itself and the obligation to protect its students and its staff.

Senator Fowles: I don't know; maybe it's mandated counseling. But when you are withdrawing a student for mental health reasons, if they are harming themselves and they are getting treatment for it, they don't have to release some of their history to the committee.

Senator Borg: The policy does not talk about that. The policy simply states on page 1 that if there are these situations that rise to the level of a direct threat, the university reserves the right to take such actions. It does not mandate that it take them.

Dr. Paterson: I would like to clarify that. There is a "Treating Doctor Reenrollment Questionnaire" that is given to the student. They are to provide their treatment provider with that form and send it to us. We are not

interested in the details of that student's medical or psychological history or even the details of any counseling session. What we are really asking for from the treatment provider is 'has this student received treatment and is at a status in their treatment to return to the university and be successful in their academic pursuits.' That is typically about all we will get whether it's a psychiatrist or psychologist. We don't see their full medical records.

Senator Fowles: That is unclear because the information on page 3 reads, 'the information submitted by psychiatrists, licensed psychologists and other relevant reports regarding a student's behavior'. It sounded like you could have those records and that was a concern I had.

Senator Tolchin: Dr. Paterson, I have a question about the interim sanctions portion, specifically in Section C. "Interim sanctions may be recommended to the President by the Vice President for Student Affairs and/or the Provost....if a student poses a threat of disruption or interference with the normal operations of the university." Why isn't there language more congruent to that put forth by the Ohio court decision of a "direct threat"? The idea of just a "threat" seems sort of broad in scope. Though it seems a small matter, it could be significant in that the policy language refers simply to a threat versus a direct or substantial threat and is, therefore, incongruent with what the court has put forth.

Senator Crothers: We will not continue with the mark-through version, but will provide a clean version of the policy to you next time, which includes the friendly amendment that was discussed earlier. So, if you must see the mark-through version, bring that with you next time.

Adjournment