

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, April 11, 2007
(Approved)

Call to Order

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

Roll Call

Senator Borg called the roll and declared a quorum.

Attendance and Motions

Approval of Senate Minutes of March 28, 2007

Motion XXXVIII-39: By Senator Nippa, seconded by Senator Richards, to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of March 28, 2007. On page 4, “interpreted” should be substituted for “interrupted” in Senator Borg’s comments. The minutes, as corrected, were unanimously approved.

Presentation: Ombudsperson Report (Ira Schoenwald)

Dr. Schoenwald, Director of Personnel/Faculty Ombudsperson: About a year and a half ago, the Senate, in conjunction with the Provost, developed a kind of “clearinghouse”, a place for faculty to go who may not know where to go in the complexity of the system that we have. I play that role, as well as a second role, which is probably the predominant one, as an informal mentor or advisor on the issues that they bring. As of the date of my report, March 26, I indicated that in the last year there have been eleven “cases”; however, since I wrote the report in March, I have had four additional ones. The kinds of issues that come to me are primarily those concerning issues of tenure. In some cases, they are issues of appropriateness of what an administrator or fellow faculty member has done and, in some cases, just advice about problems they are having in a department.

I think that the process has gone well. My impression is that people who have come have been satisfied, with the exception of one. It is important that they know what is confidential. Of course, our conversations are confidential, but there are some things that are not confidential and it is important for people to know and understand that. For example, issues of sexual harassment or an assault are not confidential. The law requires me to take that issue forward and I let the person know that. Other than that, it is really an opportunity for faculty to come and air in a very private way issues that they have and to get some feedback. I think it has gone well. I have also consulted with CAS, which has its own ombudsperson, Sabine Loew. We will consult back and forth, but not on the specifics of a case.

Senator Crothers: One of the intents of this process was to remove many of the same functions from the Office of the Senate Chairperson. People were coming to the Senate Chair for advice, such as for information about how to begin a process, which was procedurally odd since it is, in theory, possible that it comes back through the Senate Chair’s position for final adjudication. I can report that I no longer get many of those phone calls.

Senator Borg: Is this a position that you think that the university ought to continue permanently? When we instituted this, we asked for an impression after a year of how it has been working and also whether it ought to continue.

Dr. Schoenwald: Yes, I do. I think the more outlets in areas of advice that faculty have, the better. I would, however, continue the role in terms of its relationship with the Senate. I think that that is important that people in this role understand that they are part and parcel of the Senate, as well as the Provost.

Senator Crothers: Have you found that it would be useful to pursue Arts and Sciences path, which has its own ombudsperson, or is that just because it is a large college and it is helpful to have additional support?

Dr. Schoenwald: My sense is the more the better. There are going to be some people who want to go to a colleague whom they know or one in the same setting, and there are others, for the same kinds of reasons, who don't. In many cases, I am playing the role of a good chair or a good dean where I am giving the same kinds of advice as they would, but, for whatever the reasons, they feel that they can't talk to a chair or dean. Many times, my role is to help them to go back to that dean or chair.

Green Team Presentation (Charles Scott)

Mr. Scott, Director of Facilities Management/Green Team Chairperson: Many people thought that the Green Team would not survive past the first year. I am glad to say that this is our seventh year in existence. We continue to be encouraged by increased participation in campus-wide recycling programs and many efforts toward energy conservation. Since the Environmental Task Force created the Green Team in the year 2000, we have collected 9,000 tons of recycled materials and our electrical consumption has been reduced by 5.4 million kilowatt hours. When you couple that with the fact that our facilities have expanded nearly 200,000 square feet in the same timeframe, it is huge accomplishment for ISU. Some of the principle reasons behind our success have come from the top. *Educating Illinois*, Action 10.A, speaks to environmental sustainability assessments. We are addressing this through our partnership with UHECC, the University Health Education Coordinating Council. Another success comes from President Bowman's support and his signing of the Illinois Green Government Sustainable Universities Compact. By signing the compact, we have pledged to purchase renewable energy, consider green building practices, promote sustainable transportation, reduce water consumption and reduce pesticide usage. We have seen a lot of movement in each of these areas and we will have a full report to the President later this summer. The Board of Trustees is also supportive of our environment and when referring to our facilities in their vision statement, they have incorporated the phrase, "the need to use sustainable resources that protect and enhance the environment."

Most of our accomplishments this year have been around environmental awareness, as recommended through our Marketing Program. Last year when I spoke to the Senate, we had just started implementing a program that was put together by Drs. Tim Longfellow and Jeri Beggs from the Marketing Department. Their classes did a subsequent analysis of environmental behaviors. As a result of their work, we have revised and simplified our website. The address is www.greenteam.ilstu.edu. We have had articles in the *Vidette*; we have advertised in several kiosks; we have participated in all of the student-sponsored exhibits, including Spring Fest and Festival ISU. We co-sponsored the Healthy You, Healthy Earth Environmental Fair; three hundred people attended and enjoyed some educational programming. We have also encouraged recycling through positive reinforcement by giving away tee-shirts and can coozies when we saw people recycling on campus. Finally, with the creative minds of those in University Marketing Communications, our mascot, Dr. G. Blob, was born.

In addition to our marketing, we kicked off a new recognition program. The recommendation of the Environment Task Force was to create an awards program and this year during Founder's Day Convocation, we were pleased to announce the Environmental Stewardship Award, which was given to the University Housing Recycling Program for their efforts. They received a \$500 for future enhancements to their programs and there is a recognition plaque that will be installed soon at a location here in the Student Center. This year

was a first for us for participating in Recycle Mania. It is a nationwide recycling campaign and a competition that included over 200 colleges and universities. We are in the top half.

As we look forward, our goals are reflective of the same kinds of things that we have accomplished in the past year and will remain on environmental awareness. I soon will be reallocating some resources within the Facilities Management operation to convert an intern's position into a full-time sustainability coordinator position. This position will allow the Green Team to continue to pursue grants to further research environmental opportunities and to keep our Marketing Communications' plans very vibrant. We will also be reaching out to the community to identify some best practices. One of the things we identified this year was a partnership with the Town of Normal and installed a drop box recycle container north of the Bone Student Center. This is the first drop box we have placed on campus and it is already getting very favorable collection rates at over two tons per month. We will be involved this Friday and Saturday with the Illinois Sustainable Living Expo. It is an event that is held each year at Illinois Wesleyan University. Throughout the coming year, we will also support external funding opportunities through recycling energy, conservation and alternative fuel grant applications. We are going to look at environmentally conscious procurement policies at other institutions to consider whether or not there would be a feasibility of such a policy at ISU and explore some environmentally friendly options with other existing campus vendors to see if we can prepare a draft policy for consideration. We are working very hard with Campus Dining Services to research alternative sources for food purchasing and potentially even having local growers provide some products to campus. We are also assisting with their biodegradable carry-out containers and reusable mug program.

Finally, we will recommend implementation of the pledges within the Illinois Green Government Sustainable Universities Compact. It is this type of initiative and the support that we receive from campus administration that will make Illinois State very much in the forefront and have a very significant environmental impact.

Senator Crothers: Since Schroeder has been back on line, do you have a sense of what the comparative energy usage is?

Mr. Scott: I do not have that information with me, but I will send you an e-mail so that you can report back to the Senate.

Senator Crothers: With the residence halls' renovation, does that seem to have a dramatic effect on reductions in energy demand?

Mr. Scott: All of the renovations that we are doing include installation of energy efficient equipment. Ron Kelly in the Office of Energy Management has done a really good job of identifying different opportunities for us to create new energy loops that would give us redundancies in the event of failure of our aging equipment. We are also seeing, through energy efficient doors and windows, a lot less draft. So, we are seeing some major improvements.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: Distributed to you this evening is the memo, which I received in response to our Sense of the Senate Resolution for the Ethics Test Implementation, from the Office of the Executive Inspector General. They believe that we are entirely wrong and that they are entirely correct. I am to "implore you to participate in the spirit of the law." Also, one major piece of advice is to take more than ten minutes to complete the training. Finally, I would only encourage you to remember that if you said the word pedagogy to these people, they would have no idea what you meant. I say that only because it provides a context in which your actual ability to make any political changes are roughly zero. Secondly, I am still asking if anyone would like

to accompany me to Indiana State University in Terre Haute on April 24th. Finally, I do want to remind all continuing faculty senators that on April 25th at 6:15 p.m., you need to attend the Faculty Caucus in the Founders Suite. At that time, the faculty senators will nominate the new chair and secretary and new Executive Committee members. The new faculty senators have the right to participate in that meeting. Those of us who are outgoing can come if we want. The actual election of the officers of the Senate occurs on May 9th by the full Senate. There is an orientation session starting at 5:30 p.m. for all new senators, followed by the Faculty Caucus at 6:15 p.m.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Horstein: With the help of President-Emeritus Richards, I have been continuing to meet with the administration to learn more about their roles in the university, as well as how Student Government can work with them in the coming year. I am very impressed with how receptive everyone has been. The administration at ISU is certainly open to hear the concerns of the student body. I greatly appreciate that. If I have not met with you yet, I will be on your calendar soon. I have received the final draft of the Budget Review Committee's recommendations and will be forwarding that on by the end of the week. I would like to extend a personal thanks to Dr. Paterson for his help in drafting the document. Megan Cox from *U.S.A. Today* attended our Executive Committee meeting on Monday and presented her results from the surveys they conducted at the end of the campus newspaper readership pilot program. The results were very positive and we will be working with the administration to discuss funding option feasibility for the program. Last Wednesday, we had our first Assembly meeting with the new Student Government administration. We held Assembly Officer Elections. I would like to acknowledge the winners as they will be serving on the Academic Senate Executive Committee. Our new Speaker of the Assembly is Mark Cassata, Deputy Speaker, Allison Graham, and Secretary, Ted Mason. Also, we approved our new staff members and an underrepresented senator. We are still looking for underrepresented senators from the College of Applied Sciences and Technology as well as from Fine Arts. If you have any nominations, please send them our way.

Administrators Remarks

President Bowman: Twice a year, we have a Community Partners Breakfast. We invite in business leaders from the area to hear an update on the university's progress. We also feature a guest speaker. Those kinds of interactions are very important for us. The CEO of Country Insurance and many, many other people who are strong supporters of the institution were in attendance. The College of Business Dean Search is coming to a conclusion without a candidate selected. I made the decision for two reasons. One was that we did not find the individual that we were looking for. The second was because faculty and staff support for the candidates was lukewarm at best. I will appoint an interim dean within the next two weeks and we will restart the search after we have a new Provost in place. I am not concerned that this search means more than what it does on its face. Candidates for positions all across campus have been very strong. We have attracted and hired very strong individuals in our recent searches and I think that we will be able to do the same with the next round for the College of Business. On the web on our home page is a schedule for the University Advancement V.P. finalist visits on campus. Those will begin on April 16 with a candidate from Texas Tech; another one from the University of Illinois on April 20 and then finally, Dianne Ashby on April 23rd. You can click on the link and get to vitas and career summaries for each of those candidates. You may have seen a report that the College of Business undergraduate programs are ranked in the top 75 in the U.S. and ranked 41 among public universities by *Business Week* magazine. That ranking, in part, was based on companies that recruit nationally who are asked which programs produced the best graduates.

The positive news in Springfield is that people are talking a great deal about higher education. That is a real change from the last couple of years. The members in particular are very concerned about the funding

situation for higher ed. David Miller, who is the Chair of the House Appropriations Committee, as well as Mr. Mahoney on the Senate side, have both expressed outrage at what has been done to higher ed. Both sides of the aisle support a capital bill and we are reasonably certain that we will see our Fine Arts project funded. That \$44 million will mean that this governor's administration will have provided well over \$80 million to this campus in capital funding in five years.

Tomorrow night, Henry Lewis Gates is at the Center for Performing Arts. He will lecture at 7:30 p.m. He won a MacArthur Genius Award in the 1980; he is a fantastic speaker. Robert Ballard will be here Tuesday, April 17th, in Braden Auditorium at 7:30 p.m. Ballard discovered the wreck of the *Titanic*. Many of you attended Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.'s lecture. We had over 2,000 people attend that event and there was a great deal of good feedback from the campus and the community.

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Provost Presley: I want to thank the members of the Senate who attended the Celebration of Civic Engagement earlier today. We presented awards, particularly for the Focus Project, to a number of faculty who have been very instrumental in infusing civic engagement into the curriculum and co-curriculum. After that, we had a reception for Kyle Ciani of the History Department, who was the first person to receive the Reeves Award for undergraduate education. She gave an inspiring talk. We have received to date 2,473 deposits, which puts us very close to the same number of deposits we had last year. The average ACT for the perspective students who made those deposits is 24.2, which is up. The average GPA is 3.37, about the same as last year. The average class rank is 69.3, which is up slightly. We are doing equally well in the recruitment of minority students. We have once again a slightly smaller number than this time last year. The average ACT there is up almost an entire point to 21.9. The average GPA and average class rank are also slightly higher.

Vice President for Student Affairs

Vice President Adams: I want to congratulate Senator Horstein on his election as Student Body President. I also want to congratulate President Ross Richards and his staff for their many successes over the past year. I want to thank members of the community for attending the Student Affairs Planning and Budget Presentation. The search for a new director of the Student Health Services is in progress. Dr. Wayne Ericson, who has served as director for nearly 25 years, is retiring on June 30th. With the assistance of an executive search and consulting firm, we are conducting a national search to fill this position and hope to have a new director on board by July 1st. Finally, it is with deep sadness that those of us in Student Affairs extend our sympathies to the families of Mr. Richard Hunter and Ms. Sharon Mays, both employees in our division. Mr. Hunt was killed in a tragic boating accident at Clinton Lake last month. Ms. Mays died after a courageous battle with cancer.

Vice President of Finance and Planning

Vice President Bragg: We are receiving a much more positive reception in Springfield these days with respect to the budget. House Appropriation Hearings were held February 23rd. The representatives were very complimentary of Illinois State University and all that we have been able to accomplish during these difficult budget years. The Senate Appropriations Hearings will be held on April 26th. All indications, from the kinds of questions that we have been getting from staff, are that we will have a positive hearing there as well. They have been asking us to help them document the shortfalls that we have experienced over the last several years. A lot of the budget depends on the debate that is going on now concerning the proposed tax increase. The State Auditor General recently completed the institution's Fiscal and Compliance Audit for FY2006. The university received a clean bill of health concerning our financial operations and controls. On the compliance

side, we did receive three material findings. One is a very technical issue having to do with the way we filed or did not file a technical report with the federal government and we have corrected that. The second finding had to do with the positive timekeeping related to the ethics legislation. The ethics legislation calls on all public universities to keep positive timekeeping for all employees. We have a negative timekeeping system and we are working through that process to implement a system that will be in compliance. The third finding had to do with inadequate disaster and security controls for our internet and e-mail procedures. We knew that we would have that. Mark Walbert has put together and presented to the Senate a comprehensive technology plan that addresses those concerns as well.

Senator Borg: What sort of solution are you going to come up with for the positive timekeeping?

Senator Bragg: We are in the process of looking at a new, automated payroll and personnel system and as part of some of the packages that are out there, there are automated timekeeping systems that will be in compliance with the state ethics legislation.

Senator Borg: Can you give us some sense of what will be required on the part of faculty, whose time is often very flexible?

Senator Bragg: No, it is too early to speculate on what that form might look like.

Senator Crothers: Do you have plans to discuss the options with different constituency groups?

Senator Bragg: Absolutely. This is a process that we expect will take several years as we move through the selection process. We will certainly bring it through the shared governance process of the Academic Senate.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - No Report

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee

Senator Kalter: We had a spring budget meeting tonight with Provost Presley and Vice President Bragg receiving reports on FY2007. Apparently, we are on target in terms of spending, with no windfalls expected, but no excess spending expected either. Both the report for FY2008 on the Academic Impact Fund and the report on the budget in general are available for distribution to anyone who would like to see them. The Academic Impact Fund is reported to be healthy and we talked with the Provost about some of the changes that the Office of Academic Affairs is facing in the next operating year. Those included the effort to increase graduate stipends, to increase funds going to operating expenses and for technology and additional General Education sections, especially COM 101 and ENG 101. I promised Senator Mallory at the previous meeting that I would get back to her on the Academic Calendar. It is correct that the reporting for grades has gotten a little bit faster since the implementation of ICampus. Also, we had meetings last week in Stevenson that were initiated through the Executive Committee and went through the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. There were ten people from Stevenson who met with Michelle Kiesewetter, Bill Waters and Dave Martin to talk about the life-safety and move issues. Faculty can contact those people in Facilities Management if they have any questions.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Preston: We discussed the form and substance of the white paper that we are working on regarding the faculty retention survey. Secondly, Ira Schoenwald gave us a preview of the information he presented to the Senate this evening. The Faculty Affairs Committee has immediate oversight of the ombudsperson

position. The general impression of the committee seems to be that it is very valuable and functioning well.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Parette: Our committee did not meet this evening having completed its targeted agenda for the year. We do have one Action Item on the agenda for this evening.

Rules Committee

Senator Holland: We met to assign faculty volunteers to the External Committees of the Senate. We have an Information Item on this evening's agenda.

Action Items:

04.11.07.02 Plus/Minus Grading System - Recommendation for Formation of Task Force (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Borg: We bring before you the recommendation that the Senate create a task force to investigate the question of a plus/minus grading system at the university. The revised recommendation includes the italicized item, "a representative from Administrative Computing", as a member of the task force.

Motion XXXVIII-40: By Senator Borg to approve the Academic Affairs Committee's recommendation. There was no debate concerning the creation of a task force and the recommendation was unanimously approved.

04.02.07.03 2007-08 Institutional Goals and Priorities Report (Planning and Finance Committee)

Senator Parette: We bring before you this evening the report that was presented for consideration at the last Senate meeting. This incorporates the one friendly amendment that was noted indicating that recommendations were "above" as opposed to "below" in the narrative.

Senator Crothers: It also clarifies a question that the Provost asked regarding the nature of the report that we are asking for. We are not requiring units to give us large amounts of information; we are asking for it if it is helpful for them to do so and if they are willing. The only time we are asking them to make a formal report is if, in fact, they reject a recommendation, which is in the spirit of the Memorandum of Understanding. Finally, I have one additional friendly amendment, if the Planning and Finance Committee has no objection. At the end of the first paragraph on page two, under Requested Administrative Action, I want to add "to the committee" just to make sure that people know who to report to. It will require some discussion over the summer by the committee that is to be formed.

Motion XXXVIII-41: To approve the Institutional Goals and Priorities Report. There was no debate concerning the report and the report was unanimously approved.

Information Items:

04.02.07.01 Ph.D. in Nursing, Focus on Aging Proposal Recommendations (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Borg: There was a request to pull from the Senate's Consent Agenda the curriculum proposal for a Ph.D. in Nursing. The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed this at our last meeting. We had very excellent help from our committee member in Nursing, Senator Mallory, in explaining both the content of the proposal and also the role it will play in the university's curriculum. There are comments on the reverse side of our recommendations that explain the need for this kind of program. One of the concerns for all of our curricular programs is duplication of effort in light of a lack of demand. I think that it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no lack of demand for nursing professionals at all levels and it is particularly critical at the Ph.D.

level, which provides the faculty we want to encourage and instruct future generations of nursing practitioners.

Motion XXXVIII-42: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Mallory, to move the item to action. There was no debate and the motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXVIII-43: By Senator Borg to adopt the Ph.D. in Nursing proposal. There was no debate and the curricular proposal was unanimously approved.

04.02.07.02 University Writing Exam Recommendations (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Borg: It has been asked by interested parties, especially by Student Government, that the purpose of the University Writing Exam be looked at and some recommendation come before the Senate. It has been a long process and we have worked with the University Writing Board as it currently exists. We have agreed to recommend to the Senate that the Writing Exam no longer be a graduation requirement for baccalaureate degrees at Illinois State University and that the monitoring structure, as the bureaucracy in charge, be eliminated along with that.

Senator Kalter: Could you clarify your quote within your recommendations that says, “if the ISU community chooses not to make the investments required and to reap the educational rewards promised by an improved writing assessment yet to be proposed...”? What would those investments be and what educational rewards were they referring to? Do you have any information in terms of the document that this was taken from?

Senator Borg: In the process of questioning the current validity of the Writing Exam, there has been considerable discussion among writing professionals about how one might want to evaluate writing on this campus, providing evidence that we do take this seriously as a university. Unfortunately, the mechanisms to replace an exam normally, at least as I understand it, involve a portfolio evaluation. To the extent that that can be accommodated in the General Education program, especially in the Inner Core, that goes on, at least in part. Education programs on campus now also require something of a portfolio evaluation. But to create an entirely new portfolio evaluation engaging both writing courses at the basic General Education level, as well as those writing intensive courses in the majors, has sort of held up the process of answering the question, ‘is it necessary to keep an outmoded exam while we review other issues?’

The question of resources constantly comes up in the articulation of the desire, necessity and the reality of creating an entire portfolio system for the university. I believe I speak for the Academic Affairs Committee as a unit when we decided to disengage those issues. I personally believe that the university needs to continue some sort of discussion on what is the best way to evaluate writing and to ensure that all of our undergraduates write and speak articulately. We all know the censure that higher education gets from outside when individual cases of lack of training escape our attention. As a practical matter, I don’t think that we will ever overcome that, but I think finding the best way to deal with things on campus by preserving an outmoded and professionally irrelevant mode of demonstrating this, we need not continue.

Senator Kalter: Do you have a sense of how much the current Writing Exam costs the university?

Senator Borg: No, I do not.

Senator Crothers: If I understood the document and the history properly, no one has proposed an alternative yet. Part of the question that was asked was, ‘what are the educational rewards, etc?’ No one has done

anything much other than offer you a theoretical case for that at this point. Is that correct?

Senator Borg: That is correct.

Senator Crothers: So we are talking about something that apparently is not working versus something that doesn't exist.

Senator op de Beeck: I wanted to ask about the final paragraph of the recommendations. Would that paragraph negate the possibility of reinstating some sort of an assessment should something come through?

Senator Borg: Absolutely not.

Senator Crothers: I took it to mean that the only actionable part of this memo is the text in bold.

Senator Borg: That is correct. In the memos that have come to the Senate over the past couple of months, I have tried to be as bureaucratic as I can to separate the actual proposal from the explanation. One of the reasons that we have to rewrite things so often is that we include the explanation with the actual action and then it becomes enshrined. As I mentioned in my remarks, this sort of question is one that needs continued investigation throughout the academic community. It is not an action that ends the discussion or the concerns.

Provost Presley: Just to clarify, the Writing Exam is a test of an individual student's proficiency in writing. Regardless of whatever happens here, there continues to be a charge to the Assessment Advisory Committee from the Senate about the assessment of the learning outcomes of General Education. In that sense, we are building an assessment of the effectiveness of the writing programs. It is not an assessment that will certify the proficiency of individual students, but it will certify the effectiveness of the curriculum. You may have already inferred this, but no one has presented to me any request for funding or anything like that, so that is a rather theoretical point that is made about "if the ISU community chooses not to make the investment requirements." I have never heard anything about what that investment might be.

Motion XXXVIII-44: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Horstein, to move the proposal to action. There was no debate about moving the item to action and the motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXVIII-45: By Senator Borg to accept the recommendation to eliminate the Writing Exam as a graduation requirement.

Senator Kalter: I would like to get an answer about how much it costs so that we can have an understanding of how much a conversion would cost.

Senator Borg: I am sorry that I can not provide you with that information this evening. I will work with the Provost's Office to see if we can come up with an answer.

Provost Presley: That answer would be found in the English Department.

Senator Crothers: I would argue that if the experts on the test say that the test isn't working, the current costs are unimportant.

Senator Borg: I think the question that Senator Kalter is asking is not the cost of the exam as it exists, but the comparative cost of doing something different. That would be a little bit harder to get at ultimately.

Senator Crothers: It is also not directly germane to this issue.

Senator Holland: How is this going to affect our current students? It goes into the 2008-2010 catalog. Are the current students going to be required to take it as it is?

Senator Borg: We have been in consultation with the Registrar's Office. It would be possible, should the Senate agree to this, that the university policy become a blanket waiver for all current students under the previous catalogs.

Senator Ellerton: I would argue that our decision should not be made on the basis of costs but rather on the academic merit or otherwise of the proposal.

Senator Borg: That is the argument made in our recommendations.

Senator Bushell: In relation to the previous question, if it is waived as we vote tonight, is something else in place to evaluate the quality of writing skills?

Senator Borg: As I mentioned, at the current time, there are processes within the General Education Program Inner Core that try to integrate this sort of thing. There are efforts in the assessment that the Provost mentioned that intend to continue the efforts to tie this in, not only to the rest of the General Education curriculum, but also to writing-intensive courses in the major.

Senator Peppers: If the blanket waiver is put into effect, would that be immediate?

Senator Crothers: That is beyond the germane topic. You are now speculating about speculations. We have a specific issue before us, 'do we or do we not want to eliminate the University Writing Exam?' If we do, we have every right to expect the administration to continue to work on writing assessment mechanisms and to continue to bring this issue back through the Academic Affairs Committee to raise those kinds of questions, but, in my opinion, they are not germane to the issue of the elimination of the Writing Exam.

Senator Borg: I think I can answer that question by saying that in the discussions of the Academic Affairs Committee, that question came up: 'what will happen since the action that we take can only be publishable in the 2008-2010 catalog?' We talked with the Registrar's Office and discovered that a possible mechanism would be the waiver option. I think, should the Senate make this decision tonight, it would happen as soon as they can implement that particular option.

Senator Richards: I just wanted to clarify that, especially for the students, if this were to pass, there would still be a requirement to take the Writing Exam if you plan on graduating in May of 2007.

There was no additional debate concerning the elimination of the Writing Exam and the motion to eliminate the exam was unanimously approved.

04.11.07.03 Blue Book Revisions (Rules Committee)

Senator Holland: A subcommittee of the Rules Committee has gone through the Blue Book in detail and made a few changes to it. Anything that has been eliminated has strike-throughs and anything added is in bold. All of the internal committees now have an additional function added: "Other tasks as assigned by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate." We have, in almost every instance, updated the language to

read that faculty members are to be appointed by the Faculty Caucus and student members by the Student Government Association. For other constituencies, they are to be elected by their respective bodies. I have three short friendly amendments to add to the revisions. On page 37, under the Council of General Education, there are two items that need revision. Under the "Terms", it says, "nominations for membership shall be made by the respective college for approval by the Academic Senate." That should instead read, "by the Faculty Caucus". We also missed the one concerning students. It should read, "four student representatives of at least two different colleges **nominated and elected by the Student Government Association for one-year terms**." Then, on page 41, "Student Government Association" should be substituted for "SGA" for consistency. Finally, in light of tonight's action, on page 53, the University Writing Exam Board is omitted.

We very much appreciate all of the comments that did come in concerning our revisions. We were able to answer some of them. There were a few that we were not able to answer, which would have been far outside of what we were able to do this year, but I think that they are fairly important issues that should be taken up next year.

Senator Crothers: I might offer just two more of what I assume will be friendly amendments. On page 47, under SCERB, you have as number five, "SCERB shall review..." That needs to be numbered as four.

Senator Holland: I would like to point out that the numbering throughout is way out of line. It is my intention once this is approved to correct the numbering.

Senator Crothers: You have everywhere else in the document struck through anything about Senate approved. So, do you want to strike through the "Senate Approved November 11, 2000" on the last page?

Senator Holland: I am very happy to do that.

Senator Fazel: I would also like to make a friendly amendment. On page 13 are the functions of the Faculty Affairs Committee. I think that right now we do have oversight of the ombudsperson position, so I would make a friendly amendment to add "Provide oversight of and receive reports from the University Ombudsperson" as number 5 in the list of functions.

Senator Preston: In number three of the Faculty Affairs Committee functions, it reads, "nominate faculty to any committees for which requests are made for Senate faculty representation." That is very broad. What committees do you have in mind? External Committees or Internal Committees?

Senator Crothers: The Internal Committees belong to the Senate Executive Committee. External Committees get nominated by the Rules Committee. My guess is that the intent here is that when external constituencies come to us to ask for faculty representation, then it is that external constituency that this refers to.

Senator Preston: I would suggest the clarification of "external constituencies from the university."

Provost Presley: On page 22, under number 2B, does "enrollment projects" mean "enrollment projections"?

Senator Holland: Projections is fine by me if that was the intent.

Motion XXXVIII-46: By Senator Holland, seconded by Senator Nippa, to move the revisions to the Academic Senate Blue Book to action. There was no debate and the motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXVIII-47: By Senator Holland to approve the revisions to the Blue Book. The revisions were unanimously approved without further amendment or debate.

Communications:

04.11.07.03 *Sense of the Senate Ethics Training Implementation Resolution: Response from Office of Executive Inspector General (See Chairperson's Remarks Section)*

College of Fine Arts Presentations

Senator Borg: I would like to continue to invite people to the College of Fine Arts events. Currently, there is a production of *West Side Story* that is ongoing at the Center for Performing Arts. There are innumerable concerts going on and perhaps one of the finest, in a number of years, student art exhibits at the University Galleries.

Redbird Club

Senator Preston: Chuck Scott is the sponsor and speaker at the University Club on Friday. I invite everyone to attend to find out more about his programs.

Adjournment