

Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, February 11, 2002
(Approved)

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Present: Mark Albrecht, Carolyn Bathauer, Eileen Fowles, Scott Kording, Jack Howard, la'Rufus Mitchell, Curt White, Marian Hampton, Al Goldfarb, Vic Boschini

Excused Absences: Lane Crothers, Susan Winchip

Guests: Ruth Townsend, Ron Mottram, Dave Thomas

Addendum Items:

Ms. James: I am distributing four additional items, as well as a revised agenda, that we received after the Executive packets were mailed.

ORAL ADDENDUM ITEMS (for the Chair):

- 02.08.02.01 From Paul Borg: Recommendation that Senate endorse the Council for Teacher Education Policies (Extent of Student Teaching Policy, Performance Based Assessment of Teacher Candidates, Supervision of Clinical Experience)
- 02.08.02.03 Announcement of Black History Cultural Dinner

DISTRIBUTED ADDENDUM ITEMS:

- 02.08.02.05 From Ron Mottram: Materials Concerning B.F.A. in Art
- 02.08.02.02 From Paul Borg: Academic Affairs Committee's Review of Distance Education Report
- 08.07.01.02 Distance Education Report of May 2001
- 02.08.02.04 From Al Goldfarb: FOI Incentive Plan

Senator Kording: Was a revised agenda like this one distributed at the last Executive Committee meeting?

Ms. James: No.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of 01/28/02

Motion XXXIII-87: By Senator Howard, second by Senator Fowles, to approve the January 28, 2002 Executive Committee meeting minutes.

Communications (oral):

- 01.29.02.02 From President Boschini: Proposed Student Code of Conduct (To SGA and Academic Affairs Committee)
- 01.29.02.03 From Galen Crow: Announcement of New Director of Conference Services
- 01.29.02.04 From Alumni Services: Request for Nominations for Participants in Bell Ringing Ceremony on Founders Day
- 02.06.02.03 From Sharon Stanford: Academic Senate Faculty Membership Apportionment
- 02.08.02.01 From Paul Borg: Recommendation that Senate endorse the Council for Teacher Education Policies (Extent of Student Teaching Policy, Performance Based Assessment of Teacher Candidates, Supervision of Clinical Experience)
- 02.08.02.03 Announcement of Black History Cultural Dinner

Communications (distributed):

- 03.16.01.04A From Dixie Mills: Graduate School Bylaws Revisions (Chair of Rules Committee has reviewed and approved revisions.)

- 01.28.02.02 From Planning and Finance Committee: Final Report on Collegiate Restructuring
- 02.06.02.04 From Sharon Stanford: Report on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (To Faculty Affairs Committee)
- 02.08.02.02 From Paul Borg: Academic Affairs Committee's Review of Distance Education Report
- 08.07.01.02 Distance Education Report of May 2001
- 02.08.02.04 From Al Goldfarb: FOI Incentive Plan

COMUNICATIONS DISTRIBUTED RE: REVIEW OF PROPOSALS

- 01.29.02.01 From Betty Chapman: Request to Review Proposals on Consent Agenda (Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art Proposal, Teacher Education Sequence in Physical Education Proposal, Teacher Education Sequence in Art Proposal)
- 02.06.02.02 From Dianne Ashby: Request for Senate's Approval of Teacher Education Sequence in Physical Education Proposal
- 02.08.02.05 From Ron Mottram: Materials Concerning B.F.A. in Art

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of 02/20/02 at 7:00 P.M.

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Remarks

Committee Reports

Action Items:

Honorary Degree Committee Elections (Rules Committee)

Election of Senate Faculty Member

Election of Senate Student Member

Ratification of SGA Election of Student Member

***01.28.01.02 Student Elections Code (SGA) (In Senate Packets of 2/6/02)
(Requires Majority to Untable this Item)***

Information Items:

03.16.01.04A Graduate School Bylaws Revisions (Rules Committee)

06.08.01.14 Extent of Student Teaching Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)

06.08.01.15A Supervision of Clinical Practice Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)

06.08.01.15B Performance Based Assessment of Teacher Candidates (Academic Affairs Committee)

Advisory Items:

01.28.02.02 Planning and Finance Committee's Final Report on Collegiate Restructuring

02.08.02.02 Review of Distance Education Report (Academic Affairs Committee)

08.07.01.02 Distance Education Report of May 2001

02.08.02.04 FOI Incentive Plan (Senator Goldfarb)

Communications:

*Curricular Proposals Approved by the Senate on the Consent Agenda:
KNR Athletic Training Minor Deletion Proposal
Approved by the Senate on February 7, 2002*

Adjournment

Motion XXXIII-88: By Senator Hampton, second by Senator Howard, to approve the Senate agenda.

Senator Kording: I want to talk about the Student Elections Code. I just want to make sure I understand how we have gotten to this point. We sent a memo to the Academic Senate just informing the Academic Senate that the new Elections Code was in effect and at the last meeting this was somehow added to the Senate agenda for February 6. Was that because the Student Government sent it to the Senate?

Ms. James: If you read the minutes, you may understand why I was under the impression that the students were requesting that it be added as an information item for the next meeting.

Senator White: In the previous Student Elections Code, there was a provision that the Senate needed to approve it, which has been taken out. I personally don't care if the Senate approves the Student Elections Code or not, but what I don't like is that we did not have the opportunity to comment on our essentially being removed from the process. That is a very dangerous thing to happen just as a precedent.

Senator Kording: The Senate had the opportunity to comment when we revised the Constitution.

Senator White: If the Senate has the authority to approve a document and the document is revised in such a way that the Senate no longer has that authority, the Senate still has the authority to approve that new document just as a matter of process in moving from the old document to the new one. I don't mind removing the Senate from the approval process of the Elections Code. This is not a power struggle. It is simply one of procedure. I do think there are some dangers in a situation in which that procedure is bypassed. Jim Reid brings up the point that the revisions of the Constitution supervene that earlier document and that is an interesting question. He would argue that obviously they do and maybe they do, so it is up for discussion as far as I am concerned. It seems to me that there was something of central concern to the Senate in that document, something that has been changed. Unless I am reading it wrong, the same thing can be said of the Student Conduct Code, in that the previous document required that it be approved by the Senate; I am not sure I see that language in this new document. When substantial changes that have to do with authority and governance are done in this way, I have a problem with that. I don't have a problem with the change, but I have a problem with our not being sufficiently up front and aware of these changes when you made them.

Senator Kording: I am not sure what you are alleging. We sent you a copy. In the minutes of the last meeting, you said that 'if you are going to take someone out a document, you ought to tell them' and we did.

Senator White: Well that doesn't answer the problem that the Senate in the immediately preceding document had the right and obligation to approve the Student Elections Code.

Senator Kording: And had the Constitution not been revised, you would still do so.

Senator White: Okay, that's where we are at in terms of the argument.

Senator Kording: That's what I asked up front; how did we get where we are? I think we have answered that and I would like to know whether you feel we should proceed with this on the next Senate agenda.

Senator White: The question for me is does the revised Constitution supercede the document being revised, which requires the Senate's approving revisions--you have a conflict of two documents.

Senator Kording: Was it put on the Senate agenda as an information item because it was sent to the Senate by SGA?

Ms. James: I placed it on the agenda because when I read the Code, I noticed that the amendment process had changed and I brought that to Curt's attention.

Senator White: It's very reasonable given the previous document requiring the Senate to approve any revision for Cynthia to assume that it should go on as an information item and not as an advisory item.

Senate Kording: I am not trying to place blame. So, is that the reason it was on the agenda--because student government sent a copy to the Senate?

Ms. James: I was going to bring it to your attention before we received the copy because I had noticed that in your remarks to the Senate, you mentioned that you were going forward with a new Student Elections Code. I had planned to ask why the Senate hadn't been a part of the approval process. Also, I noticed that the revisions in the Constitution were only in regard to the Senate and not in regard to all elections, which the Student Code covers. When we revised the Constitution, we were only talking about giving SGA the authority over student elections to the Senate, not all student elections, which the Code contains.

Senator White: There is one way out of this. The Rules Committee of the Senate is the arbitrator of these matters when there is a controversy. If we can't reach clarity this afternoon, then we would have to send it to Rules. The Chair of Rules indicated that he doesn't think there is a real issue here, but that doesn't mean that his committee has considered it. I don't think it has.

Senator Kording: Is SGA the pseudo internal committee that sent this to the Executive Committee?

Senator White: Right.

Senator Kording: Well then we can withdraw it.

Senator Fowles: It was made an action item and voted upon.

Senator Kording: Academic Affairs withdrew an item before the Senate.

Senator White: Don't you think it would be a better idea to have a meeting of the minds than to try some kind of constitutional gambit?

Senator Fowles: There is a lot of agreement on the issue at hand. But there is another issue that bothers you which is setting a precedent that a discrete group could withdraw Senate approval, which may have been included in its previous governance, just by their own decision.

Senator White: I would be happy to understand if the Constitution supercedes the earlier document. We can decide that here among ourselves or we can send it to the Rules Committee, but I am not very happy with the idea that withdrawing it from the agenda is a solution to this problem.

Senator Kording: I think it's a short-term solution. I am all for a meeting of the minds as you put it, but I don't think that meeting should be on the floor of the Senate, at least until we resolve some of the basic issues over which we are disagreeing now.

Senator White: What I would like to hear are arguments about whether the Constitution supercedes the earlier document. Is the Constitution really referring to the kinds of things that we are talking about here? I am not sure that we can even say that without the documents in front of us and the opportunity to study them. The other possibility is to move it forward as an action item as it is without the Senate's oversight in the future contained within it. The Senate will be perfectly happy with the procedure, because it will have in essence voted itself out of involvement in the Code in the future.

Senator Kording: The problem is what if they say no. Then we will have a fight, which I have been trying to avoid.

Senator White: I don't see that fight. Do other people see it?

Senator Kording: Oh yes, SGA vs. Academic Senate.

Senator Thomas: Based upon what the Senate acted upon, this issue was tabled, so it is not an action item, it is currently a tabled item. For it to return to an action item, I think it takes a two-thirds approval.

Senator White: That doesn't really satisfy my concerns.

Senator Fowles: If SGA is going to have policies that involve academic pieces, like the Student Code, then I think it needs to be in the Senate if it contains student and faculty issues. Your take on the Student Code of Conduct and the Student Elections Code is that these are strictly SGA matters.

Ms. James: I have a question. If it is pulled from the agenda, under what Code are you going to proceed?

Senator Kording: The new Code. We say it's in effect. We have been operating under it for a month.

Senator White: That's what you call a constitutional crisis if you leave that unresolved. You don't have a clarification of the issues. It's imperious on your part to think that that is a solution. I would rather have a discussion of the issues and a decision made one way or the other about how we are to proceed. I have already offered you two resolutions that will allow things to work in your direction, because I don't think that the issue on the Senate floor would have to do with the question of should the Senate in the future approve the Code. The issue would have to do with does the Senate still have authority to review and vote on the document now.

Senator Bathauer: If that is the argument and people do feel that the Senate still needs to have oversight of the document, they may vote this down; elections are two weeks after that meeting!

Senator Kording: If it would pass, perfect. But what if it doesn't, then you are going to come back and say, you can't take the Senate out of the document.

Senator White: Were there people arguing that the Senate should retain oversight?

Senator Fowles: There was a question if we were going to vote on it, did we have oversight--did it need our approval.

Senator Goldfarb: It was a procedural question. I didn't hear people opposed to what the students wanted. It wasn't that people weren't supportive of what you were doing.

Senator Kording: Well, lets send it forward for vote. If it passes fine, but if it doesn't pass, we are going to do it anyway.

Senator White: It's nice to hear such support for the rule of law.

Senator Goldfarb: When you sent this to the Senate, did you just want this to be advisory?

Senator Kording: For the same reason I sent it to the President and Dr. Mamarchev, just so they had a copy.

Senator White: In general, Scott, there is a certain sensitivity that the Senate has because it has fought very hard in recent years to have a role in governance and it has fought very hard to make sure that procedures are meaningful and above board. If we see anything bordering on an abrogation of the procedural authority of the Senate, I am going to react strongly to that. I am telling you now that I will support removing the Election Code as something the Senate needs to approve in the future.

Senator Kording: Fine, but if it doesn't pass...

Senator Goldfarb: You actually have administrative recourse if it doesn't pass.

Senator White: Scott, it is so hard for me to hear you say that if it doesn't pass, you are going to do what you want to do anyway. How can you say that?

Senator Thomas: The motion that was before the Senate at the last meeting was approval of the Student Elections Code, so I think what you are asking is that a revision be done to the way the Student Elections Code is put together without faculty oversight.

Senator Kording: It intentionally doesn't include the Senate because no student is now directly elected to the Senate.

Senator Thomas: I think part of the confusion last time was because if the Senate voted to approve the motion, was the Senate saying that they were involved in all future Student Elections Codes?

Senator Bathauer: I made the motion to move it from information to action, because if it passed, the Senate would not look at Student Election Codes again.

Senator Thomas: So we are not asking for approval of the document, but approval that the Senate be taken out of the process.

Senator White: No, we are going to act on the entire document because we have that authority from the previous document. The document that we will be approving will not have any provisions for the Senate to approve any future Student Election Codes.

Senator Kording: I just want to clarify this. You say that we are going to take it off the table and consider it as a whole because the Senate must be consulted before the Code can be amended.

Senator White: According to the previous Code.

Senator Kording: If it doesn't pass, we are not going to adhere to that argument that the Senate has the authority to do that.

Senator Goldfarb: If it doesn't pass, Scott, I don't think what you want to argue that you are not going to live by what the Senate says. I think you are going to want to argue that you have recourse and make administrative appeal. I don't think you want to sit and argue that you are not going to listen to the Senate. There is still recourse in every decision that the Senate makes.

Senator Boschini: I think there is a bigger issue here. The Chair of the Senate has worked really hard to bring all of these people to the table. I don't think we have brought civil service to the table and I think we need to work on that, but we can fix that. Unfortunately, I feel like there is so much tension over this. It does bother me and I think this is a useless waste of all our time.

Senator Fowles: I think it's a constitutional issue and maybe that's where the tweaking needs to occur.

Senator White: Can we move to a vote now on the agenda?

The agenda was unanimously approved.

Discussion:

01.29.02.02 Proposed Student Code of Conduct (To SGA and Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Kording: Why is the Student Code of Conduct also being sent to the Academic Affairs Committee?

Senator White: If the Senate is going to be overseeing and voting on this, it seems inappropriate to send a student-based document only to SGA. It needs to also go to a committee where there are faculty. If this committee would not like it to go to Academic Affairs, this committee is free to say so.

Senator Kording: We would love to have Academic Affairs at our meetings. They would certainly be welcome.

Senator White: Okay, lets make a motion. If you have a motion that differs from my suggestion, I would be happy to hear it.

Senator Kording: I just have an alternate suggestion.

Senator White: Well, as the chair, I am going to say that it goes to Academic Affairs and SGA unless I hear otherwise.

Senator Albrecht: Are you worried about it getting approved quickly if it goes to Academic Affairs?

Senator Kording: Yes.

Senator Albrecht: Then I am in agreement.

Senator Fowles: Is it something that needs to be dealt with immediately?

Senator Kording: Very soon the student leadership is going to roll over and we have already had discussions to prepare ourselves for this. Dr. Borg was involved in the discussions and that's nice, but what's the reason for sending it to Academic Affairs?

Senator White: We can look, if you would like, to see where the Student Code of Conduct was sent for review in the past. I doubt very seriously that it was only sent to SGA. At this point, I am saying that it is going to Academic Affairs and SGA. If you want to challenge that, then go ahead.

Senator Kording: It would have gone to Student Affairs before and we are the pseudo replacement for the Student Affairs Committee.

Senator Boschini: I think it went to Student and Academic Affairs two years ago when we were about to change this. The reason is that part of this Student Code of Conduct has in it academic issues, for example, if you have a problem with a professor regarding grades. I don't think it is out of the ordinary that it would go to Academic Affairs. Part of what Dr. White has tried to do more of this year is get more people at the table. We have certainly done that with students. I think being at the table means that you have more responsibility to share everything and I don't see why we would not want Academic Affairs to see this. I think you are thinking more in terms of trying to get it done.

Senator Kording: I asked what would be the reason. Academic integrity would be a reason.

Senator Boschini: At one point I thought we should remove that part from the Code, because I thought things regarding academic integrity should be heard by another office, but I think its probably wise that it remains a part of the Code.

Senator Fowles: When there was a Student Affairs Committee, it was a combined faculty and student body. Now that is no longer in our structure. It seems like there is some confusion over what is in SGA's purview alone versus what needs Senate approval. I don't know if we need to reexamine that and maybe assign more faculty to SGA or revisit the committee structure.

Senator White: That's a separate issue. Since there are no motions, it will go to both committees.

Removal of Curriculum Proposals From Consent Agenda

Senator White: We have had protestations from Dr. Ron Mottram and Dr. Dianne Ashby about the removal of curriculum proposals (Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art Proposal, Teacher Education Sequence in Physical Education Proposal, Teacher Education Sequence in Art Proposal) from the Senate's Consent Agenda. Betty Chapman made the request that the proposals be removed for Executive Committee review. Dr. Mottram makes the very legitimate point that Betty Chapman is in the Provost's office, but she is not a member of the Senate and cannot officially request a proposal be removed from the Consent Agenda. I think Ron also has a good point in saying that the issues that Betty is interested in are general issues that the Senate should consider carefully, but probably not if it means some penalty to programs that have gone through a long process already. If the Provost's office wishes for these proposals to be withdrawn from the Consent Agenda, then I think that Provost is the one who should appropriately make that request.

Senator Goldfarb: What I asked for was to discuss this issue here. I am more than willing to withdraw the request for the proposals to be removed from the Consent Agenda if we can do three things. One of the issues that has been raised is the issue of General Education and the concern that we cannot use courses in General Education in relationship to majors. This concern has also been raised by the Faculty Affairs Committee. I would like to recommend that we ask the General Education Implementation Team for *Educating Illinois* to work with the General Education committees to review that. There was also an issue raised about overlap in courses. I would like us to charge the CTE and the University Curriculum Committee to review those issues and make sure that they talk through what the implications are. The third thing that I would like us to do is to ask the University Curriculum Committee to give us parameters for when they think it appropriate for programs to go over 124 hours. I am willing to have these proposals approved by the Consent Agenda with the request that we review those issues.

Senator White: I personally don't have a problem with any of those requests. Does anyone else have any comments or concerns? We will assume that we will get a memo from you asking us to look at those issues. I suppose that there is a possibility that as that process comes to a conclusion, it will be retroactive to some programs.

Senator Fowles: Will the review happen in the Senate?

Senator Goldfarb: All graduation requirements have to be approved by the Senate.

List Serve Policy:

12.04.01 Request to Review Policy

12.04.01A Request to Review Policy

Senator White: This is something that was carried over from two Executive Committee meetings ago when we were expecting a letter from Dave Williams about the policy on the use of the faculty list serve.

Senator Goldfarb: I was going to try to get this issue going with the Provost Advisory Council first.

Senator White: That's fine. It will just stay on the agenda.

Crime Statistics Report/Diversity and Affirmative Action (Ruth Townsend)

Several members of the Executive Committee voiced their concerns about harassment of students on and off campus concerning sexual orientation and racial prejudice. They assured Dr. Townsend that many faculty and students did not know to whom they should report these occurrences. There was also concern that the incidents were not being reported in the ISU Crime Statistics Report. Dr. Townsend informed the committee that only crimes that actually occurred on campus could be included in the ISU report. Also, she stated there was difficulty in getting students to follow up on their initial complaints. Executive Committee members suggested sensitivity training as a proactive approach and more outreach to better inform the campus community that the Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action specifically addresses these kinds of problems. Senator Hampton also noted that there had been a request for Nite Ride to make a stop in front of the Centennial building over a year ago. Senator Kording said that he would look into it.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIII-89: To adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved by standing vote.