

Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, February 7, 2003
4:00 P.M.
(Approved)

Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Present: Ryan Allen, Paul Borg, Vic Boschini, Al Bowman, Nicole Clemmons, Lane Crothers, Eileen Fowles, Marian Hampton, Mark Ligunas, Jim Reid

Absent: Carolyn Bathauer, Jack Howard

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of 01/27/03

Motion XXXIV-78: By Senator Borg, second by Senator Hampton, to approve the January 27, 2003 Executive Committee minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Distributed Communications:

- 02.04.03.01 From Jeri Ryburn, UCC: Social Work Proposals (To Academic Affairs Committee)
- 02.04.03.02 From Jim Reid, Rules Committee: Ethics Code Revisions
- 02.05.03.01 From Dave Williams: iCampus Portal Senate Presentation
- 02.05.03.02 From Maribeth Lartz, Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Presidential Commentary
- 02.05.03.03 From Jim Reid, Rules Committee: Blue Book Revisions
- From Paul Borg: NCA Accreditation Self-Study Process

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of February 12, 2003 at 7:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Roll Call

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Committee Reports

Educating Illinois Update (Joe Rives, University Planning)

ICampus Portal Service (Dave Williams, Technology)

Information Item:

- 02.05.03.03 Blue Book Revisions (Rules Committee)

Communications:

NCA Accreditation Self-Study Process

Adjournment

Motion XXXIV-79: By Senator Ligunas, second by Senator Fowles, to approve the agenda. The agenda, with the addition of the NCA Accreditation Self-Study Process and the Blue Book Revisions, was unanimously approved.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of February 19, 2003 at 7:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Roll Call

Chairperson's Comments

SGA President's Comments

University President's Comments

Vice President for Finance and Planning's Comments

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost's Comments

Vice President for Student Affairs' Comments

Vice President for Advancement's Comments

Dean Representative's Comments

Chair of the Chair's Council's Comments

Questions and Discussion

Adjournment

Motion XXXIV-80: By Senator Borg, second by Senator Allen, to approve the agenda. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Discussion

02.04.03.01 Social Work Proposals

Senator Crothers: Since the social work proposals exceed the hours per major limitation, we will send them to the Academic Affairs Committee for review.

02.04.03.02 Ethics Code Revisions

Senator Reid: We are hoping to finish the revisions of the Ethics Code next week. We want to move it forward as an information item as soon as possible, but we want to first bring it before the Faculty Caucus on February 19.

02.05.03.04 iCampus Portal Senate Presentation

Senator Crothers: The iCampus Portal is a system in which students have more access to a variety of information, such as class schedules, grades and other records. Dave Williams, Associate Vice President of Technology, will present this system to the Senate.

02.05.03.02 Presidential Commentary

Senator Crothers: Senator Lartz asks if it is necessary for the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee to go forward with the presidential commentary.

Senator Reid: It seems useless unless the board wants us to do it.

Senator Borg: This is a process that the Senate and not the Board initiated.

Senator Crothers: I will let the committee know that it will not need to continue with it this year.

Questions of Assessment

Senator Crothers: The discussion at the Senate meeting last Wednesday night on the topic of assessment was extensive. The questions are how do we make what we are already doing articulate in terms of the assessment demands that the State is making and what role, if any, do we want the Senate to play.

Senator Reid: Right now we are in the process of evaluating programs of all departments. We are being allowed to make our own criteria. We have set up our own learning objectives and are figuring out how we are going to collect that data. I think that we are only going to have to write up the final results by the end of next year and then do so on a yearly basis. This process is simply to assess programs. Therefore, the faculty is going to assess certain samples of students in specific

courses to get a sense of how those courses are contributing to the overall learning objectives of each program. The second part that is being proposed, but which has not yet been decided by the IBHE, is that they are going to plan for us to assess every outgoing senior in our program. We may be able to use what we do in the first step to some extent to assess seniors. This assessment is going to include tests, portfolios, senior recitals and many other things.

Provost Bowman: The accredited programs have been doing this for years. It is possible to do it in a way that does not drain resources. However, the initial start up is pretty labor intensive.

Senator Crothers: What do we want the Senate to do? Wendy Troxel, University Assessment Officer, could come to the Senate to explain the timelines, sequences, procedures and what the University is trying to coordinate

Senator Reid: The departments are developing the assessment programs, not Wendy, not the administration.

Senator Crothers: Wendy is coordinating these efforts.

Senator Allen: For seniors, are you saying that after we pass the final and the class, we will have to take another test to graduate?

Senator Reid: It could mean that. They will have decided the specific areas in which you should be achieving by the time you graduate. It could be a test or it could be a portfolio in which you just collect your material and then that would be evaluated.

Senator Fowles: Could this be built into program review?

Senator Borg: If it is an annual review, eventually tied to assessing individual students, that would happen much more frequently than program review.

Senator Reid: This is much more detailed than what we do for program reviews. Program review may be redefined according to this assessment.

Provost Bowman: I would recommend that Wendy come to the Senate and talk in a broad sense about assessment.

Senator Crothers: I will contact her.

Designation of Departments as Schools

Senator Crothers: If the Provost thinks a designation of a department as a school is appropriate, then he should grant it because we continue to have the same argument when it comes before the Senate. There are no actual standards. That the faculty want it and that other schools in the discipline have this designation are not standards. The other path to take is to insist on real standards such as program size and real evidence that that it is common in the discipline to be called a school.

Senator Reid: I would like to push for an overall strategic plan.

Provost Bowman: The way that the policy is written now is that the proposal has to have the approval of the department, dean and the provost and comes to the Senate just as an information item. The only criteria in the policy are that the designation of school is the trend in the discipline and that, in some cases, this designation reflects on the accreditation.

Senator Hampton: Also, there was another criterion that it should not cost the university anything more.

Provost Bowman: Why not have the Senate come up with guidelines that the Provost can use for making the decision?

Ms. James: This is on the Planning and Finance Committee's task list.

Senator Fowles: This did come to our committee last year. The criteria were that if it was needed for accreditation and if it was the standard in the discipline.

Senator Reid: I think that Planning and Finance should look at this again in terms of forward-looking criteria. I think that those criteria are insufficient.

Senator Crothers: Is there a consensus that Planning and Finance should be charged with developing some meaningful criteria?

Senator Borg: Why was it given to Planning and Finance and not Academic Affairs or Administrative Affairs?

Senator Hampton: Academic Affairs would be happy to handle it.

Consensual Relations Policy

Senator Reid: We have a draft Consensual Relations Policy. The policy started in the Provost Office, went to PAC and then to the Rules Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and AP and Civil Service Councils. The Rules Committee substantially changed the wording. If the person in the power advantage in the consensual relationship does not report the relationship to his/her supervisor, that individual can be subject to some type of sanction. If the person who was sanctioned agreed to the sanction, it would stop there. We did not change that, but we did change that if the person sanctioned did not agree with the sanction, then the supervisor could not impose it. It would have to go through the grievance process to decide upon the most appropriate sanction. The Civil Service Council is not really set up for a grievance committee to be involved in such a decision making process. The AP Council has a grievance committee, but it generally does not involve decisions like this. However, we could simply add language to the policy to allow for the councils' own procedures.

Senator Fowles: Could the person in power go under two different grievance procedures, both faculty and AP?

Senator Reid: No, if it is AP/AP, then it goes through the AP Council. If it is AP/Faculty, then it goes through our new procedure for ethics and grievance.

Provost Bowman: What about having a simpler process in which the supervisor imposed a sanction, but there was an appeal opportunity.

Senator Reid: Essentially, they want faculty input in the decision of the sanction.

Provost Bowman: Why do we pay supervisors then if you are managing your unit this way?

Senator Reid: This is the shared governance argument. We are trying to get more faculty involved in decisions. The primary goal is to work together to eliminate or mitigate the conflict of interest. The supervisor cannot impose the sanction if the defendant refuses to accept it. The supervisor has to bring it to the grievance committee.

Senator Crothers: There is an informal step of negotiation implied.

Senator Borg: What kind of sanctions are we talking about?

Senator Reid: The most extreme would be revocation of tenure. In most cases, this would be similar to grievance type sanctions—letter of reprimand, etc.

Senator Borg: I am concerned that this could become coercive in the reverse sort of way. People are not being self-selective of finding partners but are putting up barriers on themselves.

Provost Bowman: I think that this proposal should be widely distributed to get feedback before the Senate starts to discuss it.

Senator Reid: We would first put in appropriate language for the AP and Civil Service Councils and then we would distribute it. How would we distribute it?

Senator Crothers: I would send it to all of the vice presidents to distribute within in their units as they felt appropriate and provide a reasonable window for commentary.

Senator Reid: The commentary would come to the Rules and Administrative Affairs Committee and we would take that into account and bring it to the Senate. The last issue is that Sharon Stanford thinks that we have changed this so much from the original document that she would like it to go back to those committees.

Senator Crothers: I worked out with Chika and with Martha of the AP and Civil Service Councils respectively that they would send us their ideas and we would integrate them. When we distribute it for commentary, we will just continue to operate under the model that we are taking the lead on it.

Motion XXXIV-81: To adjourn. The motion was approved by standing vote.