

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
January 18, 2005
(Approved)

Call to Order

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

Present: Paul Borg, Richard Boser, Lane Crothers, Marian Hampton, Nathalie op de Beeck, Roslyn Wylie, Provost Presley, President Bowman

Absent: Brian Blair, Dusty Evernden, Craig Kauzlarich, Josh Rinker

Guest: Professor David Malone, Chairperson of the Department of Geography-Geology

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of November 29, 2004

Motion XXXVI-32: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Hampton, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of November 29, 2004. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Distributed Communications:**12.13.04.03 Earth and Space Science B.S. Sequence Proposal – Previously Removed from Senate Consent Agenda**

Senator Crothers: I asked that the Earth and Space Science Sequence Proposal be removed from the Senate's Consent Agenda basically for a policy question that I needed guidance on. Chairperson David Malone of Geography-Geology, the department presenting the proposal, is present to answer any questions we have about the proposal. As you know, we have pushed to have some revisions in the financial disclosure of the funding required for curriculum proposals. The question that emerged relates to the five-year planning process for the Earth and Space Science Sequence. The proposal states that the department does not expect there to be any new resource demands; elsewhere in the proposal, however, it does state that if the program grows beyond a certain point, the department may very well ask for additional resources. There is nothing in the document indicating that they have discussed with the college what would happen if that occurs. That is, perhaps, because it is projected five to eight years out. I am asking for your guidance about how we should respond to this and to future proposals with similar language.

Provost Presley: When I sign off on proposals, it is after a conversation with the deans. I was assured that there had been no extra resources committed now or in the future. The proposal says some growth might happen and it would be due to whether or not a certain course will be reinstated.

Senator Crothers: It does also state on page 5, "Should our number of majors grow significantly larger than what we envision, additional base budget monies for student teacher supervision will be requested."

Senator Borg: One of the problems that we encounter when we do program review is that between the time something is approved and then reviewed, this sort of form gets completely lost. If you are considering five to ten years down the line, it seems that the methodology that we use here is perhaps inadequate. I don't know if that means we need to do anything with it here. I do think that these things need to be watched.

Provost Presley: A promise made eight years back would mean little. The issue would be how many students responded.

Senator Crothers: What I am hearing, at least implicitly, is that on these things, leave it be.

Senator Borg: Your question is perfectly appropriate and I am satisfied with the response.

Senator op de Beeck: Could there be a clause stating that no new funding is requested at this time with the understanding that additional funding might be requested in the future.

Senator Crothers: The general answer to that question is yes, because we can forward this to the Academic Affairs Committee and that committee could insert such language. I am hearing, at least in the short term, that that may not be something that this committee wants to do, and more broadly, since the timeline for getting into the catalog is near. Since my question was procedural, not substantive, and has been resolved, we can place this proposal back on the Senate's Consent Agenda with its original timeline. If the deadline to request a review by the Academic Affairs Committee has

passed, then it is considered as consented to by the Senate already.

12.02.04.01 From Roslyn Wylie, Faculty Affairs Committee:

1) Request for the Removal of the NTTF Sense of the Senate Resolution from Faculty Affairs Committee's Agenda

The Faculty Affairs Committee requested that the NTTF Sense of the Senate Resolution calling for follow up on the implementation of the recommendations within the 2002 NTTF Report produced by the Senate be removed from its agenda.

Motion XXXVI-33: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Hampton, to approve the committee's request. The motion passed unanimously.

2) Recommendation for Faculty Ombudsman Position

Senator Wylie: I am distributing to you a summary of the recommendations from the Faculty Affairs Committee concerning the establishment of a Faculty Ombudsperson (Document 01.18.05.02). The Faculty Affairs Committee endorses the establishment of a Faculty Ombudsperson and is recommending Dr. Ira Schoenwald, Vice President for Human Resources, for the position. He has met with our committee on several occasions. This would be a one-year pilot project followed by an evaluation by the Faculty Affairs Committee. We would like our recommendation to come to the Senate floor for information and action. There would be no additional funds required. We will have to do a great deal of PR about this new position and would like to make sure that the Senate is backing those efforts.

The FAC's ombudsperson recommendations will come before the Senate on January 26, 2005.

12.09.04.01 From Josie Evola, Diversity and Affirmative Action Acting Director: Underrepresented Groups Report

Dr. Evola will present a report on Diversity and Affirmative Action initiatives for under represented groups to the Senate on January 26, 2005.

12.13.04.04 From Jan Shane, Associate Provost: University Outstanding Service Award Selection

A list of the recipients of the Outstanding Service Awards will be provided as a Communication Item to the Senate on January 26, 2005.

12.15.04.01 From Joe Trefzger/UCC: Proposal for Revision of General Education Program

Professor Trefzger of the University Curriculum Committee provided a summary of the academic catalog revisions for the General Education Program to the Executive Committee for its information. The Senate approved the revisions to Gen Ed at its meeting of December 8, 2004.

12.15.04.02 From ISU Student: "New Start Program" Concerns

Senator Crothers: We received a letter from a student with concerns related to the New Start Program. As a policy matter, is this something that the Senate needs to review or should we wait until the policy comes to the Senate on its normal review cycle?

Provost Presley: The policy is in the catalog and is very specific. It is a policy by which nothing is removed from the transcript, but the GPA can be recalculated anew when a student returns to the University. This student does not qualify for the program. Enrollment Management has contacted the student, gone through the process in detail, and provided alternatives.

Senator Crothers: It doesn't sound like the policy needs particular focus or attention.

12.20.04.01 From Tibor Gyires/URC: Faculty Review Committee Review/Appeal Processes

01.18.05.01 From Priscilla Matthews/URC: ASPT Calendar 2005-06 (Faculty Caucus Agenda 1/26/05)

Senator Crothers: The URC memo relates to a set of processes involving our ASPT calendar and appeal process, which is very elaborate. The process is also illogical because when you appeal to FRC in this process, you are appealing after the Provost's decision. Yet, the Provost is not answerable to or responsive to FRC. I think that the URC is suggesting changing the structure of the appeal's process such that it only goes to the Provost after it has gone to the FRC.

Provost Presley: There was a lot of dissatisfaction last year on the part of the people who took part in the appeal process. I have been given a Board of Trustees' legal counsel opinion that I am not to provide specific reasons for a decision that I make to anyone. So, the people who took part in the appeal process had no way of knowing the reasons for my

recommendations. There are people who believe that it is a waste of time to appeal my decision when they can't know what it is based on. It is the opinion of the URC that it would be more efficient and productive if people appealed a decision to the FRC and then it goes to the administration.

Senator Borg: Given the ASPT calendar dates for DFSC in January and CFSC in February, what is the timeline that is suggested?

Provost Presley: Anyone that is happy with the recommendations from the DFSC and CFSC would follow the same calendar. If, however, you want to appeal to the FRC, that would occur immediately after the CFSC recommendation. During that period and the ultimate administrative decision from the President, it would come to me.

Senator Crothers: I am not sure we can do this because on the last page in the last paragraph of the indented section, it reads, "in order to effect a just and efficient review, the FRC shall have access to any documents used by the DFSC and the CFSC or Provost."

Senator Borg: All that we would have to do is get rid of the words, "or Provost", in this particular document.

Senator Crothers: A revision such as that would need to go the Senate Rules Committee.

Provost Presley: The URC is of the opinion that this issue needs to be permanently addressed, but in the meantime, they are recommending a finding. They don't want to waste the faculty's time this year.

Senator Wylie: The Faculty Affairs Committee has oversight of the Faculty Review Committee. There will be a meeting with the FRC Chair, URC Chair and myself on January 26th to try to establish the timeline.

Senator Borg: Is it the issue that they want this to be effective for this calendar year? If so, I share Lane's quandary, because I am not sure that we can do that.

Provost Presley: In my opinion, if we communicate this to everyone who is a candidate, with the dates, it's fair.

Senator Crothers: I appreciate the reasoning, but I going to more skeptical culturally; it always meant something to me that after the Provost's decision I had an appeal. Therefore, I am concerned about the impact this will have on the campus.

Provost Presley: In a national survey, this was pretty much the only institution that anyone was able to find that splits the administrative recommendation in such a way. Logically, my decision can not be part of the appeal. The current process is very inferior and hides from them that the only effective administrative appeal is through a lawyer. It would be unfair for us to pretend that the administrative decision is appealable because they can't know why I made my recommendation.

Senator Wylie: In the past, did people appeal after your decision?

Provost Presley: I was told last year that that had never happened under these rules; that's why I sought the legal opinion.

Senator Crothers: If we assume that this clarification is acceptable, then the promulgation needs to go forward with bells and whistles.

Provost Presley: Absolutely, we must make sure that every candidate knows about it.

Senator Crothers: I would be surprised if the formal changes came through this year.

Senator Wylie: People like to know that there is one more place that they can appeal.

Provost Presley: But there ought to be something to it.

Senator Wylie: But an appeal under these rules has never occurred.

Senator Crothers: I can think of when an FRC case came after a Provost's recommendation. If we present it on the grounds that this is a much more effective means, then that is much more helpful.

Provost Presley: A lot of contentious issues could have been settled for the faculty and by the faculty before sending it to the administration. We haven't talked about those moments when the FRC refers something to the AFEGC. They will have a tighter timeline, but they will have more time to get that done.

Senator Crothers: In the short-term, if the Provost and I could work on some specific language describing the clarification, then I would like to announce it at the Senate meeting, with reinforcement again next year. For the formal long-term changes, have we historically made those recommendations out of Faculty Affairs?

Senator Wylie: The FRC reports to the Faculty Affairs Committee, but the URC reports to the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Borg: The Rules Committee reviews changes in functions of committees, so the Rules Committee would somehow be involved in this to propose it to the Senate.

Senator Crothers: Now that we are aiming for specific policy changes to reflect these recommendations, Faculty Affairs would need to work this through and then bring its proposal to the Senate Caucus, not to the full Senate, because the ASPT process belongs to the Caucus.

01.18.05.02 *From Jim Reid, Academic Affairs Committee: Recommendations for Program Proposal Financial Form (To Rules Committee)*

Senator Crothers: This document is actually a series of exchanges that Jim Reid and I had by e-mail about the reporting on the financial implications form. The question, specifically, is whether proposals concerning minors would need to include this form. I responded that new minors would count; I just think that the reference in parentheses is illustrative, not comprehensive. He, in his final message, is suggesting that there is still some vagueness in the form because Table I refers to majors, which would suggest that it does not apply to minors. He suggests sending it to Rules for clarification.

The Executive Committee agreed to forward the financial implications form to the Rules Committee.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of January 26, 2005
Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of December 8, 2004

Presentation: Underrepresented Groups Report (Prof. Evola, Diversity and Affirmative Action Acting Director)

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Committee Reports

Action Item:

Election of Senate Executive Committee Faculty Representative

Information Items:

Recommendation for Establishment of Faculty Ombudsman Position (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Communications:

12.13.04.04 University Service Award Selections

Adjournment

Motion XXXVI-33: By Senator Wylie, seconded by Senator Borg, to approve the proposed agenda for the Academic

Senate meeting of January 26, 2005. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Adjournment