Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes February 27, 2006 (Approved)

Call to Order

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

Present:, Marian Hampton, Farzaneh Fazel, Lane Crothers, Dan Holland, Josh Garrison, Brett Schnepper, Ross Richards, Lynsey Wright, Nathalie op de Beeck, Provost John Presley, Eileen Fowles

Absent: President Al Bowman

Guest: Dr. Jan Paterson, Dean of Students

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of February 13, 2006

Motion XXXVII-52: Motion by Senator Schnepper, seconded by Senator Fowles, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of February 13, 2006. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Oral Communications:

02.27.06.02 From Paul Borg/Academic Affairs Committee: Committee's Comments on Proposed Catalog Revisions to Reinstatement Policies and Procedures

See Approval of Senate Agenda Section.

02.27.06.03 From Paul Borg/Academic Affairs Committee: CLEP Policy Proposed Revisions – Request from Committee for Placement on Senate Agenda as Information Item

See Approval of Senate Agenda Section.

Distributed Communications:

01.20.06.02 From Farzaneh Fazel: Fall Semester Break/Winter Interim Courses (Previously Distributed to Executive Committee 1/30/06 and 2/13/06)

Senator Crothers: In response to the memo from a parent expressing concerns about the length of winter breaks, Senator Fazel has asked us to consider whether it would be appropriate to offer winter interim classes during the winter break.

Provost Presley: I have taught and administered such a program at Lafayette College. It was a very positive thing at that institution and probably would be here. In a three-week term, it allowed for lots of innovative courses. There was travel to other states for short-term studies, as well as travel and study abroad. The tuition paid for those courses was the same as the tuition for the other semesters. The fees paid for the trips as well as for faculty salaries for a three-hour course. It had arisen out of the need to use the facilities during the long break.

Senator Crothers: Is it something that you think, if referred to the Academic Affairs Committee, with support out of your office, is worth studying here at Illinois State?

Provost Presley: I think it would require study. Here, we have difficulty running a full summer schedule.

Senator Wright: When I went to ICC, they had "mini-mesters", which are three-hour, full-semester courses taken in two weeks. It was really intense and stressful, but you get your three hours of credit in ten days.

Senator Fazel: I had in mind a combination of the two. For example, at another institution, a few days before the Christmas holiday, department faculty get together and discuss the course and assign projects. Everyone is off for two weeks; then students and faculty return for courses of intensive work for two weeks. These would be full-day courses. In other instances, students are taken abroad during the winter break. It is not something that we could do in all of our courses, but we could do it in certain courses. I think that faculty could identify courses that would fit into such a

structure.

Senator Fowles: I would hope that this does not mean that we are cramming basic courses.

Senator Crothers: Why don't we plan on just referring it to the Academic Affairs Committee for the study to begin next year? It is certainly something worth having a conversation about.

01.30.06.01 From Chris DeSantis: University Writing Examination Board Questions (Previously Distributed to Executive Committee 1/30/06 and 2/13/06)

Senator Crothers: We previously discussed questions forwarded by Chris DeSantis about the University Writing Examination Board. Nathalie, were you able to obtain answers to those questions?

Senator op de Beeck: I spoke to Chris and Julie and they were going to talk to one another. That was the last that I heard of it. Julie was curious about the rationale for the Writing Exam Board because she is considering revising the writing exam. I am sorry that I don't have any more information, but I will talk to them again.

02.10.06.02 From Chris DeSantis: Distinguished Professor Policy Questions (Previously Distributed to Executive Committee 2/13/06)

Senator Crothers: We briefly mentioned at the last meeting questions from Chris DeSantis regarding the language in the Distinguished Professor Policy. I mentioned that this is largely out of the Provost's office, so the most the Senate could do is pass a Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing certain ideas. There is a lot of flexibility in the policy because many of the Distinguished Professors like the flexibility, so I am not convinced that we should compel certain teaching loads.

Provost Presley: I also think that people like the flexibility. Before we got the communication from Professor DeSantis, I had already undertaken a survey of what sort of teaching loads Distinguished Professors have. We have Distinguished Professors who want to teach a full load and do so. We have Distinguished Professors who teach a full load but for one academic assignment to administer a workshop or program. The people that teach these are rather adamant that they do not want a reduction. I don't want to, therefore, mandate a teaching load; they run the gambit. I think that there is a great deal of emphasis placed on departmental culture and teaching loads. They vary tremendously.

Senator Fazel: Senator DeSantis also inquires about the occasion when the Distinguished Professor and Department Chairperson are unable to agree on a teaching load. So, maybe the question is not what the Distinguished Professor would choose to do, rather what the Department Chairperson would ask them to do. Shouldn't the Distinguished Professor decide on a teaching load?

Provost Presley: No, I don't think so. I don't believe that any of us should be free entirely to determine workload.

Senator Crothers: Different departments have different needs. Therefore, I think the dean is the appropriate level at which to raise these concerns, rather than at the university level.

Provost Presley: If there is a recalcitrant dean or chair, I am perfectly willing to have a conversation about this, but Lane is correct that there are fluctuating demands.

Senator Crothers: This is never closed; people can come back if better arguments come along. I will reply to Chris and let him know about our discussion and our thinking.

O2.21.06.01 From Jan Paterson: Proposals for Revisions to Student Center Policy and Programming Boards Senator Crothers: I have asked Jan Paterson to be here to address something that has not been a high priority for sometime because of the other things on our agenda. The Dean of Students Office and Student Affairs are trying to do some reorganizing of some of the programming boards for the Bone Student Center. What you have before you is a proposal from Student Affairs to change the existing language in the Blue Book for the Programming and Policy Boards to new kinds of boards with new patterns of oversight. This also addresses one concern that the Senate expressed in the past—that it seemed that the changes were ongoing inside Student Affairs concerning these boards

with no connection to the Senate, despite the fact that the Senate, hypothetically, oversaw those boards. That has been rectified in this proposal.

Dr. Paterson, Dean of Students: It was a full year that the Bone Student Center did not have a director, but rather had acting directors and divided up the tasks between multiple people. Then with the Dean of Students Office in the Bone Student Center coming into play, we recognized that there were these two boards that had been a part of the Bone Student Center that had virtually disappeared. The Dean of Students Office is very interested in reinvigorating some advisory boards. So, we initially went to that which was in existence and recognized that, as they were written, there was a bit of awkwardness to some of them. So, I come to you today to present to you a possible alternative approach to these same boards, but with slight modifications to them.

Senator Crothers: I don't have any doubt that people would be open to appropriate change, there was just more a matter of that period of drift and disconnect.

Dr. Paterson: We very much value advisory boards. We believe that they can provide us with good insight and understanding of the impact of the administrative decisions that we are contemplating making. The other benefit is that there is some coverage there. If a whole board helps you to decide that this is the way to go, sometimes you can make tougher decisions and implement them because a large number of folks agreed that this was tough, but the way we have to go. I would happy to speak to what the modifications are and why.

Senator Crothers: Eventually, this is going to have to be referred to the Rules Committee. Are there any questions or concerns regarding these proposals?

Senator Fowles: My only concern is whether we have enough students and faculty to fill these boards.

Dr. Jan Paterson: In both of these areas, we feel that it is absolutely critical that students need to be present at these kinds of meetings. One major change is the addition of two other constituencies. On the Performing Art Series Board, we believe that we need to add into that membership some community members because the reality is that we are highly dependent on this community to come to our performances for this to work financially. On the Policy Board, there would be the addition of an alumni member, who we would like to be a local individual. So, those are two other voices that we think need to come to the table.

Ms. James: When this issue first came about, the question was that when the University Programming Board was established, which was done absent of Senate oversight, would it replace the Student Center Programming Board. In an e-mail communication from you last year, you stated that there was no intent whatsoever to replace the Student Center Programming Board, but that seems to be what has happened. Also, the issue of redundancy arose in the Senate concerning having two programming boards for the Student Center when the dissolution of the Entertainment and Forum Committees was discussed.

Dr. Paterson: Last spring, we were able to resolve the issues concerning the University Forum Committee and the Entertainment Committee. Those committees were removed from the Blue Book with the replacement of the University Programming Board. The University Programming Board remained a Registered Student Organization; it was not considered an external committee of the Academic Senate. These, on the other hand, are modifications of existing external committees of the Academic Senate with slight modifications of their make up and purpose. My request is that you keep the boards you have, but modify them slightly. But, if you don't want to do that, we can except the old definitions and operate those, but we will likely create these two new boards to meet the needs that we are trying to address.

Senator Garrison: What was the rationale for lowering the number of students on the Student Center Complex Advisory Board?

Dr. Paterson: Historically, there was never a year that Student Government was able to provide the full student membership. The second reason is on committees in which there are multiple members, in that setting, people tend to not take as much ownership or responsibility. If you want to modify these numbers, then those folks would need to be

committed to learning the background material that would make them qualified advisors as opposed to uninformed opinion makers.

Senator Garrison: Could you give one example of the programs that would be put on by the Performing Arts Board?

Dr. Paterson: The Boston Pops performance.

Senator Garrison: Is that paid for through student fee dollars?

Dr. Paterson: No, it is driven for by ticket revenues, which again is why community involvement is so critical. Even in this year and half when we have not had this formal board, Barb Yonder has certainly called upon the Fine Arts faculty to help her think through decisions she has made. Related to many of these performances, we try to offer master class opportunities. So, when there is a performer coming in, if there is an ability to bring them in a day early or keep them an extra day, Barb has worked with faculty to offer a master class, which means that a set of students deemed appropriate is given an opportunity to have time with the performer. That could involve career exploration or actual training.

Senator Crothers: We will pass this on to the Rules Committee. I am sure that Dan Holland, Chair of the Rules Committee, will be in touch with you.

Dr. Paterson: If we could bring in the staff aligned with these two roles into the discussion, that would also be helpful.

Ms. James: How do you propose to fill the boards with faculty members?

Dr. Paterson: When you and I communicated last fall about the reactivation of these boards, we had, of course, missed the normal rotation of being assigned membership through the Academic Senate. So, Cynthia and I agreed that it would be at least this spring before we could fill the boards. If it would be your decision that it can't get through Rules this spring and you want to go ahead and assign faculty and students to these boards, we would love to have that happen. If we needed to increase the number of members, we would come back to you with such a request and find those additional faculty members on our own. SGA will need to think through whether it wants to assign the full 12 students to the committee or rather the number that we are recommending.

Ms. James: We have already sent out a mass mailing to faculty requesting participation on the external committees of the Senate, which did not include the option of serving on either the Policy or the Programming Board.

Dr. Paterson: Could there be an addendum to that or a second go around?

Ms. James: We could send out another 1,200 copies with that request to faculty.

Senator Crothers: We will talk about a mass e-mail; we will do our best.

Dr. Paterson: If not, as an alternative, you could allow us to seek faculty members to serve on the boards and present them to you for your approval.

Senator Crothers: That would probably be easiest at this point; there is precedent for doing that.

Dr. Paterson: That would be wonderful, because we have already established a relationship with the Fine Arts faculty and my guess is that if we did some thinking of the kinds of folks that utilize the Student Center a great deal, we probably could come up with those members and present them to you for your approval.

02.27.06.04 From Brent Paterson: Administrative Withdrawal/Involuntary Withdrawal Policies - Revised Senator Crothers: The Administrative Withdrawal Policy will be on the next Senate Agenda and, hopefully, the revisions have satisfied both the President and the Provost.

Provost Presley: There are two things that I want to put in the policy, "The Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs may recommend interim sanctions."; and, under the Interim Sanctions section, as the last sentence, "Applications of interim sanctions may be in addition to the procedures under the Classroom Disruption Policy." This Administrative Withdrawal Policy deals mainly with only medical or psychological issues. There is another situation that I wanted to ask Dr. Paterson if there are rules somewhere about the writ of persona non grata that sometimes also emerges from these situations. I know that it is not specifically for students; we can and have issued a writ for people who are not students here. It is simply a declaration to the police that if they are here, they can arrest them.

Dr. Paterson: My guess is there will be times at which it would be important in doing an administrative withdrawal or a classroom disruption that results in a withdrawal, that in addition, because their behavior is deemed dangerous, they might be perceived as a threat to the campus, we would want to do the persona non grata also. But there also times that people are withdrawn that are not deemed a threat to anyone. So, my guess is that that should remain separate.

Provost Presley: If, in fact, a student's classroom behavior can result in a writ of personal non grata, or if their psychological manifestations can result in it, should we not allude to it in these rules? I have never actually seen it written down.

Senator Crothers: I believe that persona non grata is inside police procedures.

Provost Presley: I have signed more than a few of them.

Dr. Paterson: Lane is correct; that is something that only the police can act on.

Provost Presley: It seems to me a legal issue and not an academic issue, but should it be mentioned here?

Senator Crothers: If I understand you correctly, at the bottom of the first paragraph, there would be something along the lines that there may be other circumstances under which a person may be withdrawn from the university as described in the persona non grata policy.

Dr. Paterson: The persona non grata doesn't have anything to do with being withdrawn from the university.

Provost Presley: Yes, but if you have this applied to you for psychological, behavioral or medical reasons, we might impose it, so if we don't list it here as a possibility...

Dr. Paterson: Could we say that additionally persona non grata may be imposed?

Provost Presley: Not even use that language, but say that students may actually be forbidden to set foot on campus property.

Senator Crothers: The question is if the Academic Affairs Committee would take that as a friendly amendment next Wednesday night.

Provost Presley: I wouldn't want the persona non grata to come out of no where and land on a student. At the same time, I think if we are describing withdrawal from the university, people need to also understand it can mean withdrawal physically from your room, from your classrooms, from the property.

Dr. Paterson: That makes a great deal of sense to me, but persona non grata is just a legal activity. It is not a policy.

Senator Crothers: Can you ask Brent if he has a problem with that and if he does to let us know? If not, we will do it from the floor.

Senator Fowles: It appears that this committee has access to psychiatric information and we know that that is legally protected. People who are admitted to hospitals and to psychiatric units—nobody has access to their records. They have to specify who has access to their records. I am looking at this and it states, "information submitted by a

psychiatrist...and any other relevant reports." They don't have to release that information.

Senator Crothers: You are right; but then we don't have to let them back in. That is the condition; if you want back in, you have to let us see your records. That is a contractual thing. We don't have the right to see them, but we are not obliged to educate them if we feel threatened by them either.

Senator Fowles: Yes, that is true. Is the committee aware enough of what is in those records?

Provost Presley: The Director of Student Health Services might have to keep people continually updated.

Senator Fowles: I am not sure if they would understand some of those sorts of things. The records are private. Could a person say, 'I don't want my records released; I want my psychiatrist to come and talk to the committee'?

Provost Presley: Not according to this.

Senator Crothers: This is where the lawyer in me looks at the doctor in you. I say it's a contract. You have the right to waive your privacy.

02.27.06.01 From Chris DeSantis/Faculty Affairs Committee: Faculty Retention Report

Senator Crothers: The report that was just distributed to you is on faculty recruitment and retention. There are many issues here that need to be discussed. Students need to pay close attention to this material as well. There are number of things in here for graduate students and for faculty-student relationships. This deserves a very serious and full discussion. You should consider the patterns of things that make students happy and unhappy and the difference between faculty who seem to be challenging and engaging and those who are not. You may be frustrated because you are not doing well in those classes, but you recognize the excitement, energy and passion of the faculty member.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of March 8, 2006:

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of February 8, 2006

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- President Al Bowman
- Provost John Presley
- Vice President of Student Affairs Helen Mamarchev
- Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg

Committee Reports

- Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Borg
- Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Smith
- Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator DeSantis
- Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Burk
- Rules Committee: Senator Holland

IBHE-FAC Report

Information Items:

02.27.06.01 Faculty Retention Report (Faculty Affairs Committee)

11.10.05.04 Classroom Disruption Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.27.06.04 Administrative Withdrawal/Involuntary Withdrawal Policies – Revised (Academic Affairs

Committee)

Communications:

Documents Pending Approval by President Bowman:

Documents submitted to the President for approval on January 27 and February 9, 2006 are still pending approval. No additional documents have been submitted.

Adjournment

Motion XXXVII-53: Motion by Senator Richards, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Senate Agenda of March 8, 2006.

Ms. James: Lane, did you get the e-mails from the Academic Affairs Committee about adding the CLEP revisions to the agenda, as well as their communication concerning the proposed revisions to the reinstatement policies and procedures in the catalog? If not, I have copies for you as oral communications to this committee.

Senator Crothers: No, I did not receive those items. So, we need to add the CLEP revisions and the catalog revisions to the agenda. Is there anything beyond those items?

Provost Presley: Would CLEP be an Action Item?

Senator Crothers: In the short term, it would be an Information Item, but it will probably turn into an Action Item.

Provost Presley: On what authority has this suddenly become an issue for the Senate? It is out of the Provost's Office.

Senator Crothers: Then why was it sent to us? Since the Provost points out that the CLEP Policy existed independent of the Senate previously, then it is perfectly appropriate to come as an Advisory Item.

Ms. James: The discussion at a previous Executive Committee meeting was that we would forward the proposed revisions concerning the reinstatement procedures to the Academic Affairs Committee and that that committee would decide how they wanted to bring them forward. (Executive Committee Minutes of 1/17/06).

Senator Crothers: The committee, in all honesty, came back and said that it was happy with the policy. They did not tell us anything about the procedure.

Provost Presley: Then I appreciate their input, but it is not necessary for it to go to the Senate.

Senator Wright: I don't think that there is a problem because there was no major change.

Senator Crothers: The standard difference has been this: if it is a minor editorial policy change, even if it is an academic issue, we have typically allowed it to go forward without Senate action. If it is a serious change that would affect academic policy, we then demand Senate action on it.

Provost Presley: Then why did you not bring the change for Distinguished Professors before the Senate?

Senator Crothers: In my opinion, it was because that program has been run out of Academic Affairs and exists

outside of the ASPT process.

Provost Presley: So has the CLEP.

Ms. James: Policies don't necessarily have to originate in the Senate for the Senate to review and act upon them.

Senator Crothers: For example, the university could not dramatically change its admission standards without discussing it with the Senate. My position is that there is a line and the question is where the line is drawn.

Provost Presley: It does not require Senate approval to change a procedure.

Senator Crothers: I agree; there was one recommended change, however. Do wish to just have that presented to your office?

Provost Presley: Yes.

Senator Crothers: Academic Affairs (addressed to Senator Wright, representative from Academic Affairs), please present that proposed change to the Provost's Office.

Senator Fowles: Could we present it as an Advisory Item so that everyone would be aware?

Senator Crothers: If you want a change, it can't be advisory; that is for information and action. I need a direct statement from the Academic Affairs Committee that that is how they want to handle this. Under these circumstances, since the Provost is resisting that position, it would be the President's decision and I can't make that decision for the President. So, that is why I am asking that first, the Academic Affairs Committee please make sure that the Provost receives the proposed change and, second, if the Academic Affairs Committee as a whole wishes this discussed in front of the entire Academic Senate, please give me a good argument as to why so we can make it here and ask the President to support that. Getting back to the agenda, we will include the Administrative Withdrawal Policy and the Report on Faculty Retention. We also need to track down the Classroom Disruption Policy for placement on the agenda in that there is a reference in the Administrative Withdrawal Policy to the Classroom Disruption Policy, so they need to come forth at the same time. Further, I don't see why catalog revisions would require Senate action. If someone wishes to have them as advisory, we can have them as advisory.

The agenda, as revised, was unanimously approved.

Adjournment