

**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes  
Monday, February 23, 2009  
(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

***Present:*** Farzaneh Fazel, Dan Holland, Susan Kalter, Kathleen Lonbom, Ted Mason, Matt Spialek, Ed Stewart, Jodi Sullivan, Provost Sheri Everts

***Absent:*** Jacqueline Krug, Paul Borg, President Al Bowman

***Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of February 9, 2009***

**Motion XXXX-:** By Senator Fazel, seconded by Senator Mason, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of February 23, 2009. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Distributed Communications:***

***02.19.09.01 From Susan Kalter/Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Presidential Commentary Report (Executive Session)***

The discussion on the Presidential Commentary Report was postponed until it can be discussed with the President in attendance at the meeting. In spring 2008, the report was requested by the Board of Trustees by April 1.

***10.28.08.06/07 From Susan Kalter, Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Chair: Hiring and Retention for Diversity – Recommendations and Statistics (Follow-Up From 11/10/08 Executive Committee Meeting)***

The follow-up on the hiring and retention for diversity recommendations was postponed until Senator Paul Borg and President Al Bowman are in attendance so that the Executive Committee might receive feedback from them concerning the recommendations.

***02.09.09.01 From Paul Borg/Faculty Affairs Committee: Memo Regarding the HR Personnel Recruitment Manual/ASPT Document***

**Senator Holland:** Though Senator Borg is not here, I don't know that we necessary need to put off the discussion of the update of the HR Recruitment Manual. Senator Borg's memo proposes that a committee be formed to do that, considering that it has not been updated in over a decade.

**Senator Mason:** Should we send it to Rules?

**Senator Kalter:** Well, it's coming from the Faculty Affairs Committee.

**Senator Holland:** His memo recommends that the committee include "significant representation from the Senate as well as the Administrative Departments that aid in the recruitment/hiring process." Typically, what we do when we do when we would like to have an ad hoc committee formed is we vote on it and then refer it to the Provost's Office for the committee's formation. We could ask Steve Bragg to form this committee, since it relates to human resources.

**Senator Lonbom:** Do you know who created the manual in 1998?

**Senator Holland:** I don't have a clue.

**Senator Lonbom:** Was the manual signed off by anyone?

**Senator Holland:** The only information I have about the issue is that which is contained in Paul's memo.

**Senator Fazel:** Shall we wait until Paul comes back? I am sure he would know. I think that Senator Lonbom brings up a good a good point; there needs to be some continuity.

**Senator Holland:** As far as just authorizing the formation of a committee, I think we can go ahead and do that. I think it would be the committee's job to answer Senator Lonbom's questions. I do agree that it should have input from both the academic side and the human resources side.

**Provost Everts:** I agree. Since HR reports up through Vice President Bragg, he might have additional feedback to provide.

**Senator Holland:** Would someone like to make a motion that we charge the Vice President of Finance and Planning with establishing a committee to update the HR Recruitment Manual to reflect changes in practices over the last decade?

**Motion XXXX-:** By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Mason, to charge Vice President Bragg with the formation of a committee to update the HR Recruitment Manual.

**Senator Fazel:** Paul is suggesting that the Executive Committee establish a committee, so should we just go ahead and establish the committee?

**Senator Holland:** In order to get the representation necessary, I think it's going to have to come from the Vice President's Office.

**Senator Fazel:** And for Senate representation, it would come back to us?

**Senator Holland:** We will select people from the Senate and they will get people from Human Resources.

**Senator Fazel:** So at that time, I would nominate Senator Kalter.

**Senator Kalter:** It seems like at least one chair and one representative from the dean's office might be helpful, since these things have to go through their processes. Chairs have a lot of experience in terms of how the ASPT and HR things affect the lives of the faculty in their departments.

**Senator Holland:** That's probably a good idea. So the committee would be composed of a representative from the dean's office, a department chairperson and how many members from the Senate? I am guessing one or two, but that would probably have to come from Steve's office. With a representative from HR, a chair, someone from a dean's office, someone from ODAA and someone from the Senate, that makes five. That is probably a large enough working group. I am thinking one representative from the Senate, so Senator Fazel could nominate Senator Kalter at that time.

**Senator Kalter:** I would be happy to serve.

**Ms. James:** So we are considering five members for the committee?

**Senator Holland:** Five plus other representatives in consultation with Vice President Bragg's office.

**Senator Kalter:** I think that the view from the dean's office is a little different than the view from the department chair's standpoint.

**Senator Fazel:** So we are not talking about including one of the deans?

**Senator Kalter:** Not necessarily the dean, himself or herself.

**Senator Stewart:** From what college?

**Senator Holland:** You might naturally look at the College of Arts and Sciences, but not necessarily. I think that any representative from any dean's office would be involved in quite a bit of hiring. I think that diversity and NTTs are going to be very tricky issues.

**Senator Kalter:** The only college that rivals Arts and Sciences, when it comes to NTTs, is the College of Education.

**Senator Holland:** Only in terms of percentages.

**Senator Fazel:** Should we include a representative from the Provost's Office, because Paul's memo recommends significant representation from administrative departments.

**Provost Everts:** In terms of NTTs, there would be pool issues, so you would definitely want someone with that background, whether it is from the Provost's Office or Finance and Planning or IR, which is in Finance and Planning.

**Ms. James:** Would you want an NTT faculty representative on the committee?

**Senator Kalter:** That might be a good idea, but I think it is probably best not to make the committee overly large.

**Senator Holland:** I am a little reluctant to put an NTT on the committee, unless they are being paid to be there.

**Ms. James:** Senate reps, other than students, are not paid to serve on these types of committees.

**Senator Holland:** I think that they (non-tenure track faculty) are serving on the Senate pro bono, aren't they? The faculty are doing it because it is part of their university service, but NTTs are hired to teach or to do whatever else they are assigned. Unless it is a specific assignment, they can run into trouble. I say that because my wife was an NTT for awhile and did get into trouble for serving on a committee. They should definitely consult with the union, but I don't know if they should be a part of the committee.

**Senator Kalter:** I think it would be a good idea to ask Paul what the Faculty Affairs Committee meant by "significant representation from the Senate". What does he consider significant?

**Senator Holland:** So we have discussed a committee of five members or did we add any additional representatives?

**Provost Everts:** I don't think it's a bad idea to have a representative from the Provost's Office.

**Senator Holland:** So there will be six representatives—basically all levels involved in the hiring process, Senate representation and ODAA.

**Senator Kalter:** This is only for faculty hiring?

**Senator Holland:** It may be everybody, but APs could conceivably be represented by both the chair and the deans.

**Ms. James:** Do you want me to inform Steve Bragg's office?

**Senator Holland:** Yes, and if he has any questions, he can speak to Paul or to me. Is there any further discussion about the committee formation?

There was no further discussion and the motion to charge the Office of the Vice President of Finance and Planning with the formation of an ad hoc committee to update the HR Personnel Recruitment Manual was unanimously approved.

*Academic Impact Fund Documents from Susan Kalter/Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:  
02.17.09.01 "Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Recommendations to the Academic Senate  
Subsequent to the Ten-Year Review of the Academic Impact Fund"*

**02.17.09.02** *Statistical Table for Above Report*

**02.17.09.03** *Academic Impact Fund Summary of Funding Sources, Assumptions and Authorizations, November 2006*

*Academic Impact Fund Reference Documents Requested For Distribution to Executive Committee By Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:*

**06.27.08.01** *AIF Guidelines and Allocations Memo/AIF Guidelines*

**04.04.08.01** *“A Review of the Academic Impact Fund 1997-2008”*

**04.04.08.02** *AIF Data Dashboard*

**Senator Kalter:** The first two items, the document that says “Executive Summary” on it and the chart of statistics, are the items that we are suggesting being forwarded to the full Senate. I will just go over the Executive Summary of the first document and give a little bit of background.

We reached the ten-year point of the Academic Impact Fund last April and had a report from the Provost’s Office about where we were. Since the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee is charged with overseeing the fund, this year the committee undertook a special study of that report and the changes that were made in the fund policies during the summer.

**Senator Holland:** I think that the fund may have been in effect longer than ten years.

**Senator Kalter:** It was implemented in 1996-97 for the fall 1997 hiring term, so you may be right that it has been about eleven years or so. The committee is recommending, and I’ll just go through the Executive Summary, that the AIF June policy change include an explicit mention of program quality and program review, hoping to get back to the original aim of the fund, which was to set up a system, in part, to reallocate (funds/lines) for tenure-track faculty among departments and colleges and follow things like student demand, but also to make sure that programs that were doing well got the faculty that they needed and that sort of thing. So that’s our first recommendation.

The second one has to do with the fact that when they first implemented the fund, the assumption that, usually, when a tenure-track faculty member retires or leaves, their salary is going to be above the salary of the person that is hired to replace them. It turns out that that has not always been the case, so we are recommending that when there is an inversion issue that we immediately, or as soon as possible, reallocate funds into the AIF so we don’t get to a point where these kinds of things build up and you have like \$100,000 that has been taken out from the AIF to take care of inversion instead of little by little infusing money in there. (Item 2a: “internally reallocate to the fund an amount equivalent to the dollars that have been expended...bringing the entrance salary in any particular tenure-track line to a level that exceeds the exit salary in that line.”)

The third recommendation says, ‘Accurately track and report separately to the Senate by college the AIF tenure-track lines and the maintenance non-tenure track hired through AIF dollars.’ In other words, the fund had been operating for a long time where a tenure-track faculty member would leave a position and replacement dollars would be allocated back to the department to sort of tide that department over in terms of instructional capacity, first of all while the sick leave was being paid out for the tenure-track faculty’s line and then while the search was implemented.

As far as we could tell, there was also a clause in the original policy that said that you could also use the AIF monies to enhance teaching and instructional capacity, but we haven’t been really tracking which one was being used for replacement and which one was being used to enhance. It looks like what happened is that the number of non-tenure track faculty on campus started to balloon when the fund was implemented. We are asking that we do start tracking that so that we can see where the needs are and also that we enforce a two-year sunset rule so that when that two years has run out, you presumably either search the position or clearly say, ‘you are not getting that back; we are reallocating it to a different department’, or what have you. So you would not have a line sort of linger in a department where you are rehiring non-tenure tracks repeatedly rather than using those dollars for tenure tracks.

**Senator Lonbom:** Where does that oversight come from when you are talking about the two-year term? I remember at the end of last year when we went through this, it was shocking to see that oversight across campus was not good.

**Senator Kalter:** I think that it is sort of a dual thing. What I found when I researched the Senate history of the fund was that there was a period during which people were sort of reviewing the fund when it was implemented. There was a three-year review. There was supposed to be another three-year review that never happened and it kind of lagged. So the Senate is actually the body that is supposed to oversee this fund. The committee that both you and I previously chaired (and which I now chair), the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, received reports about sort of the yearly state of the AIF, but the overall comprehensive picture sort of got dropped out of that. So one of the things that I am hoping that the ten-year report will do is remind us that we have that responsibility to look at what is happening with the fund, where the dollars are going, because I think that Kay, essentially, during the first caucus meeting alerted us to the fact that the number of dollars being spent on non-tenure track faculty had actually started to exceed the number being spent to rehire tenure-track faculty.

**Senator Lonbom:** That is part of what I am talking about, but in terms of oversight, if we really want to see change, and I understand the implications of the Senate committees, the bottom line is that it's advisory in nature. So when it comes down to oversight...

**Senator Holland:** The Provost Office's has fiscal responsibility over the fund.

**Senator Kalter:** It should come as no surprise to anybody that one of the suggestions that we made was that the Provost's Office consider, as the need for sick leave payout diminishes, which we estimate will be in about 2015, replacing the AIF with some other mechanism for reallocation (Item 5). The original ideas were instructional capacity, either replacing or enhancing, sick leave payout and summer school. Summer school has now been detached from the fund. So once both those go away, basically the fund will become a mechanism for, a) reallocation, and b) instructional capacity maintenance and enhancement. It is not clear that this kind of fund would be the best; it is not clear that it is not.

**Senator Holland:** Have you thought of different mechanisms?

**Senator Kalter:** No, we actually decided to let the Provost's Office and Dr. Bragg decide that.

**Provost Everts:** There are other models. You all know that I am new, so I inherited this and the nearly ten years of allocations. So the recommendations and the items to consider are certainly useful as we look forward.

**Senator Kalter:** I am just going to move on and talk about number 6 of the Executive Summary, because the other two (numbers 7 and 8) are fairly straight forward. Number 6 is "Optimum Ratios". One of the things that we wanted to call people's attention to, and that has to do with the statistical chart (Document 02.17.09.02), is that we shouldn't necessarily assume that where we are now is where we plan to be, given the budget cuts that we had in 2002-03, which may have caught a lot of departments, with people who had just left, off guard, because, all of sudden, we were not hiring (Item 4). So, we should look at where we are and where we want to be, in terms of reallocation and new positions, and also what would be optimal for each department, in terms of the kinds of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty that we need.

We have widely different programs. We have programs like physics that only has undergraduates. We have many programs that have undergraduates and master students. We have other programs that have undergraduates, masters and Ph.D.s. EAF I think is the only one that has only graduate students. So when you look at this chart, which the Provost's Office generates about these sorts of things, you will see widely differing numbers. In the last column, "Major to Instructor Ratio", the Business School, for example, is at almost 39-40 majors per instructor for MQM, which is a very high ratio. The goal is to get it around 19 to 1, which is what we advertise.

**Provost Everts:** Yes, in *U.S. News and World Report*.

**Senator Kalter:** Whereas, if you look, for example, at EAF in the College of Education, you would want to ask, 'why do you have three students for every faculty member?' The reason is that Ph.D. and master students are much more intensive, work-heavy kinds of students to have. So that explains some of the differences that you see. That is why we

put on this chart the kinds of programs, in addition to a bachelor's degree, these colleges or departments offer so that you can kind of see some of the rationales for differing major-to-instructor ratios.

What we were suggesting is that the Provost's Office and/or the deans' offices work with the departments to say, if we have this many undergrads, this many master students, what would be the optimal number of tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, etc. For example, in Math, you have a lot of Gen Ed service credit hours that are being generated there. It's not clear that all of those things need to have tenure-track faculty, but it is of concern, when you look at this chart, that Math has only one more faculty member than it did ten years before, yet its head counts, for example, have gone up to 162% and its change in credit hours is 151%.

**Provost Everts:** To Susan's point, this is actually an area around which conversations do take place. That was absolutely identified as a key area, Math education instruction. Those numbers wouldn't be represented yet on this chart.

**Senator Kalter:** Right, I should say that that this chart is always fluctuating and some of the data is from 2007, some is from 2008, and, particularly, Milner is important to look at and not look at because that data is not recorded because there are very few students recorded there. Yet, that does not mean there are no tenure-track faculty there, of course. The latest information that I could get about that was actually the library's own data for fiscal year 2007-08, which is I think the last one that came out, and I am talking about that public information about our salaries. So they have lost about four tenure-track faculty members, but that may be outdated. They may have lost six or they may be back to where they were ten years ago.

**Provost Everts:** Dean Elzy has shared why it is that the library is different, so we are cutting and slicing and dicing information to accommodate the differences in the colleges, as well as the budget implications and the accreditation factors associated with many of these programs.

**Senator Kalter:** The last thing we did was to make three sort of larger points (page 2, "Larger Administrative and Budgeting Issues"). The first one was that we have to find a way to balance sort of the high and low-cost departments and programs of excellence. In other words, we are asking for kind of a set of priorities. If you have to choose between feeding your gas tank and feeding your kids, you obviously can't just feed your kids and not feed your gas tank, etc. It's a complex problem, but we are suggesting that it be looked at at this point, not that it has not been looked at before, but this is a good time to do that. The second point was that there are almost 500 more employees of the university than there were I believe in 1990, which surprised us. We have gone through these two fairly major recessions and yet we now have more people working for us. That may be because we have more part-timers. So we are recommending looking altogether at whether we are allocating our human resources dollars in the right way.

The last one has to do with what we were just talking about. If we are going to have, and I hope that this is not the case, but if we are going to have more non-tenure track faculty, we have to do a better job of diversifying those ranks, because they actually have gone backwards in terms of racial and ethnic diversity over the last 10 to 15 years. That is something of concern because I think, but I don't have any proof of this, that the AIF has enormously helped to diversify tenure-track faculty ranks over the same years. As Senator Stewart said a couple of Executive Committee meetings ago, the easiest way to solve that problem is to hire more tenure-tracks and fewer part-time non-tenure-tracks. The rest of this, after page 2, is just kind of an expansion of these recommendations, so that you see the rationales. So those are the basics.

**Senator Holland:** As far as faculty goes, tenure-lines are about the same as they were ten years ago?

**Senator Kalter:** In terms of quantity?

**Senator Holland:** Yes, quantity, plus or minus 20 throughout the entire period, but NTTs have gone up about 100.

**Senator Kalter:** Yes, and I think that APs have gone up significantly. I don't remember the exact number, but I think it's in the 100s.

**Provost Everts:** The NTTs and tenure-track numbers—these you would find at almost every institution, which, of course, fits perfectly with the decreasing state aid.

**Senator Holland:** The APs have a historical reason also. Back in the mid 90s, we were not allowed to search for tenure-lines, but we were allowed to hire APs.

**Provost Everts:** So that's associated with budget cuts and hiring freezes, etc.? Those are really important factors as we look at the history, because it is not always notated that way. That's one of the things that Kay has said; you can't always underscore the conversations that took place.

**Senator Kalter:** My guess is that much of the AP increase is in Student Affairs because of the fee increases and various kinds of things. It could also be grants.

**Provost Everts:** But with number 3, you do bring together the last several AIF documents and it certainly is a focus for Academic Affairs.

**Senator Kalter:** What I found interesting about that is that former Provost Urice had that in mind as one of his goals. His stated goal to the Senate in 1996 was this will help increase the diversity of the tenure-track faculty. It was a sort of two steps forward and one step back. It did, in fact, increase diversity among the tenure-track faculty, but we ended up not increasing it in the other areas.

**Provost Everts:** You know that in many of these cases, there will be budget implications. As such, we don't even know where we are yet in terms of budget.

**Senator Kalter:** This is a really bad year for a good report to come out about budgets. Paragraph 2 of the "Detailed Report" is all about everything that we have had to face over the last ten years.

**Senator Mason:** But you have set the precedent for what the next report should look like.

**Senator Kalter:** Yes, the last time we met with the Provost's Office, we found out about things that had not been tracked that we can now track. We may get ten years out and find out that there were other things that we should have tracked, but that's the precedent. Once we find those things, we know what we should be doing.

**Provost Everts:** I know that it mentions in here something about accounting staff. All of these decisions were made in a thoughtful manner with a great deal of conversation. One of the things that most attracted me to Illinois State, which is actually related to my document that is later on the agenda, is how transparent budgeting is on this campus. That is very unusual, especially the opportunity to attend those budget hearings. There is an opportunity to have input throughout the process.

**Senator Kalter:** We hope to send a signal with that (accounting) bullet point that you deserve help because this is so complex.

**Senator Fazel:** When we talk about internal reallocations of funds, how does this affect the annual midyear salary process? Is that from the same funds or is it from a different source?

**Senator Holland:** AIF does not do the salary increases.

**Senator Fazel:** I know that, but we are saying that we need to internally reallocate funds equivalent to the dollars expended. Where would the money come from for those internal reallocations to the AIF?

**Provost Everts:** I don't have enormous pots of money. That is an enormously important aspect in regards to recommendations associated with, of course, the notion that there are unlimited funds.

**Senator Fazel:** But when we say reallocate, that means that one pot is going to be reduced to increase another one. It

is always good to know where the money is coming from.

**Senator Holland:** There is usually a reduction in travel.

**Senator Fazel:** In the Priorities Report from the Planning and Finance Committee, in every category, we were asking for more funds. So the question is, where is all of this coming from?

**Senator Holland:** Of course, the state will suddenly give us more money next year.

**Senator Stewart:** On a brighter note, I have read a couple of articles in which Governor Quinn said that the universities need to be well funded, that it is a job's issue. 'We run on brain power and if we are going to create more jobs, it's going to be through the universities.'

**Senator Kalter:** There are a couple of things that I would say in response to Senator Fazel's question. I don't remember where we put it in this report, but the Provost's Office, at some point during the summer, reallocated almost \$500,000 into the AIF. I am not sure where it came from, but it went into the AIF to make up for I believe 15 permanent non-tenure track lines that were allocated out of the fund when they shouldn't have been. I think that was several administrations back. So, we kind of put 2a in there as, 'this would be a good idea to do', but carefully worded it 'as soon as fiscally possible'. We also put in that Dr. Presley had, in fact, recommended that a couple of years ago. So actually that one is again kind of coming from the Provost's Office telling the committee that this is the kind of thing we are finding we need and the committee trying to support that back through the Senate to the President.

I think that our committee would welcome it if the Planning and Finance Committee took this report and talked about it. I don't know that it absolutely has to be put into the Priorities Report, because it is sort of a separate issue, but if these kinds of things deserve talking about, our committee often passes them over to the Planning and Finance Committee. We are sort of the year-by-year (budget committee) most of the time and your committee is kind of the big-picture committee. It would be worth having a conversation about where those reallocations come from.

**Ms. James:** Do you want this distributed to your committee?

**Senator Fazel:** The question is, do we have the time to consider it for this year's Priority Report? This is a major issue by itself.

**Senator Kalter:** If it gets discussed next year, I think that's fine.

**Senator Fazel:** We can definitely do that.

**Senator Kalter:** I think the more important point is that as we go forward, when we have the occasion that a person retires let's say at \$80,000 and the person you hire is coming in at \$90,000, it's wiser, I would say, to reallocate \$10,000 right then back into the AIF rather than letting that pile up and the AIF kind of start to somewhat to shrink. It's easier at that point. You can see that that is happening, realize where it's happening, why it's happening, how long it might happen and plan for it. The midyear increase is separate, but as the midyear increases occur, that will happen less and less, because part of that is inversion.

**Senator Holland:** Is this going forward as an Information Item?

**Senator Kalter:** I wish Paul were here so we could discuss how this should go forward.

**Senator Holland:** It probably just goes forward as an Information Item.

**Ms. James:** Are you saying for the next Senate agenda?

**Senator Holland:** Yes, if that's what your committee wants.



**Senator Kalter:** Yes, March 4<sup>th</sup> would be great.

**02.12.09.01** *From Provost Everts: Academic Affairs Annual Planning Presentations Announcement (Dist. to Senate by E-Mail on 2/12/09)*

Members of the Academic Senate are invited to attend the Academic Affairs Annual Planning Presentations. The presentations will be held on Tuesday, March 24, and Wednesday, March 25, from 8:30 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. in the Old Main Room of the Bone Student Center.

**02.13.09.01** *From Ed Stewart/Academic Affairs Committee: Withdrawal Policy – Withdrawal from Courses/Withdrawal from University-Draft 2 (Action Item on 3/4/09 See Note at End of Discussion)*

**Senator Stewart:** This was introduced as an Information Item at the Senate meeting of February 4, 2009. On page 3, the part that is highlighted in gray, is the section that was revised to make the policy a little bit broader and more inclusive. I think that last time there was some question as to if the criteria for withdrawal only included psychological and physical reasons. In our committee meeting, we discussed that there are also economic constraints, so Jonathan Rosenthal revised that section and I think that this will work a lot better.

**Senator Holland:** Is “or from other authoritative sources if the circumstances are not health-related” the phrase that was added?

**Senator Stewart:** Yes.

**Senator Kalter:** The only concern I have with the revised language was that the former text specifically included “clinical psychologist” and “psychological reasons”. Sometimes people read health as something other than mental health. I am wondering if something very small could be inserted into this paragraph so that it will call people’s attention to that. Also, I think that someone at the Senate meeting mentioned that the entire policy had been crossed out then rewritten (even though some of the “new” text is the same as the text that was stricken). It might be helpful if we could have the policy that included just the new language and the strike-throughs.

**Senator Stewart:** I think the reason that they did that was because it was easier to take it all out and just to redo it because it might be confusing to try to find the strike-throughs.

**Senator Kalter:** Ok, but we could have the inclusion of the reference to psychological reasons?

**Senator Stewart:** I think that the reason that we left that out is because the people who are going to be using this are in the Registrar’s Office and they already know.

**Senator Holland:** Also, in the strike-through text, in the paragraph below the gray section, the last line reads, “If approval is granted, a grade of WX will be awarded.” It looks like that line should not have been stricken.

**Senator Stewart:** Oh yes, I see; that is an error.

**NOTE:** Following the Executive Committee Meeting, Draft 2 was replaced by 02.25.09.01 Draft 3, which includes “If approval is granted, a grade of WX will be awarded”, as the Senate Action Item on March 4, 2009.

**Addendum:** *02.22.09.01 From Student Government Association: Proposal for Social Justice in the Curriculum (Dist. Academic Affairs Committee)*

**Senator Holland:** If there is no objection, I would like to amend the agenda. We have received the “Proposal for Social Justice in the Curriculum” from the Student Government Association. We can send this to the Academic Affairs Committee to look at. This is proposed as being an addition next year to General Education as a Social Justice Requirement. Next year is the year in which we are to review the General Education Program, so this would be an opportune time to look at this.

***From Senator Stewart: Recommendation by Area Bookstores for the Formation of a Textbook Affordability Committee (Academic Affairs Committee Discussion on 2/18/09)***

**Senator Stewart:** I have something else that is not on the agenda, which I mentioned at the last Senate meeting. We met with people from the bookstore and talked about textbook affordability and their recommendation that an advisory committee be established. Part of it is about communication. The folks at the bookstore have several ways of making sure that the money that is spent on textbooks is the most economical way of spending it. It has to do with very simple things like getting the textbook orders in on time, making sure that the books that are ordered are actually used, and if that same textbook is going to be used over a period of time, letting the bookstores know. This affects buy-backs; the students can save money because they can get 50% of the cost back.

**Ms. James:** I know that the Student Advisory Committee of the IBHE was also looking at textbook affordability, so that might be a good committee to involve for student input.

**Senator Stewart:** But it was suggested that a representative from each college might be on the committee. (See Discussion Section)

***Proposed Agenda for the Academic Senate for March 4, 2009:***

**Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**  
**Wednesday, March 4, 2009**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Approval of Minutes of February 18, 2009***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

***Student Body President's Remarks***

***Administrators' Remarks***

- ***President Al Bowman***
- ***Provost Sheri Everts***
- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams***
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg***

***Committee Reports:***

- ***Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson: Senator Stewart***
- ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Chairperson: Senator Kalter***
- ***Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson: Senator Borg***
- ***Planning and Finance Committee Chairperson: Senator Fazel***
- ***Rules Committee Chairperson: Senator Solberg***

***Action Item:***

***02.25.09.01 ~~02.13.09.01~~ Withdrawal Policy – Withdrawal from Courses/Withdrawal from University-Draft 2 Draft 3 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Communications***

## *Adjournment*

**Motion XXXX-:** By Senator Mason, seconded by Senator Stewart, to approve the proposed Academic Senate Agenda for March 4, 2009.

**Senator Holland:** We need to add an additional agenda item, the Academic Impact Fund recommendations from the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee.

**Senator Kalter:** In reading the minutes of the last Executive Committee meeting, it was stated that a group would be making a presentation to the Senate at some point, but I don't remember what group that was.

**Senator Stewart:** I had talked about Year One. I talked to them and they are preparing something. They will contact the Senate Office.

The agenda, as amended, was unanimously approved.

### *Discussion:*

#### *Textbook Affordability (Continued from Previous Page)*

**Senator Holland:** If the students want to be in on the textbook committee discussion, we can delay that until the next Executive Committee meeting.

**Senator Mason:** Yes, but we do need to leave now.

#### *Faculty Productivity Reports and ASPT Timeline/APST Document Review*

**Senator Holland:** The Chair of English would like to know if it is possible to have faculty productivity reports due in August. My response is "no", because it is a University Calendar that is followed university-wide and that is the date in the ASPT document. If we want to change that, I am sure that we are allowed to do that, but I think that it would be somewhat nutty to start filing reports when we have just gone under contract a week earlier.

**Senator Kalter:** I think that there are a lot of timetables that this would potentially derange. It might not even be worth trying to track down a place in which it would fit. The main one that I thought of is that there is a reason for the winter break, that that is feeding into our salary for the following year. That's the main thing that is driving that.

The Chair of the English Department talked to Gabe Gudding and he talked to me. I advised Gabe two things, that the chair should go up the chain of command and find out whether there was some reason for this to be where it was, just to start out. If there was a reason, then there was no point in pursuing it. I also told Gabe that if it came to the Senate as a proposal, it should go to the Faculty Affairs Committee for discussion. Faculty should weigh in on it because it is going to affect a lot of people's schedules. I don't know, but what might be driving this request is that in English, our hiring season overlaps with the annual ASPT matters.

**Senator Holland:** That's true for everybody.

**Senator Kalter:** That's true for everybody?

**Senator Holland:** Yes, everybody does their hiring in the spring.

**Senator Kalter:** In January?

**Senator Fazel:** We do it mostly in the fall.

**Senator Holland:** Well, you start interviewing, but every time we have ever done a hire in Physics, advertisements are in journals in September. We accept applications through the entire month of November. We review them by Christmas and then invite them on campus, etc.

**Senator Kalter:** So I think it's hard on DFSCs when that happens, but on the other hand, it might make it hard on a lot more faculty to have their reports due at a different time of year. It's hard to tell.

**Senator Stewart:** I thought that it was a little strange that I was here for one semester and had to make a report. I hadn't done anything yet.

**Senator Kalter:** If it's in the ASPT document, then that is where the request should be referred.

**Senator Holland:** It is in the ASPT timeline, so that is what would have to be changed. The URC (University Review Committee) would be the committee to change that.

**Provost Everts:** And the URC will be making any changes associated with the ASPT in this next year. As I understand it, that document is a five-year document and it is time for a review. So if there are items or issues such as this, Roger Singley is the URC Chair to whom those should be referred.

**Senator Holland:** So, I will just get back to Gabe and let him know that if he wants to do this, he should contact the URC. However, I don't think that this change will happen.

*Adjournment*