

*Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, November 9, 2009, 4:00 P.M.
(Approved)*

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of October 26, 2009

Motion XXXXI-39: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of October 26, 2009.

Distributed Communications:

11.02.09.01 From Academic Affairs Committee: Residency Status Policy (Information Item 11/18/09)

Senator Stewart: This is one that came from Jonathan Rosenthal that should have come to the Executive Committee first, but he brought it to the Academic Affairs Committee first. The main thing that he was trying to do was make the policy fit what was actually going on and try to make it less difficult for students to come to ISU.

Senator Holland: Does this have anything to do with allowing Iowa?

Senator Stewart: If they come and establish residency a semester before they apply, they can get in.

Senator Fazel: After they are here for six months, do we charge them in-state tuition?

Senator Stewart: I am not really sure.

Senator Holland: If someone came here from out of state in the fall, in the spring they would pay in-state tuition if they have established residency.

Senator Wedwick: They have to do these other things. They have to get an Illinois drivers' license and a voter registration card, so they have to show more permanency.

Senator Holland: I know that Iowa will take Illinois students at Iowa's rate. They don't even have to establish residency. I think Wisconsin does the same thing. Are we planning anything like that?

Senator Stewart: That's not in here. The old argument was that my state tax money is supporting that school and so we should get a break. That doesn't hold much water anymore since so little of our money comes from the state. So having a differentiated tuition for in and out of state doesn't make much sense.

President Bowman: We are thinking about a small experiment for talented students, but that's down the road.

Senator Kalter: When I was reading this, it seemed to me that some of the language was changed to make it less formidable. One of the things that you crossed out was that students claiming independence may be requested to present satisfactory evidence that their parents have not committed significantly to their support or claimed them as a dependent on federal or state income taxes. Does this make it easier for a student to establish independent status or do they still have to do that?

President Bowman: They don't have to do that. It's easier.

Senator Fazel: Why do we have high school residency on page 4 in the policy?

Senator Stewart: If they are here to go to high school, that establishes residency.

Senator Fazel: That's for U-High?

Senator Holland: That's for any high school in the state.

Senator Kalter: It looks as if a person could establish residency if their parents teach here, but live in Iowa.

Senator Stewart: That's correct.

Senator Kalter: It's rather confusing. It might be helpful to get a clean version of the policy.

Senator Holland: If it's going forward as an Information Item, we probably need the mark-up version.

Senator Kalter: I mean having both.

Senator Wedwick: Perhaps we could have that when it is an Action Item.

11.02.09.02 *From Charles McGuire, Associate Vice President for Academic Administration: Administrator Summative Evaluation Schedule for FY10*

This item was advisory to the committee.

11.05.09.01 *From Academic Affairs Committee: Constitution Exam Elimination Sense of the Senate Resolution*

Senator Kalter: I don't understand why this is coming forward as a Sense of the Senate Resolution. If it comes forward, I would prefer to see the legal statements from our legal department.

Senator Hochhauser: We decided not to include it because we did not want the debate to turn into a debate about the legalities.

Senator Stewart: The main point of this is that it does not affect our native students, but it affects transfer students only.

Senator Kalter: There is very little information for the Executive Committee to go on to decide if this should be sent forward to the Senate. Whether we show the full Senate the legal opinion, I think that this committee deserves to see it. I think that it does not affect our native students because they go through some sort of curriculum that gives them constitutional information. What we are not doing with this format is checking if those transfer students have had the equivalent.

Senator Stewart: A lot of the transfer students can't get an exemption. They may have taken courses at their original school, but we have no way of checking to see. Secondly, all of the students have taken a Constitution exam in order to graduate from high school. There is nothing in Illinois law requiring them to take another one in college.

Senator Kalter: All of our native students presumably have taken that high school exam, but we don't exempt them from our General Ed credits that give them constitutional information. When people transfer credits in, they get checked against courses that are equivalents and sometimes get credit for those. Why there is no mechanism to see if they have had that curriculum, I don't understand. I don't understand why the fix is to get rid of the Constitution Exam, but rather see if we can eliminate it through a different process.

Senator Carnahan: Some of the classes that can exempt you from the Constitution Exam do talk about the constitution; some of them do not. So the objection is that our General Education doesn't really require any knowledge of the Constitution at all.

Senator Kalter: You are going to have an enormous uninformed debate on the floor of the Senate without this information in writing. I am also still wondering why a Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Senator Holland: Typically, Sense of the Senate Resolutions come from individuals, not from committees. Part of the

charge this year for the Academic Affairs Committee is to review Gen Ed requirements. If it is felt that this is something that we want to do as a university, then it's our job as the Senate to debate that.

Senator Hochhauser: I don't think the Constitution Exam is a Gen Ed requirement.

Senator Holland: It's a graduation requirement.

Senator Hochhauser: Is it part of Gen Ed?

Senator Holland: I would guess it would be counted as part of Gen Ed like the Writing Exam. The Senate looked at that and voted that it should no longer be a graduation requirement. I think that you should do the same thing with the Constitution.

Senator Spialek: In the initial packets to the Internal Committees, this was one of the items that carried over from the year before. So I think that is why it is being individually addressed now.

Senator Fazel: Can you do a proposal with all of the reasons that we shouldn't have this instead of a resolution?

Senator Holland: Instead of a Sense of the Senate Resolution, which is not binding in any way, we can turn this into a proposal.

Senator Kalter: I think that evidentiary backing is in order.

Senator Stewart: So having a copy of the legal opinion?

Senator Kalter: Yes, and having all of the other things that I asked about. Why isn't there a way to look at transfer credits and see if they have had it and things like that. It's going to be very confusing without that.

The Academic Affairs Committee will present a proposal to the Executive Committee for consideration at a later date. The Sense of the Senate Resolution will be removed from the November 18, 2009 Senate Agenda.

11.05.09.02 From Faculty Affairs Committee: University Professor Policy – Revised (Action Item 11/18/09)

Senator Holland: The only difference in the policy is that it is going to be an Action Item and the policy now contains the actual amount of the award.

Senator Wedwick: There is one typo in number 2 under responsibilities. It should say "base" instead of "vase".

President Bowman: With the October 15th deadline, does this mean that we can't do it before the 18th.

Senator Holland: I think for a first round we could probably do an exemption on that.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate on November 18, 2009:

Academic Senate Meeting Agenda

Date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009

Time: 7:00 P.M.

Location: Old Main Room, Bone Student Center

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of November 4, 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 Daniel Layzell*

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee: Chairperson Gudding

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Chairperson Kalter

Faculty Affairs Committee: Chairperson Liechty

Planning and Finance Committee: Chairperson Fazel

Rules Committee: Chairperson Solberg

Action Items:

11.05.09.02 University Professor Policy - Revised (Faculty Affairs Committee)

10.28.09.01 Code of Student Conduct - Revised (Executive Committee) (In 11/4/09 Senate Packets)

11.09.09.01 Code of Student Conduct – 1 Item Revised

Information Item:

11.02.09.01 Residency Status Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)

Communications:

~~*11.05.09.01 Constitution Exam Elimination Sense of the Senate Resolution (Academic Affairs Committee)*~~

Adjournment

Motion XXXXI-40: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Kalter, to approve the Academic Senate Agenda. The Constitution Exam Sense of the Senate Resolution was removed as a Communication Item and the agenda was unanimously approved as amended.

Discussion

Faculty Recruitment and Retention

Senator Holland: The Faculty Affairs Committee has asked us to remove the faculty recruitment and retention survey from their list of charges. They did that survey about five years ago. They made a presentation to the Senate about the information they received. They were told to go back and think about it again. All of this is completely out of date now, so they would have to do the process again.

Senator Wedwick: We asked this because there is no clear purpose for doing it. There is no clear direction. We didn't see a problem, so we asked why we are researching something when there is no problem.

Senator Holland: At the time, it really had to do with minority faculty recruitment and retention.

The committee voted in favor, with the exception of Senator Kalter, of removing the item from the Faculty Affairs Committee's agenda.

10.28.09.01 Code of Student Conduct (In 11/4/09 Senate Packets) – Discussion of Revisions

The Executive Committee agreed that the Code of Student Conduct would continue to apply to a student's actions on and off campus. The committee's rationale was that you cannot disavow yourself from a community of which you are a member. The committee also changed the membership of the academic dishonesty panel from one student, one faculty member and one staff member to two faculty members and one student. Several committee members expressed concerns that the sanctions were not always academic or appropriate and that sanctions for local infractions were implemented disproportionately to those committed outside of the community. The committee recommended having someone present to the Senate the procedures for the applications of sanctions. Senator Kalter reported that the University Hearing Panel was the only one of the three SCERB panels for which staff, according to the Blue Book, are nominated by the Rules Committee and elected by the Faculty Caucus. Senator Wedwick stated that only faculty and students served on the Hearing Panel. She added that a member of Community Rights and Regulations attended the meetings, but that that individual did not vote.

Adjournment

Motion XXXXI-41: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Spialek, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.