

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

April 8, 2014

Meeting convened at 1:00 p.m. by Terry Clark, President.

ROLL CALL

Members present: Philip Anton, Connie Baker, George Boulukos, Joe Cheatwood, Tsuchin Chu, Terry Clark, Lucian Dervan, Mark Dolan, Ahmad Fakhoury, Anthony Fleege, Qingfeng Ge, Edward Gershburg (Springfield), Steven C. Goetz, Edward Heist, Eric Holzmueller, Holly S. Hurlburt, Andrea Imre, Allan Karnes (ex-officio), Carolyn Kingcade, Meera Komarraju, Sajal Lahiri, John T. Legier, James MacLean, Nancy Martin, James Phegley, John McSorley, Rachel Stocking, Brooke Thiebault, Stacy Thompson, Rachel Whaley, Lyle White

Members absent with Proxy: Reza Habib proxy for Carl Flowers

Members absent without Proxy: Bruce Devantier, Laura Halliday, Stacey Sloboda, Mingqing Xiao

Visitors and guests: John Nicklow, Provost (ex-officio), James Allen (Associate Provost for Academic Programs)

MINUTES

Minutes from March 18, 2014 meeting were approved as presented.

REPORTS

1. **Terry Clark** reported this is the last business meeting of the current senate. Chairs of current committees need to have final reports to Rhonda by April 18th. Next meeting final reports will be summarized and reported on briefly. T. Clark read the verified election results. (**attachment A**) The new senators will be seated in the second half of the meeting on April 22nd.

- 2a. **Provost John Nicklow** reported the Board of Trustees meeting will be held in Carbondale on April 17th. Focus of that meeting will probably be the presidential transition. Tuition and fees are on the agenda, not sure if they will stay on the agenda. A couple positive events on campus include: the 27th there were 7 community college presidents and representatives on campus. The meeting produced conversations about what they perceive as current issues and how we might help them. One of the things that came out of the meeting was to rework our current dual admission program and transition it to a dual degree program. Most of this is being done anyway, but allowing a reverse transfer and reverse articulation piece is not. When the student goes to the community college and enters an agreement, they would begin with a UCOL 100 course, via distance, at any location, and could lock in tuition their freshman year. They could continue to work with the admissions people and goal would be to have them finish the associates degree, then move here. Data shows that a third of transfer students come to the university with more than 60 hours without a degree, so they could take courses here to fulfill degree requirements at the community level, simultaneously. McLafferty Open House was great on the 31st. Honors Day was on Saturday, with 2000 students that were honored. Afternoon events were in the colleges for awards, then many came back for a dinner to be awarded cords and medallions for graduation. A long Saturday but a great one. Undergraduate Research Forum was held. It was greatly attended, up from last year. Awards were given out and was a positive moment in the afternoon. Research Town Hall meeting was also held. VCR is working on changing this to a yearly event, any feedback, please share with Provost or VCR Jim Garvey. Interdisciplinary Research forum was very good, but poorly attended. So this

definitely needs to be reworked. On the 25th of April there will be a Distinguished Alumni Awards ceremony at 3 p.m. in the Guyon Auditorium. The Debate team won the national championship for the second time in a row, first time in the history of the tournament that there was a back to back win. On Enrollment, going up against last year has been tough, trying to keep pace but down about 5% in apps and admits, still up from the 2010 level. The Enrollment numbers for next fall are down, but not comparing apples to apples just yet. Registration opened two weeks later than in the past. Positive signs are that the transfer apps are rising, up about 3% and flat on admissions. New Housing contracts are 27% positive, transfers alone are 42% higher, new student orientations up 5%. Retention specialist Teresa Farnum is on campus meeting with the action groups to finalize the retention plan. The committees will meet and launch the 2 year rolling retention plan. It will be posted on the Provost's website. The two dean searches are being finalized.

Provost wanted to discuss a Reading Period for Fall Finals Week. He has discussed this with Grad Council, Executive Committee and wants to get feedback from the Senate. This would be a break between classes and finals. Breaking it up from the semester to emphasize the importance of final exams and the importance placed on preparing for them. The facilities would be open with food and structured activities for students. Tutoring would be offered. Provost asked for feedback from all groups. Feedback has been mixed and the majority is positive. Peer institutions have this sort of thing. Programming needs to be available to keep students on track. Provost Nicklow proposed that this be piloted in the fall. Feedback is important. Finals would start Monday at 4:00 p.m. and finish Friday at 4:00 p.m., using Sunday and Monday as the reading period. The point is to pilot it, assess it, take what is learned from it and move one way or the other.

Questions for Provost Nicklow

MacLean asked if the Undergraduate Research Forum was going to be moved to fall. Nicklow had not heard of that and that is not being considered that he knew of.

E. Heist asked if cramming finals into 4 days isn't a psychological/stressful issue on students. Nicklow noted it was not being crammed only shifted, finals will run until 8 or 9 p.m., overlap should not be greater than it is already.

S. Goetz wanted to know if time would be added to breaks between classes to allow students traveling from one location to another to make it in time for their next exam. Ex: Aviation students traveling from the airport to campus – 10-15 min. would not be enough time, it is currently 20 min. Some exceptions may have to be made, some units try to put exams the last week of class, needs to be discussion on this. Some program specific issues may need to be dealt with.

R. Stocking wanted to know if there was a reason for this policy. Have the students asked for this? Nicklow replied that it is to better support student success, help them perform better and take exams seriously and be prepared. Other institutes have a similar policy and it is in the best interest of students.

Further discussion included: 1) Many institutions have some form of this policy; 2) If this is done, there needs to be an "all in" atmosphere, not something that is declared and just happens, library's open, tutoring and review sessions on that day; 3) Is Friday not feasible with our curriculum – no because semester would have to be moved up a day; 4) other institutions that have this program, some 3 days, some a week – students seem to love the time to study, might be a different culture than SIU; 5) Students would be more apt to leave campus and go home if given a long weekend or a week off; 6) student feedback was overwhelmingly positive. The idea is to pilot the program in the fall and let it evolve a bit, and the entire campus needs to be engaged and "all in".

3. **Allan Karnes, Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE**

A. Karnes reported that the FAC and IBHE had a joint meeting before the regular IBHE meeting. Discussions include several topics including the budget, whether the board has power to keep low value programs out of the state, the new PARCCD Assessment tests for teacher certification. In budgetary matters – the numbers have been all over the board. The possibility of budget cuts is not over. A. Karnes full report is attached ([attachment B](#)). A. Karnes suggests we keep the pressure on the legislature and our elected representatives.

4. **Graduate Council, Reza Habib.**

In Carl Flower's absence, Reza Habib gave the Grad Council report. R. Habib reported there will be two meetings in May. Elections are going on and will be seated at May meeting. During the April meeting, the Grad Council passed three resolutions including: RME for addition of accelerated MS in Agribusiness Economics, RME for creation of STEM Education Research Center, and the Plus-Minus Grading at graduate level. Three resolutions were introduced and will be voted on at next meeting – Smoke Free Campus, Application Fee Increase from \$50 to \$60 to help cover expenses for Graduate School, and updating policy for Distance Education Delivery Resolution. Other RMEs, and NUIs that have been given to the committee and waiting on more information from Faculty Association.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

No Report.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLICY COMMITTEE -- *B. Devantier, Chair*

J. Legier gave an update on the RME for the Reallocation of Information Systems Technologies to the School of Accountancy. The School of Information Systems Technologies received the RME in February. There was a vote to accept the RME the way it stands. There was a motion to table the RME because of an on-going search for a Director and should wait for the new leader to be in place. Then the program should be re-evaluated. The motion was seconded, and the vote was 12 to table the RME and 4 votes to let it stand. So 75% of the faculty voted to table the RME. A part of Article 9 is, responding to this RME, a report needs to be written, that report was written with input from the faculty and school. That report went to appropriate areas and is under review now for further recommendations.

H. Hurlburt expressed concern with this RME coming at the end of a term year that it does not get lost in the transition of the UEPC committee. With the next business meeting not being until July, she suggested that Faculty Senate think about some sort of structure to make sure that the logistical issues facing Faculty Senate at this time of year don't get in the way of time sensitive issues such as the RME.

G. Boulukos agreed that with the time sensitivity of some issues hitting during May, the Senate is constitutionally disabled from acting on them.

M. Komarraju suggested, as something for the senate to think about; having some overlap with the committee chairs to work with the new committees and chairs to make the transition smoother. At least, have communication between the two chairs.

J. Allen added that there is a provision that any standing committee can have its own sources of information, it can come in an ex-officio capacity or at the invitation of the committee as long as the invitee is welcome. None of these would necessitate changing of the operating papers.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES -- L. White, Chair

L. White reported that Gray Whaley, Amber Loos, and Cheng-Yao Lin have been put forward to the Provost for the Position Advisory Board for a two-year commitment. One name will be chosen by the Provost.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE -- B. Thibeault, Chair

B. Thibeault reported the Governance Committee has been working on the definition of faculty in the operating paper. She explained that some faculty has questioned why they cannot vote or serve on the Faculty Senate. The committee looked over lists of those who are included and who are excluded. Office of Teacher Education and Paralegal Studies Non Tenure Track faculty are two of the groups that consistently get left out. They are in academic units but not in a unit that grants Tenure. They would still have to have at least a 51% appointment. Thibeault read the resolution ([attachment C](#)). A vote of hands was taken, 25 yes, 0 opposed and 1 abstention. The resolution passed unanimously.

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEES -- E. Heist/H. Hurlburt, Co-chairs

H. Hurlburt reported on the ICE Evaluation form and the ongoing revisions to it. Hurlburt handed out the current ICE Evaluation form to all the senators for review. In 2012 the FSW reviewed the findings of the ICE Redesign Committee that provided the senate and the committee feedback from other faculty and university members. The new form is streamlined and easier to use. There was questions on online implementation of the form and of how the data would be used and disseminated. That was all two years ago. Current FSW members met with Karla Berry, Director of Center for Teaching Excellence, who has been involved with the redesign. She provided the form and gave the committee a comprehensive update. It has been piloted two different times since 2012, one online and there was a positive review. In fall 2013, the form was piloted again, this time using a free software platform called Explorence. This software creates stunningly beautiful data and graphics for assessment that can be used for Tenure promotion. Karla Berry will come to senate to address the platform more. Committee raised some concerns about moving forward with the Explorence platform: 1) cost, 2) response rate to be assured that they don't use responses by going strictly online 3) what happens to the data, who owns that data. K. Berry had expressed that the software platform is one issue and the other issue is the form itself. H. Hurlburt pointed out some of the problems of the current form; content wise could do a little better. The senate received the hand-out to have the conversation about what the evaluation form should be and to give input and ideas; might be able to adapt the form to each individual college. Hurlburt encouraged all senators to take a look at the form and forward any and all feedback to her.

Discussion on the form followed Hurlburt's report. Some of the senators felt that the questions didn't apply to all colleges in all instances. A negative response might be used by the University for a positive outcome. Both paper and online forms would be better. Provost Nicklow suggested getting an Ad-Hoc committee together to work on a proposal, and would like the Senate to take an active role in developing the form. This form is for the academic units and for faculty feedback so he feels it's important for the faculty to have say in the form and its contents to promote better teaching. M. Komarraju commented that one concern is the pre-tenure faculty need that data to support their dossier. By doing the evaluations in class they would get a better response rate to receive the data needed. Hurlburt added that it's been bantered about – to dangle a carrot to get the student to fill them out, such as not being able to access their grade until it's turned in. Habib added that all the new incoming freshman will have tablets and most have smart phones. They should be able to do it and be encouraged to do it online, and it shouldn't be a problem. MacLean commented that if purchasing a platform, if it could be used for accreditation assessment as well, that would make it worth it. L. White commented on 3 things: 1) student's perception of learning are not always supportive 2) There is a difference in how students orient to a class depending on whether it is in their major or one that they have to take; 3) Two often the responses are given numbers, that sets limitations on how we treat the data.

BUDGET COMMITTEE – *George Boulukos, Chair*

G. Boulukos reported on the Chancellor Planning and Budget Committee meeting. The 70/30 formula is being changed. They are looking at a 100% model made up of credit hours. The committee is discussing the major of the student getting the credit for the student even if classes are taken outside of their major. Budget is still up in the air so nothing has been decided yet. Second point of G. Boulukos report included: Chancellor is concerned about communicating the budget information, disseminating information and what senate might do about better communication on budget matters. Because of the state budget situation, we might get a 6 month appropriation from the state. No decision has been made yet. A. Karnes commented most of the budget was based on credit hours in the past, so it will not be that much different, won't have the new student hours to modify. He added whether the University goes with the major model or the credit hour producing model – it's still up in the air. There is a possibility of weighting the courses, and there are arguments for both sides. The theory behind weighting the majors is for retention of students within the majors. Retention is being defined as a freshman going into sophomore year no matter the major. There will be more discussion on this subject.

OLD BUSINESS - None.

NEW BUSINESS - None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark J. Dolan, Secretary

MJD:rf