

MINUTES OF THE 2015-2016 FACULTY SENATE April 12, 2016

ROLL CALL

Members present: Shaikh Ahmed, Philip Anton, Deborah Burris, Joe Cheatwood, Shawn Cheng, Terry Clark, Sandra Collins, Jon Davey, Judith Davie, Lucian Dervan, Ahmad Fakhoury, Sandy Fark, Ann Garrett, David Gilbert, Tobin Grant, Laura Halliday, Andrea Imre, Bobbi Knapp, James Mathias, Jim MacLean, Howard Motyl, Ryan Netzley, John Reeve, Benjamin Rodriguez, Stacey Sloboda, Robert Spahr, Rachel Stocking, Saikat Talapatra, Melissa Viernow, James Wall, Gray Whaley, Wendi Zea

Members absent with Proxy: Jason Bond (Seb Pense proxy)

Members absent without Proxy: John McSorley, Shelley Tischkau

Ex-Officios and guests: Brad Colwell (Interim Chancellor, ex-officio); Jim Allen (Associate Provost for Academic Programs); Mike Eichholz (Graduate Council, ex-officio); Craig Anz (Associate Professor, School of Architecture), Qian Huang (Assistance Professor, School of Architecture)

Prior to getting to the official order of business, President Imre made a point of clarification regarding a question voiced after the March meeting about the call for abstentions when taking a vote. Imre pointed out that the Faculty Senate Operating Paper states that the meetings are to follow Roberts Rules of Order. Imre read the information directly from the Roberts Rules of Order book and stated "The Chair should not call for abstentions when taking a vote since the number of members who respond to such a call is meaningless". Imre explained that calling for abstentions would probably only be valuable at the end of the meeting when there is question about having a quorum; if a vote is taken and the votes do not add up to a quorum, a call for abstentions may be called.

MINUTES

Minutes of the March 8, 2016 meeting were presented for approval. J. Wall asked for clarification regarding the conversation about the urgency to pass the resolution to Recommend Approval of the Revised Associate of Sciences Degree at Illinois Community Colleges for Transfer Credit at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Wall stated that the answer to his question about why it is so urgent that the resolution be done "today" is unclear. After brief discussion, it was decided that the recording of the minutes would be reviewed and the approval of the minutes of the March 8, 2016 meeting would be postponed until the April 26, 2016 meeting. B. Rodriguez made a motion to review the recording and postpone the approval of the minutes until the next meeting, J. Wall seconded. Motioned passed by unanimously by voice vote.

REPORTS/REMARKS

1. **Andrea Imre** brought a few items to the attention of the Senate: the resolutions that were approved about higher education and MAP funds were delivered in person to Terri Bryant's office by Imre and J. MacLean, Imre and G. Whaley hand delivered copies of the resolutions to Dave Luechtefeld's at an event that he was attending; copies of the resolutions were mailed to the local offices of the other representatives mentioned on the resolutions. Imre noted that the conversations with the representatives that they met with in person did not offer any real concern; they voiced their support of higher education and stated that they could not commit to any details as this time. Imre continued by saying that the Non Academic Program Review Committee met for the first time in February and received their charge; the next meeting will be on April 13; there is nothing to report because the committee has only received its charge and has not had any other meetings. Imre stated that an email went out on March 24 that included a campus-wide Campus Lake survey and asked those present to check their clutter and junk folders in their email if they had not received it. Imre reported that the Board of Trustees meeting was on March 24; the board

approved a 3% raise in tuition for incoming freshman; there was a discussion of diversity at the BOT meeting and the Constituency Heads meeting. Imre encouraged those present to bring any problematic issues that are present within the colleges to the Senate for discussion; there will be a listening presentation regarding diversity issues and racial discrimination on April 13 at 4:30 p.m. in the Morris Library Auditorium. Imre concluded by saying that the IEA will be bussing people up to Springfield for lobby day on April 20.

2a. **Interim Chancellor Colwell** No report

2b. **Provost Ford** Jim Allen presented a report on behalf of Provost Ford. Allen started by giving an update on searches; Dr. Matthew Keefer will be the new COEHS Dean contingent upon the Board of Trustees approval; there is a request to make an offer for the Business Dean; the Provost's office has put the search for a permanent Director for the Center for International Education. B. Rodriguez asked why that search was put on hold; Allen responded by saying I think we are trying to save money and continued by saying that was put on hold as well as a lot of other searches on campus, including faculty searches, and believes it is related to the budget. Allen stated that as of this week, there have been 6,746 students admitted for Fall 2016; that number is down approximately 1500 students compared to this time last year. Allen stressed the importance of efforts to yield students; that is something we can control regardless of what is going on in Springfield.

3. **Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE**

A. Imre reported that T. Clark was not available for today's meeting and submitted a written report. ([Attachment A](#))

4. **Graduate Council**

M. Eichholz reported that the Council met on April 7, 2016 and passed four resolutions: Resolution in Support of the Proposed Elimination of MBA concentrations in Change Management, Management of Information Systems, and International Business in the College of Business

Resolution in Support of the Addition of an Accelerated MA degree in Linguistics in the College of Liberal Arts

Resolution on Graduate Student Academic Grievance Procedure

Resolution to Recommend Approval of a Policy and Definition to Grant Emeritus Status to Retired SIUC Faculty and Administrators

Eichholz continued by saying that there was discussion about the Non Academic Program Prioritization Task Force at the Graduate Council meeting and why has there not been any movement on that committee because of the pending budget decisions that are going to have to be made.

R. Netzley asked how many times the Academic Prioritization Task Force has met. Eichholz said that all committees have met for an approximate total of 36 times. R. Netzley asked that that number be included in the minutes.

A. Imre added that the task force started meeting in December; Eichholz added that there has been approximately five meetings a month.

5. **Academic program prioritization committee**

J. Davie reported that all three subcommittee are meeting continuously; qualitative and uniqueness are meeting together; both committees decided that there was some overlap and decided to work together to bring forward a combined qualitative uniqueness component. The committees have decided what they think should be examined, the big question is how to score it. Once the criteria and how to score it are finalized, that information will be put forth to the faculty for their input.

M. Eichholz added that the plan is to vote on the preliminary criteria at next week's meeting; the subgroups will then meet to test the criteria.

A. Imre stated that when you talk about criteria and testing of that criteria, is there some sort of data that can be applied to all programs.

M. Eichholz stated that each of the committees has identified criteria that they would like to be used; the entire committee will combine all the criteria and then use the Faculty Senate's recommendation on which programs they think should be reviewed using the rubric to verify that it is doing what it should do; that information will then be presented to the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council; the idea is to send it out to the entire faculty for feedback before it is finalized.

A. Imre stated that it is important to note that the Provost has indicated that she has a tight deadline and she was concerned that "if the plan includes the collection of data that is not readily available at this time, she would not be able to incorporate the input of faculty"; this process was not in vain; it may be used for long term planning but would not be used to address the immediate crisis. Imre added that the Faculty Senate Executive Council has been having a discussion about this over emails and the conclusion was that whatever criteria the task force is developing, we would still like to stay with the original goals of the resolution which was to have transparency, accuracy, and fairness. Imre noted that the resolution does not require Senate approval, but faculty input is important and some kind of presentation and review of the documentation would be appropriate before it is sent to administration.

M. Eichholz stated that he has spoken with the Provost and will be presenting a white paper once there is final criteria; the white paper will be distributed to everybody.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Gray Whaley

A. Imre presented the Approval of Candidates for Judicial Review Board ([Attachment B](#)) and ballots were handed out to each Senator. The completed ballots were collected by H. Motyl and A. Ortiz. B. Rodriguez and A. Ortiz exited the room to count the votes. The four candidates were unanimously approved by voice vote.

G. Whaley read the motion to approve the appointment of Jonathan Bean as Judicial Review Board Chair and Janice Thompson as Judicial Review Board Vice Chair ([Attachment C](#)). S. Sloboda asked why the JRB elections are taking place now and not in December. A. Imre explained that the entire process was delayed because of inaccurate data from Human Resources and added that the delay did not affect the JRB because there has not been anything brought to their attention. No further discussion. R. Netzley made a motion to approve the appointments of the JRB chair and vice chair, seconded by J. Mathias. Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

G. Whaley read the Resolution on UCC Assessment Data. ([Attachment D](#))

R. Stocking suggested that the resolution include a more specific definition of program review; not in terms of elimination.

G. Whaley stated that the language can be changed; the term "program review" does get used different ways.

A. Imre suggested using "program assessment".

J. Cheatwood suggested "program review for accreditation".

J. Allen stated that he has specific language that will help and address R. Stocking's concern and added that the current language is perhaps not strong enough protection; it should be limited to the explicit needs of curricular revision. Allen suggested to not use the phrase "program decisions" and to change it to "administrative decisions". Allen read his final suggestion "Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate declares that the use of data collected for the assessment of academic programs including University Core Curriculum should be limited to the explicit needs of curricular revisions, IBHE program review and accreditation."

R. Stocking stated that she does not understand why it has to include "IBHE program review".

J. Allen stated that it is required by state statute. Assessment is required as part of IBHE's expectations as part of the review process.

R. Stocking stated that she confused about the purpose of this resolution and added that previous discussion were about University Core Curriculum and not about all assessment of academic programs.

G. Whaley responded by saying that the Faculty Senate discussion focused on the UCC, but because of the larger elements of LEAP it covers a lot more territory than UCC.

R. Stocking stated that she does not understand why the use of data for assessment of all academic programs was not part of the original discussion; it doesn't make sense that it is now included in a resolution without being discussed.

G. Whaley responded by saying that the Faculty Senate of 2012 had that discussion and adopted the LEAP goals; what is being done now is having further input limiting the effect of that decision that was made in November 2012. The timing has to do with the fact that the requirement is for this to begin in fall 2016.

R. Stocking stated that she had profound problems with how this procedure has taken place. The basis for the meeting outside of the Faculty Senate are no longer the basis of the reason for this resolution.

R. Netzley read a section from the talking points distributed on behalf of Pat Manfredi prior to the meeting to discuss the use of assessment data; "assessment data should never be used as part of a faculty member's performance review process, it should never find its way into a tenure/promotion dossier, nor can it be discussed in the chair's or dean's letter in these dossiers. Similarly, assessment data should not be used by SIU in any process whose sole purpose is target programs for possible elimination." Netzley added that the answer to the very narrow question as to who controls the data is we should not IBHE. There are all sorts of ways to do assessment and the fact the IBHE mandates assessment does not mean that it has to be this way. This way of doing things needs some controls, IBHE mandated program review is not a control, it's an open door.

J. Allen stated that he would be happy to remove the IBHE mandated language in the friendly amendment that he suggested and explained that he was trying to be more precise to distinguish it from program evaluation which is often confused with program review. Allen added that the use of "IBHE mandated" was his misuse of a term well-intended to help specify what we are talking about.

A. Imre restated the friendly amendment proposed by Dr. Allen as follows; Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate declares that the use of data collected for the assessment of academic programs including the University Core Curriculum should be limited to the explicit needs of curricular revisions, program review, and accreditation and not personnel or administrative decisions about programs unless the Faculty Senate specifically approves any additional uses of the data in the future.

R. Stocking asked why "program review" has to be in the resolution at all and reiterated that she is strongly opposed to this process and does not think that she can vote on any resolution based on this process.

R. Netzley stated that he agrees with R. Stocking and added that keeping "program review" is just one more thing that can be added to the list.

A. Imre asked if R. Netzley is suggesting to remove "program review" from the resolution.

R. Netzley replied yes.

B. Knapp suggested that this resolution address Core Curriculum only and address program review later.

A. Imre asked if there were suggestions for new language.

R. Stocking suggested "...declares that the use of data collected for the assessment of University Core Curriculum courses should be limited to..."

H. Motyl reread R. Stocking's suggestion for clarification.

A. Imre finished the sentence for clarification "...limited to the explicit needs of curricular revisions and accreditation and not personnel or administrative decisions concerning programs, unless the Faculty Senate specifically approves any additional uses of the data in the future."

G. Whaley added that the fourth "whereas" needed to be changed to "..., and the integrity of that data therefore depends on it having no other actual or perceived use beyond assessment of learning outcomes."

A. Imre reread the entire resolution. ([Appendix A](#))

J. MacLean noted that the title of the resolution should be changed to Use of University Core Curriculum.

A. Imre asked if there were any objections to the friendly amendments. None voiced.

A. Imre called for a voice vote. Resolution approved unanimously by voice vote.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLCY COMMITTEE – Ruth Anne Rehfeldt / Stacey Sloboda

R. A. Rehfeldt presented the Resolution to Approve Addition of the CMOM Minor ([Attachment E](#))

B. Rodriguez asked if these courses are courses that they currently have or will students have to take an elective someplace else.

R. A. Rehfeldt responded by saying it is her understanding that these courses are currently being offered.

C. Anz stated that these courses are already offered and clarified that no new resourced will be needed.

J. Mathias asked if the specialization will be dropped eventually.

C. Anz stated that one day they hope it will be dropped; it will probably fade out on its own.

A. Imre called for a voice vote. Resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.

S. Sloboda read the Resolution to Approve Renaming of ET to EET ([Attachment F](#))

S. Ahmed stated that this is very strange and asked why Electrical Engineering Technology.

R. A. Rehfeldt replied that the rationale given to her was that this change better fits with their degree recognition and the actual degree.

S. Ahmed stated that it is unconventional.

A. Imre asked if there was any faculty input when the discussion took place within the department or college.

S. Sloboda replied that the comments of the faculty were unanimous and the UEPC felt that the faculty in that department considered it to be the best decision.

A. Imre asked if the comments were satisfactory.

S. Ahmed stated that he will not vote for it.

A. Imre called for a vote by show of hands. 20 in favor, 1 opposed. Resolution passed.

S. Sloboda presented the Resolution in support of Plus/Minus Grading for Undergraduate Students ([Attachment G](#))

H. Motyl presented the results from the plus/minus survey that was sent to faculty ([Attachment H](#)) Motyl stated that it needs to be made clear that there will be one grading system; there will not be a plus/minus and a non-plus/minus. Motyl suggested a friendly amendment to the last whereas stating "once implemented, the plus/minus modification will become the only grading system at SIUC. The assignment of grades is ultimately the decision of the instructors of a course."

J. Wall asked if the B- 2.667 is consistent with other institutions.

H. Motyl replied yes, the only difference is that SIUC has to use three decimal points instead of two because of the way the system is set up.

A. Imre asked if there are any objections to the friendly amendment.

S. Lahiri clarified that the A+ has been removed from the resolution and that the decimal points are still the same.

J. Allen stated that the School of Medicine does not use letter grades and this resolution appears that they are going to have to adopt letter grades for the evaluation of their medical students.

J. Cheatwood stated that for professional medical education, the School of Medicine does not use letter grades.

After brief discussion a friendly amendment was suggested saying "Therefore be it resolved that SIUC Undergraduate Programs for courses using the A, B, C, D system adopt a policy of allowing plus and minus grades..."

D. Burris stated that she wanted to clarify where it says it is ultimately the decision of the instructors of a course; could it also include "unless the decision is made by the department or unit".

R. Netzley asked if there is a policy change being discussed; when this is discussed with the chair of the department, who wins that fight as to whether to use this or that grading system.

T. Grant called for a point of order stating that the only policy change will be after "Therefore be it resolved..." The "whereas" are just explanations and provide content.

J. Wall asked how this will affect multiple courses taught by different instructors.

H. Motyl responded by saying that this is perhaps related to what R. Netzley's concern is; the department could tell instructors how to grade.

J. Wall said that this could be problematic when it comes to large multiple courses taught by multiple instructors.

H. Motyl stated that D. Burris' concern is about the same course during the same semester being taught by different instructors; multi-sections using the same syllabus.

D. Burris also pointed out that it could affect admission to a program that happens in the junior year.

R. Netzley suggested to stay with the original language on the resolution.

H. Motyl pointed out that the original language would not solve the concern raised by D. Burris.

D. Burris pointed out that if the "whereas" do not matter because they are only explanations and the "therefore" is the thing that is binding then everything will be good; but if the "whereas" does carry some weight, then it gives every professor the right to do it their way which causes an issue for certain programs.

S. Lahiri stated that there is only one system.

T. Grant agreed and added that the questions are concerns that take place at the college level, but as a system, it is one system.

B. Knapp stated that she did her own survey within her department; the results were 7 against, 4 in favor. Knapp asked if there was a way to have it presented to individual departments.

J. Davie noted that the probation rate for Graduate Students is 3.0 and added that it may have to be changed to reflect a change in the grading system.

M. Eichholz stated that the Graduate Council passed a similar resolution about a year and a half ago; the Graduate Council resolution reflects an A+; which would make this not the same grading system.

B. Rodriguez stated that he would like to see some data on this; do a test run using both scales so we can see how grades are affected.

S. Sloboda noted that the UEPC had already done research on data and found that overall, grades do not change.

H. Motyl added that once the system is implemented there is no transition period.

J. Cheatwood asked how many other institutions in Illinois use the plus/minus system.

H. Motyl replied by saying that almost all institutions use plus/minus.

J. Davie asked in reference to the Graduate Council resolution and asked why there is not an A+; it's a reflection of an outstanding performance and should be reflected.

There was brief discussion about the point values of an A and A+ being the same and how do you really evaluate an A+.

A. Imre stated we are running short on time and a vote needs to be taken.

There was brief discussion about tabling the resolution; work on the language and have the next Senate take it up.

G. Whaley pointed out that that is what happened the last time this was brought up; questions were raised and it was tabled.

H. Motyl pointed out that the only difference between the Graduate Council resolution and the Senate resolution is the A+; everything else is the same except that the Senate has three decimal points and the Graduate Council has two because they weren't told that they needed to have three in order for it to work with the system. The A+ could be put back in.

There was more discussion about the A+ having no more value than an A; it was pointed out that there is no way to know that an A+ is not available when looking at a transcript; it was stated that it is a way to show extraordinary achievement on a transcript.

D. Burris asked how this is going to affect multi-section classes with the same syllabus.

S. Sloboda responded by saying that the shared syllabus would have the grading criteria and everyone using that syllabus would have to use that scale.

J. Cheatwood stated that this does need to be clarified so that it addressed departments that don't use the A, B, C, D grading scale.

A. Imre pointed out that earlier there was a friendly amendment that addressed that concern. Imre read the friendly amendment; "Therefore be it resolved that SIUC Undergraduate Programs for courses using the A, B, C, D system adopt a policy of allowing plus and minus grades for the undergraduate students using the following GPA equivalence: A+ 4.0, A 4.0, A- 3.667, B+ 3.333, B 3.0, B- 2.667, C+ 2.333, C 2.0, C- 1.667, D+ 1.333, D 1.0, F 0.0."

There were no objections to the first friendly amendment.

A. Imre asked if the friendly amendment regarding the last whereas has been withdrawn.

H. Motyl replied yes, the original language stays the same.

J. Wall asked when this is to be implemented.

H. Motyl stated that the registrar needs one year and that this would be implemented for Summer 2017.

J. Wall asked how that change will affect the grading system that is printed in the catalog for 2017.

G. Whaley stated that there is no way for this body to control that; it is our job to pass the resolution; it is up to the administrators to decide how to handle the catalog.

J. Allen stated that when it comes to this, you follow what the faculty tells, it is just part of the matter.

A. Imre called for a vote by show of hands. 17 in favor, 7 opposed. Resolution passed. ([Appendix B](#))

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEE – Ahmad Fakhoury

No Report

BUDGET COMMITTEE – Joe Cheatwood

J. Cheatwood reported that nothing has changed but there are proposals on the table. FY17 is not being discussed.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – Ben Rodriguez

No Report

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – Deborah Burris / Sajal Lahiri

No Report

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Imre announced that the next meeting is just two weeks away on April 26, 2016. There will be two meetings; the first one is final reports for the 2015-2016 Senate; the second meeting is when the newly appointed Senators are seated.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
Howard Motyl, Secretary
HM:ao