

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR April 8, 2003 (Vol. XXXI, No. 26)**

The 2000-2001 Faculty Senate minutes and other information are available on the Web at <http://www.eiu.edu/~FacSen> The Faculty Senate agenda is posted weekly on the Web, at Coleman Hall 3556 and on the third-level bulletin board in Booth Library. Note: These Minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of all utterances made at the Senate meeting.

### **I. Call to order by Anne Zahlan at 2:02 p.m.** (Conference Room, Booth Library)

Present: R. Benedict, D. Brandt, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, L. Clay Mendez, J. Dilworth, F. Fraker, B. Lawrence, M. Monippallil, W. Ogbomo, S. Scher, M. Toosi, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Excused: G. Canivez. Guests: P. Age, B. Augustine, J. Chambers, C. Chatterji, S. Guccione, M. Hanner, W. Hine, M. Hoadley, B. Lord, J. Tidwell, B. Young.

### **II. Approval of the Minutes of April 1, 2003.**

Motion (Dilworth/Clay Mendez) to approve Minutes of April 1, 2003, with the following correction: Under IV. Communications, item H. should read: E-mail message (13 February) from Blair Lord re: Touch-tone registration. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Scher, Toosi, Wolski. Abstain: Zahlan. **Passed.**

### **III. Announcements:** None.

### **IV. Communications:**

- A. Memo (1 April) from Allen Lanham re: Library Calendar
- B. E-mail message (4 April) from Michael Hoadley re: CTPC and PDG Review Process
- C. Memo from Frank Hohengarten re: Faculty Senate representative on Enrollment Management Committee
- D. Notes (19 March) from President's Council, Including Revised Policies on "University Personal Property Control" and "Directory Information, Personal Data, Lists and Labels for Students and Employees."
- E. Copy of E-mail message (7 April) to Les Hyder from Sue Kaufman re: SURS Board

### **V. Old Business:**

- A. Committee Reports:
  - 1. Executive Committee: Chair Zahlan reported that the Senate's Executive Committee met with the Executive Committee of the Council of Chairs on 4 April 2003 and discussed subjects of mutual interest, such as assessment and technology governance.
  - 2. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: No report.
  - 3. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.
  - 4. Elections Committee: Senator Brandt is still working to resolve ties between write-in candidates for various councils/committees.
  - 5. Nominations Committee: Senator Canivez has reported that several openings on various committees remain vacant, and a list of these openings appears at the end of these Minutes. Anyone interested in filling any of these openings should contact Senator Canivez or Senator Carwell by no later than Friday, 18 April 2003.
  - 6. Distinguished Faculty Award Selection Committee: Motion (Scher/Benedict) to approve proposed amendment to the Agreement Creating and Administering The Distinguished Faculty Award, so that it reads, in part: "The minimum award shall be \$500," and the authorizing agent be identified as Chair of the Faculty Senate. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. No: Dilworth. Abstain: Clay Mendez. **Passed.**

- B. Appointment of Senate Representatives to Achievement and Contribution Awards Selection Committee: Motion (Carwell/Brandt) to appoint Senators Lawrence, Ogbomo and Wolski to the

Achievement and Contributions Awards Selection Committee. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. **Passed.**

C. Appointment of Senate Representative to Enrollment Management Committee. Motion (Ogbomo/Clay Mendez) to appoint Senator Scher as Senate Representative on Enrollment Management Committee. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Scher. **Passed.**

D. Functioning on Council on University Planning and Budget. Motion (Monippallil/Toosi) to adopt resolution to recommend to Eastern' s President restructuring the CUPB [Resolution was attached to Senate Minutes of February 25, 2003]. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. **Passed.**

E. Electronic Writing Portfolio Follow-Up. Chair Zahlan distributed "Faculty Senate Comments and Recommendations on the Electronic Writing Portfolio" [attached at the end of these Minutes]. Motion (Benedict/Lawrence) to accept "Faculty Senate Comments and Recommendations on the Electronic Writing Portfolio." Yes: Benedict, Carpenter, Carwell, Clay Mendez, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Brandt, Dilworth. **Passed.**

Hearing no objection, Chair Zahlan suspended published order of business and moved Senate to VI.B.

#### **VI. New Business:**

B. Comprehensive Technology Planning Committee and Other Issues of Governance for Academic Technology: Update from M. Hoadley and C. Chatterji. Hoadley handed out an informational sheet re: Comprehensive Technology Planning Committee (CTPC), its functions, etc. Hoadley: ...Our whole motivation for this idea of strategic planning, and for looking at the committee [CTPC] was pretty clear--trying to figure out what the institutional priorities are, trying to give everybody some information and updates about what is going on technologically, looking at some of the needs and constraints that are facing this campus, trying to build alliance with all the groups across campus so they were some of the key decision-makers, trying to figure out how we' re going to use our resources better and what would be appropriate for this campus, and then looking at some of our technology needs and...at what' s out there for the future, in terms of our vision for the use of technology. ...Since we started it' s been a real good dialogue, for the people who are on that committee [CTPC]; there' s 22 people. It' s a diverse group; it' s a very informed group. I think they really are sincere in trying to look at the issues for the campus.... Our approach is...pretty clear: ...The focus is on the students; the focus is saying all the things that we use technology for, in support of the academic mission, does have to eventually funnel in and focus on the students....

[A general discussion followed Hoadley' s opening remarks, during which discussion Senator Benedict expressed appreciation for the creation of the CTPC steering committee; Senator Lawrence asked about whether the CTPC would continue being an ad-hoc committee or at some time be made a permanent committee (Hoadley indicated there is no plan to make it other than an ad-hoc committee); and Senator Zahlan suggested that members of CTPC visiting various departments on campus, to facilitate and conduct informational sessions, re: technology, would be very valuable. Chatterji noted that, during periods of budgetary constraints, such as the present period, time can be devoted usefully to planning, as well as to educating people about the broad and educationally germane uses of technology at the university.]

At this point, Hoadley handed out his "Proposal for CATS Professional Development Grant Review Committee." Hoadley: ...You can see the proposal, and I' d like to get some reaction from you about the proposal and any suggestions you might have. [The proposal is attached to these Minutes.]

[A general discussion followed, during which Senators and guests expressed their opinions and concerns about: the problematic possibility of--or potential for--faculty representation on the committee constituting less than half of the proposed membership; the proposed size of the committee being large; the university' s academic mission and use of instructional technology not necessarily being supported by the proposed composition of the committee; the preference for graduate-student representation on the

committee because of their technological knowledge; the need for accountability re: the way TEAM and/or TEDE grant money is actually used by grant recipients; the necessity for faculty, staff and students to be selected by their respective constituents to serve on the committee; a possible over-emphasis upon institutional priorities at the expense of individuals' technological pursuits or goals or initiatives; the necessity for having a reliable and agreed-upon rubric by which grant applications are evaluated; and the necessity for creating a CATS PDGR Committee that will have integrity exclusive of specific personalities in administrative positions at any given time.] The Senate decided to discuss further the composition of the CATS PDGR Committee.

**VII. Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

**Future Agenda Items:**

Phi Beta Kappa; NCA Re-accreditation Process; Legislative Update from State Senator Righter; Senate Constitution and By-laws; Faculty Representation of Board of Trustees.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Carpenter

## **Faculty Senate Comments and Recommendations on the Electronic Writing Portfolio**

In response to concerns expressed by faculty constituents, the Faculty Senate discussed the Electronic Writing Portfolio with Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning representatives Janet Cosbey and Mary Hogg; Writing Across the Curriculum Committee representatives Robin Murray and Daiva Markelis; former CAA member Tim Shonk, and concerned faculty member John Allison. Also present at the 25 February discussion were Mary Herrington-Perry, Debra Hopgood, and CAA Chair Nancy Marlow. The following recommendations grow out of the Senate's consideration of faculty concerns and the discussion at the 25 February meeting.

1. The Faculty Senate recommends that the Council for Academic Affairs, the Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning, and the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, the three bodies primarily charged with determining the means and overseeing the implementation of the assessment of student writing, pool their knowledge and coordinate their efforts.

Additionally, the Senate suggests the inclusion on CASL of a faculty member with specific expertise in teaching and assessing writing.

2. The Senate further recommends that the purpose for collecting samples of student writing be clarified and agreed among the three committees, and that the purpose as agreed upon be made clear to the faculty as a whole. Clearly there is disagreement as to whether, on the one hand, the EWP is intended to insure that individual students write competently as a requirement for graduation, or, on the other, that the EWP is intended to measure improvement in the writing of the entire student body as a result of education at Eastern. The question needs to be resolved to the satisfaction of both students and faculty.

3. The Senate further recommends that the intention of using Electronic Writing Portfolio compilations as "data" that can be used to demonstrate some kind of "value added" be tested by standards applied to research in relevant fields.

In this connection, it should be noted that the samples of writing come from different level classes that may not be taken in the order suggested by the course numbers (a 2000-level general education course could, for instance, be taken by a senior). Additionally, it should be

noted that samples of student writing from different disciplines and courses respond to very different assignments and are designed to meet the different criteria applicable to different types of writing.

4. The Senate further recommends that the rubric currently provided to the faculty for the evaluation of EWP submissions be reexamined. It is noted that there are a number of subjective standards (such as ‘rich, engaging, and/or pertinent details’ or ‘precise and/or rich language’). While such standards may indeed be valid in assessing writing, it may be difficult for a faculty trained in different disciplines to apply them uniformly. Given the difficulties of consistent assessment and the varying criteria for different genres in different disciplines, the Senate requests that the committees reconsider the evaluative component of the EWP procedure. Perhaps going back to indicating that a given writing sample is satisfactory would be a more practical and ultimately more valid method of evaluating EWP submissions.

5. Finally, the Senate recommends that the EWP process be evaluated also in regard to its pedagogical value. Many would agree that the collecting of writing samples (especially if they are selected and revised) as a record of individual student accomplishments in writing can have pedagogical value. However, the committees charged with designing and implementing the process should do all they can to ensure that such is the case, that the process is of value to students. In this regard, the committees may need to consider the university commitment to prevent assessment from intruding into the classroom. An assessment process that takes time and energy away from instruction is not the best process possible.

**Date:** April 4, 2003

**To:** Anne Zahlan, Chair, and Other Members of the Faculty Senate  
at Eastern Illinois University

**From:** Dr. Michael Hoadley, Assistant VP for Academic Affairs for Technology  
Center for Academic Technology Support (CATS)

**Re:** Proposal for CATS Professional Development Grant Review Committee

I have discussed this matter with Provost/VP for Academic Affairs Lord, the CATS staff, the Council of Deans, and numerous faculty, staff, and administrators on campus. Here is what I am now proposing for the composition of membership on the CATS Professional Development Grant (PDG) Review Committee:

Each Dean of the four academic colleges will determine  
one representative from his/her college (faculty and/or staff) = 4

The Office of Academic Affairs will determine four at-large  
representatives (possible combination of faculty, staff, and/or students) = 4

Through the election process facilitated by the Faculty Senate,  
one faculty member will be selected to represent each of the four  
academic colleges = 4

Booth Library will determine one representative (faculty or staff) = 1  
Total = 13

The total number of 13 reviewers on this committee is large, but it appears to be necessary. My goal all along has been to make sure that the reviewers represent the diverse interests of the campus, especially since ‘The (PDG) funds are intended to help a person improve his/her technological skills and knowledge in order to enhance, deliver, and/or support classes and programs through the use of instructional technology.’

I would appreciate any feedback the Faculty Senate would like to provide before I make my final decision. If anyone needs additional information about the PDG application process, please refer them to the CATS website (<http://cats.eiu.edu/team/teampdg.cfm>).

## Eastern Illinois University Faculty Senate **A Resolution**

Whereas the Council on University Planning and Budget plays an important and integral role in the tradition and structure of shared governance at Eastern Illinois University;

Whereas the Council on University Planning and Budget, pursuant to Board of Trustees Regulations, Section 5, Part B, serves as an advisory council to the President of Eastern Illinois University with respect to:

1. *The setting of program priorities in the University budget.*
2. *The periodic review of University budget.*
3. *Transfers of significant amounts among internal budget items;*

Whereas the Council on University Planning and Budget, according to the Minutes of President’s Council, March 22, 1995, is *expected to review, evaluate, and, in regard to new funding, recommend institutional priorities;*

Whereas the Board of Trustees’ Regulations, Section 5, Part B, stipulate, on the Council on University Planning and Budget, that it *is expected that broad committee representation will provide maximum opportunity for a voice of the faculty as a body; and*

Where as the present size and composition of the Council of University Planning and Budget hinder the achievement of its stated objectives and the effective and efficient execution of its responsibilities;

Now, Therefore, Be IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Eastern Illinois University makes the following recommendation to the Interim President and the President’s Council of Eastern Illinois University to alter the size and the composition of the Council on University Planning and Budget as presented below:

## **COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND BUDGET**

### **Voting Members:**

Chair, Faculty Senate  
President, UPI or Designee of UPI Executive Board  
Four Faculty Members (representing four colleges)  
1 Faculty Member (representing library, counseling center)  
Chair, Staff Senate or Designee  
President, AFSME, or Designee  
1 Dean (representing Council of Deans)  
2 Chairs (representing Council of Chairs)  
President, Student Senate, or Designee  
1 Student Senate Representative  
1 Person Appointed by the President

### **Non-Voting Members**

President  
Members of the President's Council

### **Non-Voting Resource Personnel**

Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs  
Director, University Budgets and Planning  
Director, University Facilities and Planning  
Other Resources Personnel as Needed