

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR November 19, 2002 (Vol. XXXI, No. 14)

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 2:03 p.m. (Conference Room, Booth Library)

Present: R. Benedict, D. Brandt, G. Canivez, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, J. Dilworth, F. Fraker, B. Lawrence, M. Monippallil, J. Pommier, W. Ogbomo, S. Scher, M. Toosi, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Guests: J. Chambers, R. Deedrick, B. Donnelly, D. Fernandez, J. Kilgore, B. Lord, C. Prendergast.

II. Approval of the Minutes of November 12, 2002.

Motion (Scher/Canivez) to approve Minutes of November 12, 2002, with the following amendments: Under IV.G., Provost Lord stated, in response to Zahlan's expressed hope that the Faculty Senate would be involved in any discussion about any changes in the organizational structure of TEDE/TEAM, that faculty will be involved. Also, under V.E., re: a possible Senate discussion about the Electronic Writing Portfolio, Senator Benedict stated: I do not think the Faculty Senate should discuss the evaluation of the Electronic Writing Portfolio. The E.W.P. was accepted as part of the University assessment plan on 10-26-2000. Moreover, the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, and the Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning approved the E.W.P. on 4-16-2002. This assessment process was discussed at length and approved by the Council on Academic Affairs. Given this, it would be more appropriate to discuss any faculty concerns regarding the E.W.P. at CAA where the discussions originated. Alternatively, any faculty concerns should be brought to the WAC and CASL committees. If the Faculty Senate does decide to discuss the E.W.P., then I would request that the Senate Chair invite representatives from both the CASL and WAC committees to be present for our discussions. Yes: Benedict, Canivez, Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Pommier, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Brandt. **Passed.**

III. Announcements: None.

IV. Communications:

- A. Letter from Bob Augustine (11 November) re: CUPB and Senate Minutes
- B. Minutes of President's Council Meeting of 9 October
- C. Information from President's Council Meeting of 23 October (JoBarron)
- D. E-mail Message (12 November) from Rick Sailors re: Radio/TV Advisory Board
- E. E-mail Message (12 November) from Jeff Stowell re: Radio/TV Advisory Board
- F. E-mail Message (17 November) from Chat Chatterji re: Computer Infrastructure Issues
- G. E-mail Message (18 November) from John Kilgore re: Computer Privacy
- H. E-mail Message (18 November) from Janet Cosby re: Electronic Writing Portfolio
- I. E-mail Message (18 November) from Alan Grant re: Senate Minutes

V. Old Business:

Committee Reports:

- 1. Executive Committee: Zahlan: The Executive Committee's scheduled meeting with Interim President Hencken and Provost Lord [18 November] was cancelled because Mr. Hencken had a meeting in Springfield. The CUPB meeting of 15 November was cancelled.
- 2. Nominations Committee: No report.
- 3. Elections Committee: No report.
- 4. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: No report.
- 5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.
- 6. Other Reports: Senator Scher is serving as Chair of the Distinguished Faculty Award Selection Committee this year. The Committee is updating the nomination form and it will be very similar to the

previous form. The deadline for nominations will be February 28, 2002, with the name(s) of selected candidate(s) presented to the Senate for approval by March 11, 2002. Ogbomo: The search for Budget Director is progressing.

Hearing no objection, Chair Zahlan suspended the published order of business to permit discussion of a Student Senate proposal on grade-appeal procedures.

VI. New Business:

A. Student Senate Proposed Resolution 02-03-07

Deedrick: This Senate Resolution has not been voted on by the Student Senate yet. ...With the informal discussion of this, within Student Government, I would say support for this is pretty wide. ...I would probably venture to say it will probably be passed unanimously. ...The IGP [about grade appeals] is kind of vague. The only thing it does spell out is how a student goes about appealing the process. It gives the four criteria, which are error in calculation of grade, assignment of grade based on more exacting or demanding standard, assignment of grade on some basis other than performance, or a substantial departure from the instructor' s previously announced standards. ...The IGP also states that ... the Student Body Executive Vice President, or the Chairperson of the Graduate Student Advisory Council, would serve as an ex-officio member of a [given] grade-appeal committee.... This policy was last looked at in 1993. ...[re: "Therefore Be It Resolved, Eastern Illinois University Student Government recommends to the Provost that students be included in the grade appeals process as a voting member" [sic]] What a student should have is some semblance of a jury of peers.

Lawrence: Do you [Deedrick, as Student Vice-President of Academic Affairs, who sits in on undergraduate grade-appeal proceedings] have a vote when you sit in on-- Deedrick: No, I do not. I' m just there as an ex-officio member. Scher: I' m not only thoroughly in support of this resolution, but I would take it further. I would support even a more prominent role for students [on grade-appeal committees]. ...Dilworth: I would feel more comfortable if [the exact language] of the IGP were used [in the first "Whereas..." clause of the proposed resolution], verbatim. I remember students had a vote in ' 93...Fraker: Where it [the proposed resolution] says "students be included," are you asking that a student be part of it, or a number of students? Deedrick: The way the wording is, students would be drawn from a pool.... Benedict: I would support Steve Scher' s view that having a vote for the student [appealing a grade] would empower the student; it would give credibility to the entire process. We take it seriously as a faculty; we take it seriously as an institution, and giving, allowing that [student] vote would reflect that.

Carwell [to Deedrick]: You' re not talking about something university-wide; you' re talking about each individual department, and this would take the place of whatever the process is in each individual department? Deedrick: I' m simply working with Mary Harrington-Perry to try to work out some language, and I' m coming to all the different bodies, that need to be consulted, to get their support. What the next step would be, if I do have the support from the different constituencies, [is] to try to work out some language, for the IGP, that gets a student in there as a voting member. This is not setting up a structure for any department; this would just be a university-wide policy that says a student must be included; that' s it. Carwell: You' re not talking about one, over-arching grade-appeal [process]you' re talking about each individual department. Each individual department' s grade-appeal committee would have to include a [voting] student? Is that what this is? Deedrick: Yes. Zahlan: I didn' t know that.Carwell: If that' s the case, this [proposed resolution] would have something to do with the DAC in our department, looking at the membership of the committee, and what have you. ...I' m not sure whether I agree with Steve Scher or Reed [Benedict], but I know there are going to be some people in my department who are going to be uneasy about giving a student a vote on another student' s grade. There will be people in my department who will be concerned about that. Deedrick: I guess the larger question I have is...is this IGP being followed? Dilworth: At the university level, at the top of the grade appeal [process]? Zahlan: He' s [Deedrick] talking about every department.

Deedrick: This is the way I understand the grade-appeal process to work: First, I appeal [to] my professor; if you and I cannot reach a conclusion, then it would go to [the given department' s Chair]; if [that Chair] feels that [he] and I cannot reach a conclusion, then he calls for the Department Grade Appeals Committee; at that time the Department Grade Appeals Committee is meeting to have a fact-finding session, they should be notifying my office [Student Vice-President of Academic Affairs], if it' s an undergrad. case,

and--if it' s a graduate-student case--they should be notifying the chairperson of the graduate case. Whenever I' m notified, that' s whenever I' m going to bring that student along; and if I' m not being notified, then there' s an inherent problem with that, and that means the IGP is not being followed. The only time that I' m bringing the student in is if I' m being notified; and I would assume, if you' re voting on a student' s grade, then my position--or the graduate student--needs to be there to represent that student. If you' re conducting votes, without having my position, or the Chairperson of the Graduate School [sic. Chairperson of the Graduate Student Advisory Committee], then you' re out of order in your department.

Carwell: What you' re saying now is that what we would do is notify you, and you would come in...and now have a vote in [for example] the Political Science Grade Appeal Committee. Deedrick: Correct. Pommier: We do have a Judicial Board at the university level, and on which you have many students who sit and do a terrific job, and I think that process works quite well. So my original thought was, yes, students should sit in...; but my issue with this is to how you are actually going to identify [students who wouldn' t have a conflict of interest when voting on a grade-appeal committee]. If you' re going to bring this to the departmental level, that could be an issue--especially if you have a department that--for instance, right now, technically we only have three faculty members in our department. So now you set it up so there' s a student in there--three faculty members, one student, plus an ex-officio [student], and is that going to be representative? Deedrick: I simply go in there, just because I' m an ex-officio. I have no--I mean, ex-officio; you take that for what it' s worth. Reasonably, you cannot pay attention to a word I say; it doesn' t really matter. I mean, it' s up to your interpretation of what "ex-officio" means. My interpretation of "ex-officio" is that I' m there to see to it that' s [grade-appeal process] hopefully conducted in a manner that' s not detrimental to the student.

Toosi: ...If it [the proposed Student Senate resolution] gets to the grade-appeal at the university level, then I' m for having a student there; they should be there; but if you' re forcing this to, at the department level, to have a student there, you have department chairs and DPC' and faculty of each department. Have you [Deedrick] considered that? Deedrick: I' ve spoken with the deans of the colleges; I have yet to speak with the chairs; but I would say since you [Faculty Senate] are representing faculty, if you do take action on this--whether you draw up a resolution of your own or offer friendly amendments [to the proposed resolution]--vote on this as a faculty member. Don' t vote on this representing your department. I will be in consultation with the department chairs.... I will go to the Council of Chairs. Vote representing faculty in general. Would faculty support this? Monippallil: ...The fact that a student is only an ex-officio member does not exclude that student from participating in the deliberations [of a grade-appeal committee].... At the university level, it [the proposed resolution] certainly makes sense, if the matter is not resolved at the department level and the petition goes to the university level. It probably makes very good sense to have, at that particular point, a voting [student] member. Carpenter: There is no university-level grade-appeal committee. Deedrick: So, essentially this is a university-wide policy affecting a departmental issue. That' s the problem with it.

Scher: Again, this [proposed resolution] makes a lot of sense. We have a lot of university-wide policies that constrain departments, like the process of hiring faculty members.... I think a lot of reservations people have aren' t necessary. Toosi: I think this [proposed resolution] is a great idea. I support [a student vote] at both levels, the university level and the department level; but we should leave the decision with the department when it' s at the department level.... Benedict: I don' t see a problem with this [proposed resolution]. ...Empowering [students] with that one vote is a very positive way of showing students that we take these issues seriously.... Deedrick: As I said, I spoke with the deans two weeks ago in a meeting. Dean Johnson said my argument had merit. That' s a direct quote from him. Associate Dean Lynch, whenever I spoke with him, he said...this was probably one of the best ideas that he could have thought of because...he said it' s a very intimidating process students are going through. Whenever I hear Dean Lynch say that, it really added some air to my argument. Zahlan: I' m confused about it [the proposed resolution] in a way because what Ronnie [Deedrick] originally said was that, when he goes to one of these [grade-appeal] committees, he serves as counsel for the [petitioning] student; that' s really a different role [from a voting student member on a grade-appeal committee]. ...The counsel for the student I have not seen [in the grade-appeal process]. It may be an important role and good role, but those would be certainly two separate functions--that someone would come in and advise a student about how to handle [the appeal]; that' s completely different from a student being among the people who are making the judgement.

At this point the Senate returned to its published order of business.

V. B. Computer Privacy Policy

Kilgore: ... It seems to me there is a very important need to ...start spelling out privacy policies and make sure that somebody is not setting a precedent that e-mail will be less protected than personal mail, business mail has been traditionally. ...I would no more think that the university has the right [to read e-mail] than I think they [sic] have the right to come by my house in the middle of the day, when I have personal mail in my mailbox, and open all the envelopes. That' s snooping, and that' s a violation of the right of privacy. Just the fact that our e-mail passes across the university server, gives them absolutely no right to go on fishing expeditions, to look at stuff just because they can. Now, in certain special situations (where a virus is involved, perhaps, or actual illegal activity--death threats or photographs of minors...) [there] would be exceptions. The basic principle, however you' re going to word it, has got to be My computer, my business; my mail is my mail, and nobody else has the right to snoop through it.

Toosi: Except for some words here and there, I support [the proposed privacy-policy statement]. ...We need to protect the privacy of what we are writing and what we are doing, so somebody else will not have access to it. Scher: I wonder about incorporating in this [proposed] policy privacy protection for students.... Fraker: The first one [sentence of the proposed privacy policy]--"Personal computers, once assigned, become effectively the property of...."--it seems to me that, more in reality, the data contained therein becomes your property. So it' s not the unit sitting on my desk that becomes mine; it' s what' s inside that I' m really trying to protect....Kilgore: ...Management has appealed to property rights to trump free-speech rights, and that' s why I wanted to use "property" right there in the first sentence.

Brandt: [A privacy policy] has to be consistent with state statutes. ...You can' t make a statement "personal use shall be permissible" when state statutes say it' s not permissible to use state property for personal use. So it has to be consistent with state statutes if it becomes a policy of the university. Those things have to be considered, whether these [proposed] statements are consistent with state statutes. Scher: Does what we present have to be legally consistent, or are we just saying philosophically we believe in these philosophical principles, and we think a policy should be adopted to promote those principles; and it' s up to whoever writes the final policy...? Brandt: I was saying I think it would be more appropriate to be a philosophical statement.... Fraker: Are we reinventing the wheel? Does this [such a privacy policy] exist at other institutions, other universities in Illinois? Kilgore: I think that' s an excellent point, but I haven' t put that kind of time into it.

Scher: There are arguments in favor of both sides, of doing a more philosophical statement; but there are also some pragmatic reasons to try to put something together that we think is legal, because then we can present it to the [BOT]. They may want to amend it; but if we give them the skeleton to go on it' s much more likely to come out in a way we support, than if they draft it from scratch. Benedict: Do we have any current policies on sanctions for any person who might violate computer issues such as this? Lord: We don' t have a formal policy on computer privacy. There is an IGP--in fact, there are two of them on computer use, sort of tangential statements, that make some reference to implied privacy of the use of that computer. We don' t have an IGP, for example, on computer privacy, based on principle or anything else. ...There are institutions that do have policies like that; there are institutions like ours that yet to have one.... Benedict: ...Is there a deterrent for somebody who might tap into [another person' s] computer, or use somebody' s e-mail for whatever purpose...? [Creating a policy that creates deterrents] would be another way to possibly look at this [computer-privacy issue].

Chair Zahlan requested that Senators Lawrence and Wolski, as well as John Kilgore, form a subcommittee to research and draft a computer-privacy policy, and she intends to request that James Tidwell also serve on the subcommittee.

VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Future Agenda Items:

Administrative Search Procedures; Computer-Privacy Policy; Shared Governance Concerns; Evaluation of Chairs; Temperature Control in Classrooms and Offices; Evaluation of Writing Portfolios; Facilities-Naming Procedures; Textbook-Rental Service; Increased Workload and Overload; Distance Education; Timing of Commencement; Efficient Use of Available Resources; Planning for University Events.

Notice: The Faculty Senate requests expressed opinions from faculty members about the Electronic Writing Portfolio and the evaluative rubric to be employed when evaluating students' writing.

Respectfully submitted,
David Carpenter

