

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR August 30, 2005 (Vol. XXXIV, No. 2)**

The 2005 – 2006 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 Physical Sciences Building 1450, and on the third-level bulletin board in Booth Library. Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

**Call to Faculty:** Faculty interested in serving on the Intercollegiate Athletic Board, which meets every other Thursday at 2 PM, should contact Senator Pommier at [cfjhp1@eiu.edu](mailto:cfjhp1@eiu.edu). Faculty interested in serving on the Development Committee, which meets Tuesdays at 8:30 AM in the Neal Welcome Center, should also contact him.

- I. Call to order by Chair Dr. Assege HaileMariam at 2:00 p.m.** (Library Conference Room, Booth Library)  
Present: J. Ashley, A. Brownson, L. Curry, M. Dao, R. Fischer, A. HaileMariam, J. Kilgore, R. Marshall, M. Monipallil, J. Pommier, T. Sinclair, J. Stimac, D. Van Gunten, and B. Wilson.  
Guests: B. Lord (Provost and VPAA), K. Sanders (Director, Center For Academic Support and Achievement), J. Allison, M. Burns, D. Hopgood, T. Shonk, C. Frederick (Student VPAA), and S. Whitney (Reporter, *Daily Eastern News*).
- II. Approval of Minutes of 23 August 2005.**  
Motion (Wilson / Brownson) to approve the Minutes of 23 August 2005 with correction. Yes: Ashley, Brownson, Curry, Dao, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Marshall, Monipallil, Sinclair, Stimac, and Wilson.  
Abstain: Pommier and Van Gunten.
- III. Announcements**
  - A. Convocation is being held 30 August at 7 PM in the University Grand Ballroom
  - B. Faculty Luncheon, co-sponsored by the Faculty Senate, is being held 31 August in the University Grand Ballroom. Starts at 11:30.
  - C. New Faculty Reception to be held 20 September from 4 – 6 PM in the Tarble Arts Center. This is co-sponsored by the Faculty Senate.
- IV. Communications**
  - A. Letter of 9 August from William Hine, Appointment to Continuing Education Advisory Council. Chair HaileMariam stated that last year four faculty were appointed to the committee and that their names would be forwarded to Dean Hine.
  - B. Email of 17 August from Gail Richard, re: Appointment to Intercollegiate Athletic Board. Chair HaileMariam reported that one person resigned from the IAB and that the alternate had left the University. Senator Stimac stated that if the position needed to be filled quickly, that he knew D. Deptula, Psychology, would be interested in the position. Senator Pommier suggested that in order to give all faculty the opportunity to volunteer for the position a call should be placed in the minutes.
  - C. Letter of 19 August from President Hencken, re: Appointment to University Naming Committee. Chair HaileMariam stated that as chair of Faculty Senate, she is supposed to be the Faculty Senate's representative to the committee. Senator Ashley asked if state law had changed such that the ability to name University buildings was being questioned. Provost Lord stated that it had not and that this request had to do with a naming opportunity.
  - D. Email of 25 August from John Allison, re: Faculty meeting place
  - E. Senator Fischer asked about revisions being made to IGP 57 (Grants and Contracts Proposal Approval). Provost Lord replied that changes in the IGP will only change the proposal form, not changes in the way matched commitments are done. The Provost added that these changes are in anticipation of the change over to the Banner system and how information is collected.

- F. Email from Adam Due, Chief University Police Department, re: request for faculty to serve on committee. Chair HaileMariam stated that four faculty names are available and that their names would be forwarded to Chief Due. Senator Pommier said that he would forward the names.

## V. Old Business

### A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee: Chair HaileMariam asked that a list of all committees with membership, year elected or appointed, and contact information be posted on the Faculty Senate's web site. Senator Pommier stated that he was nearly finished generating the lists.
2. Nominations Committee: Senator Pommier asked who was serving on the Awards and Contributions Awards Committee. Senator Stimac replied that himself and Jean Wolski had volunteered last semester to serve on that committee. Senator Pommier asked that faculty interested in serving on the Development Committee please contact him at [cfjhp1@eiu.edu](mailto:cfjhp1@eiu.edu). He also reminded the Senate that the Distinguished Faculty Award Committee needs to have three members appointed to it during the fall.
3. Elections Committee: Senator Ashley reported that he had replacements for senators Allison's and Comerford's sabbatical leaves. Senator Kilgore's sabbatical replacement is also taken into account. Dawn Van Gunten and Patricia Fewell have agreed to serve as replacements for senators Allison and Comerford and Van Gunten has agreed to continue to serve during the spring for Senator Kilgore's position. Senator Ashley (Brownson) made a motion that Dawn Van Gunten and Patricia Fewell be accepted on the Faculty Senate. Yes: Ashley, Brownson, Curry, Dao, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Marshall, Monipallil, Pommier, Sinclair, Stimac, and Wilson. Motion passes 13-0. Senator Van Gunten was welcomed to the Faculty Senate. Chair HaileMariam stated that Senator Fewell had a previous commitment during this meeting, but will be able to attend the other Faculty Senate Meetings.
4. Faculty – Student Relations: no report.
5. Faculty – Staff Relations: no report.
6. Budget Transparency Committee: Senator Ashley reported that senators needed to be appointed to the ad-hoc committee.
7. Other Reports
  - a) Provost's Report – Provost Lord reported that the beginning of the semester is still going smooth. Senator Monipallil asked if enrollment figures were available. The Provost reported that official enrollment figure would not be available until after the 10<sup>th</sup>-day enrollments came out, but that unofficial numbers appear to indicate a slight increase with the number of new freshmen down, but the number of transfers up. Senator Ashley asked if with the size of the freshman class decreasing, did the University expect a decrease in class size in coming years. Provost Lord stated that a variety of small, external forces would probably result in very small growth. Senator Wilson if Enrollment Management's procedures for selection helped this year. The Provost stated that some of the new procedures had been implemented, but that additional study is needed to understand the effect that the procedures had on the entering class. The Provost added that he strongly believes in Brenda (Ross) Major's ideas and concepts. Senator Kilgore asked if the catalog was later than normal this year and if that had caused nay problems. Provost Lord replied that it was later than normal, but that had more to do with the new printer since the catalog had to be modified from the electronic version (acalog; <http://catalog.eiu.edu/>) to a print version. Senator Kilgore asked if long-term plans called for going to more of an electronic catalog. The Provost replied that he does expect the catalog to eventually become electronic, but that it should take a long time, at least not until after his tenure at the University. He stated that higher education in general is going to more electronic references. Senator Brownson asked if such a practice would be a problem since the catalog is the contract between the student and the University. Provost Lord replied that the catalog is the contract, so some type of archival catalog would need to be kept.
- B. Motion (Ashley / Marshall): "That the By-laws of the Faculty Senate be changed so that Section II, paragraph B, subsection d be modified such that "d. When the list of alternates to the Senate (as specified in section II, B.8.a.) has been depleted, nominees receiving the highest number of votes, short of being elected, in subsequent elections shall be appointed to the Senate; if no nominees are available then the Senate will hold a special election." Chair HaileMariam explained that the reasoning behind

the motion was so that the bylaws would not have to be suspended every time in which senators needed to be replaced by being selected from a year in which the candidates did not run. Yes: Ashley, Brownson, Curry, Dao, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Marshall, Monipallil, Pommier, Sinclair, Stimac, Van Gunten, and Wilson. Motion passes 14-0.

## **VI. New Business**

- A. Electronic Writing Portfolio (EWP) assessment. Karla Sanders, Director, Center for Academic Support and Achievement (CASA), began the discussion by handing out a section from the EIU Plan for Assessment of Student Learning that addressed the student learning goal that EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to write effectively (see attachment at end of Minutes). Chair HaileMariam stated that she had shared the concerns raised at the previous Faculty Senate Meeting with Sanders, so we would not need to go over the material again. Sanders stated that one question asked previously was what was the purpose of reading the papers that had been previously scored by faculty using the supplied rubric. Sanders stated that this second tier assessment will not be looking at individual papers but is intended to look at portfolios as a whole. Senator Curry asked what the second tier assessors would be looking for. Sanders responded that she is still waiting on the trainers to get that information back to CASA, but that she expects that organizational structure, mechanics, and the like would be reviewed at the portfolio level. Holistic strengths and weaknesses would be assessed. Senator Monipallil asked how students benefit from the EWP. Sanders replied that she hopes faculty are requiring students to submit rough drafts and revised versions so students' writing improves. Faculty who see the student's writing during the course of the semester should also address systemic issues. Senator Curry asked how the second tier assessment will be done if the assessors are not rescoring the students' papers. Sanders stated that the assessors will not have the score assigned by the faculty member and that only after reading an entire completed portfolio, four submissions, will an assessment be made. Senator Ashley suggested that the data are already available so that this assessment is an attempt to look for patterns so that changes can be made in the future. Sanders agreed. Senator Stimac asked how submissions in foreign languages are addressed. Sanders replied that less than one percent of the submissions are in a foreign language, and that in each instance, that language had been Spanish. One of the second tier assessors is fluent in Spanish. Senator Monipallil stated that much time could be saved if we just stipulate that "X" percent of the students write well, "Y" percent write fine, and that some small percent, "Z," write poorly. That small percent will never improve. We must offer some benefit to those students who write poorly. Similar programs have been tried elsewhere and have failed miserably and have had to be abandoned. This creates additional resentment from the students. Senator Monipallil asked what would happen when this second tier assessment finds the "X", "Y", and "Z" percentages he mentioned. Sanders replied that she believes the assessment will work and disagrees that similar system failed elsewhere. The current system is not setup to look at progress, but is currently designed to see if the goals are being met. It is not designed to catch students who need remedial effort, but will identify if students are improving through the system. Senator Monipallil asked what added value to the student is the EWP. Many students consider the EWP a no value assignment. Sanders replied that the previous assessment, the Writing Competency Examination (WCP) had students showing up drunk, but that writing must be assessed by some method. In this case, students may submit any paper from a Writing Intensive (WI) course. Senator Pommier stated that he agrees with Senator Monipallil and asked again, why the second tier evaluation. A second question that arises is how do we know that students actually did the writing being submitted. Sanders reported that there are a wide range of courses from which students might submit samples. Burns added that the second tier assessment is more qualitative and that based on this assessment, the Writing Center may be able to design and offer additional courses or help sessions geared to the students' identified problems. Burns further suggested that there will be holistic approach to the assessment and that it will not single out any one element. Sanders echoed the fact that the second tier assessors will be looking at the larger collective issues, not the minutia. Allison stated that in his experience the majority of revised essays incorporate his suggestions and that this second tier assessment may see that. The submitted material to the portfolio are actually showing some the best work from the student and faculty and are therefore not a good assessment indicator. He asked how such an approach could be justified to the students. He cited, from the 2005 Report on the Electronic Writing Portfolio, that 2853 holds were placed on student records and that the worst of it is that students only take the WI courses because they must. Allison stated that this is shaping education a bad way. Sanders

acknowledged that the EWP is not the perfect plan, but the data need to be reviewed in order to understand how to plan any adjustment. Burns added that preliminary reviews of the papers indicate that they are not perfect, so revisions by faculty may not be fully incorporated. Senator Ashley asked the Provost if the NCA commented on the EWP. Provost Lord replied that when the self-study was prepared that approximately 2/3 focused on assessment issues. The NCA did comment on the unevenness of campus assessment, but that without the EWP there would have been a very direct comment. Senator Fischer thanked Sanders for coming to the Faculty Senate and said that the WCE was problematic. He has no problem with testing the students, but that maybe we should go about it in another way. Rather than having the rubric as it now stands, perhaps the rubric could emphasize the organization, style, mechanics, and data being presented in the paper. We must also sell the EWP to both the faculty and the students. Making the portfolios available to prospective employers might be such a method. Senator Fischer added that the middle two submissions might come from any two courses in the students' major. This would encourage both the student and the faculty. Senator Kilgore stated that the public handed this problem to us. Every faculty member has different ideas as to what makes for good writing. Perhaps the expectations of the EWP are too high. He suggested that perhaps the second tier assessment is actually a pseudo-assessment since we rarely fail students. In essence, is the EWP a standard that no one fails? Senator Wilson suggested that there should be a change in the philosophy. The WCE was an examination done before graduation; the EWP is trying to ask what should be taught and is done after the fact. Major submissions, without revisions, would be best since the students would probably be doing their best work and it would have no influence from their instructors. Allison stated that Senator Wilson had put her finger on the essence of the goal. Not only must there be assessment, but also there must also be early intervention and the possibility of help when needed. Shonk expressed his dismay that these are the exact same questions being asked that were asked five to six years ago when the EWP was first proposed to the CAA. Shonk asked why faculty grade according to a rubric of 1 – 2 – 3 – 4, when the second tier assessors never see the grades. Sanders replied that the grade faculty submit are used for formative data assessment. Senator Curry pointed out that the EWP as constructed allows students to submit what they think is their best work and so skews data analysis. She added that some type of WCE within the major might be appropriate. Sanders pointed out that only 56 percent of the programs have writing included as an objective. Chair HaileMariam concluded the discussion by stating that no one is objecting to assessment, but that assessment must benefit the students. The rubric may need to be addressed so that it can benefit the students and produce meaningful data.

## **VII. Adjournment at 3:45 p.m.**

### **Future Agenda Items:**

Future Agenda Items: Study Abroad; Admissions and enrollment; Childcare follow-up; Faculty representation on BOT; Campus atmosphere.

Respectfully submitted,

John Paul Stimac

---

---

**Student Learning Goal: EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to write effectively.**

---

---

**Step 1: Student learning objectives**

Skills objectives: EIU students will prepare written assignments that demonstrate competent writing skills including:

- Establishing and maintaining focus and appropriate voice;
- Organization that enhances presentation;
- Development of ideas supported by details;
- Use of effective sentence structure, syntax, and diction; and
- Use of correct mechanics.

---

**Step 2: Assessment measures**

EIU students will submit an Electronic Writing Portfolio (EWP). Documents submitted to this portfolio will be assessed by the course instructor based on the Writing Rubric and will be given a holistic number of 4, 3, or 2. A sample of full portfolios will be read by faculty trained by a writing expert for qualitative data concerning students' writing skills.

---

**Step 3: Assessment procedures*****Students subject to assessment***

All undergraduate students who graduate from EIU will submit an electronic writing portfolio (EWP) composed of writing samples from writing-centered and writing-intensive courses\* completed at EIU. Native students will submit one writing sample from courses taken at each level:

|            |                 |                                  |
|------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Sample #1: | Freshman level  | (0-29 semester hours)            |
| Sample #2: | Sophomore level | (30-59 semester hours)           |
| Sample #3: | Junior level    | (60-89 semester hours)           |
| Sample #4: | Senior level    | (90 semester hours - graduation) |

Transfer students will submit one writing sample from each level completed at Eastern Illinois University. Consistent with the University graduation requirement of completion of at least 42 semester hours at EIU, transfer students at a minimum will submit writing samples from each of the junior and senior levels. Students in the Board of Trustees program will submit one writing sample from EDF 3985 and at least one sample from a writing assignment in another course taken at EIU.

Students with internships off campus during their entire senior year (e.g., Engineering Cooperative and Clinical Lab Sciences) will be exempt from submitting a writing sample during their senior year.

The University Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL) and the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing (OAAT) will develop appropriate procedures governing the EWP, subject to the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

\* The University Council on Academic Affairs describes writing-centered and writing-intensive course as follows:

In writing-centered courses, (English 1001G English 1002G, and their honors equivalents), students learn the principles and the process of writing in all stages, from inception to completion. The quality of students' writing is the principle determinant of the course grade. The minimum writing requirement is 20 pages (5,000 words).

In writing-intensive courses, several writing assignments and writing activities are required. These assignments and activities, which are to be spread over the course of the semester, serve the dual purpose of strengthening writing skills and deepening understanding of course content. At least one writing assignment is to be revised by the student after it has been read and commented on by the instructor. In writing-intensive courses the quality of students' writing should constitute no less than 35% of the final course grade.

---

---

**Student Learning Goal : EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to write effectively (cont.).**

---

---

*Submissions to the EWP*

Each native student's EWP will include the following:

- Sample #1: an assignment from a writing-centered course in the General Education curriculum: ENG 1001G, ENG 1002G, ENG 1091G, or ENG 1092G (generally completed before the student has earned 30 hours).
- Sample #2: an assignment from a writing-intensive course in the General Education curriculum at the 2000 or 3000 level or from an introductory, writing-intensive course in the major field (generally completed when the student has earned between 30 and 59 hours).
- Sample #3: an assignment from an upper division writing-intensive General Education course or from a 3000 or 4000 level writing-intensive course in the student's major (generally completed when the student has earned between 60 and 89 hours).
- Sample #4: an assignment from the Senior Seminar (generally completed after the student has earned 90 hours).

Transfer students will submit one writing sample from these courses for each level completed at Eastern Illinois University with a minimum of two documents submitted.

*Performance expectations*

All students will complete an EWP (as described above in "Students Subject to Assessment") composed of submissions that have been assessed holistically as highly competent (4), competent (3), or minimally competent (2) by their instructors using the *Writing Rubric*.

---

**Step 4: Collection, analysis and report of assessment data***Responsibility for data collection*

*Students' Responsibilities.* Each student is responsible for preparing and selecting appropriate course assignments for the EWP, consulting as needed with the course instructor, and submitting those assignments to his/her EWP in accordance with procedures established by the Center for Academic Support and Achievement (CASA).

*Instructors' Responsibilities.* After a student has notified an instructor that the student has selected a course assignment for submission to the EWP, the course instructor will certify the student writing sample and holistically assess that assignment using the *Writing Rubric*. The instructor will submit the certification and assessment to the student's EWP in accordance with procedures established by the CASA.

*CASA's Responsibilities.* CASA is responsible for collecting and maintaining students' electronic writing portfolios in accordance with procedures established by CASA and approved by CASL and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

*Analysis of EWPs*

A sampling of submissions to the EWPs will be analyzed on an annual basis by trained faculty and staff evaluators. At a minimum, the evaluators will identify the strengths and weaknesses of students' writing samples.

---

---

**Student Learning Goal : EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to write effectively (cont.).**

---

---

*Procedures for analysis of EWPs*

CASL, WACC, and CASA will develop and implement procedures for analysis of submissions to the EWPS, subject to the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, that include:

- Procedures for selecting and training evaluators;
- Procedures for selecting samples to be analyzed by evaluators; and
- Procedures for analyzing writing samples.

The procedures will ensure that:

- Faculty and staff evaluators include, to the extent possible, individuals from a variety of disciplines and academic background;
- The identities of students whose submissions are analyzed remain confidential and are not revealed to faculty and staff evaluators; and
- Samples selected for evaluation by faculty and staff include submissions from students from a variety of majors and include submissions from native and transfer students.

*Reports and dissemination of assessment data*

Each semester, CASA will prepare a report summarizing data on the EWPs including, for example, number of portfolios, number of submissions, and summary statistics. Following assessment by faculty and staff evaluators, the evaluators—with the assistance of CASA—will prepare a report summarizing their analysis including documentation with examples from student EWPs.

CASA will distribute copies of the reports to:

- Council on Academic Affairs
- Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Writing Across the Curriculum Committee
- Vice President for Academic Affairs

---

**Step 5: Use the results to improve student learning**

Students enrolled in writing-centered and writing-intensive courses will have the opportunity to consult with instructors regarding revision and improvement of writing assignments. Based on the reports of assessment data, CAA will consult with appropriate groups and individuals—such as CASL, WAC, CASA, and instructors of writing-centered and writing-intensive courses—concerning changes to improve students' writing skills and will implement appropriate changes.

---

---