President Wilson called the meeting to order at 4:05 and noted a quorum was present.

Tribute to Forrest Frank by Prof. Rettich

Forrest Frank, who taught organic chemistry here from 1965 to 1999, passed away last month. In over three decades of service, Forrest made many noteworthy contributions to our university. After his sabbatical at Scotland Yard, Forrest introduced an innovative and popular general education course in forensic chemistry. Forrest helped bring two NSF grants to campus in support of chemical instrumentation and curricular innovation. And in 1995 the student senate named Forrest co-teacher of the year. But Forrest will probably be best remembered for his consistently positive attitude. It was his positive attitude that led to his inspired teaching, his generous community service, and to his ability to see the best in every individual and every situation. Even when that situation was a grim prognosis of his disease, Forrest continued to inspire us with his positive attitude. He devoted his remaining time and energy to those things his considered most important, which included IWU. He continued to come to chemistry talks, root at home basketball games, and his favorite activity of all, to talk with people: students, alumni, faculty, and fellow retirees. Forrest will be missed as a valued teacher, colleague, mentor, and friend. So let us pause just a moment to honor his memory, to reflect on a life well led, and to express our sympathy to Forrest’s wife Dottie.

The faculty shared a moment of silence in memory of Forrest Frank and for Brandon Landau who died this past weekend.

Approval of the minutes from the February 6, 2012 meeting

Minutes approved.

Consent Agenda

Nothing removed from consent agenda.

Committee Reports

CUPP – Prof. Duke

CUPP has three proposed changes to the faculty handbook.

Proposal 1: strike Alice Sturgis and replace with American Institute of Parliamentarians. This is for the code of parliamentary procedure we use, the name of which has recently changed.

Proposal 2: change “faculty visitors to the board of trustees” to “faculty representatives to the board of trustees.” Rationale: have name reflect increase in responsibilities.
Proposal 3: changes to reflect the fact that faculty reps to the board of trustees attend CUPP meetings.

Paper ballots were passed out for these three proposals. Update: all 3 passed.

Prof. Bollivar presented the ACTF report and brought a motion from CUPP before the faculty which will be voted on at the first April meeting. Prof. Duke led the faculty in a round of applause for the good work of the task force, especially under such a tight deadline.

Proposal (to be voted on at first April meeting): Form a standing assessment committee. See the report for full details of its charge. Here’s an attempt at a summary: establish effective assessment policies and practices, serve as a repository of annual assessment reports, provide feedback and support to programs, and evaluate the extent to which each program has performed assessment.

Rationale (Prof. Bollivar): We haven’t had such a committee for many years, and should have formed one 10 years ago after the last external review. We are behind our peers with regards to assessment, and our accreditation agency is looking for departmental level assessment as well as University-wide assessment that influences decisions made. Forming this committee would show a good faith effort in this area.

The primary purpose of the committee would not be enforcement, but rather to help departments and programs put together assessment tools and strategies.

There are also proposed changes to the written charge of the assessment committee. These changes are clarifications rather than substantive modifications. First, change function 1) to include the phrase “for assessment of student learning” to show that the focus is on student learning. Second, in c) Reports and Records: the committee shall maintain and archive minutes and a record of all actions taken. The addition is the word “minutes.”

The first order of business was the amendment to enact the written changes. Prof. Chapman asked if student learning is broadly defined to include curriculum and pedagogy. Prof. Bollivar answered yes. Amendment passes.

Prof. Jaggi proposed an amendment to strike student participation from the committee.

Prof. Tiede supports the amendment. While he supports student involvement in the process, student membership on the committee (even non-voting) is not appropriate since the subject matter is the primary purview of the faculty. Important to note that the constitution calls for student membership on faculty committees where appropriate, but Prof. Tiede believes it is not appropriate in this case, even if the student is non-voting. In contrast Prof. Folse opposes the amendment and believes a student voice is needed on this committee.

Prof. Jaggi wants student input, but not in this committee because the committee will pass judgement on department assessment efforts. The appropriate place for student involvement would be at the department level when the department is gathering data. An analogy is PAT,
where student input is welcome in the process of assessing faculty, but PAT makes a final judgement without student involvement.

Prof. Theune asked if there is a student representative on CUPP. The answer is yes, and they are a voting member.

Prof. Bollivar responded to Prof. Jaggi that the analogy with PAT fails since the judgement passed is of programs, not of personnel. He does feel this is an appropriate place to include students, and is not afraid that a student would sway faculty members in their evaluation.

Mr. Michael Thompson confirmed that the majority of other institutions he’s looked at include a student.

Prof. Tiede supports the analogy with PAT because both involve subject matters that are the primary responsibility of the faculty. He places greater weight on the subject matter rather than on whether it is evaluating personnel or programs.

Prof. deHarak is primarily concerned with whether a student voice would be a help or a hindrance to the hard work the committee has ahead of them. He currently leans toward believing the student presence would primarily be a hindrance.

Prof. Matthews commented that the number one student concern to come out of the self-study was that professors don’t pay attention to course evaluations and don’t take assessment seriously. He believes having a student on the committee would help alleviate that concern. Prof. Duke added that it has been helpful to have a student on CUPP; questions can be asked of that student in real time.

Prof. Williams expressed concern that programs would be less frank in their reports knowing that a student was viewing them. Prof. Bollivar responded that all material sent to the assessment committee would be public information (at least, public to everyone on campus). Prof. Matthews added that all such material would also be public off campus as part of the University accreditation process.

Paper ballots were handed out for voting on the amendment. Update: amendment failed.

Prof. Spalding asked if it would be appropriate to send process to the committee rather than data. Prof. Bollivar responded that indeed the goal would be to have departments send the process used, what was learned, and how it informed what was done next. Surveys and other data should reside with the department or program.

Prof. Jeter asked for an estimate of the service hours this will take every year. In the math program external review the reviewers reported that faculty were overworked and understaffed. Prof. Bollivar responded that hopefully this is just writing reports to talk about what is already being done. In addition, the committee should endeavor to streamline the process. Prof. Theune added that once systems are in place then the amount of work should decrease.
For Prof. Chapman items 3), 5), 6) are the kicker, i.e. making this public. Usually it is a good idea to keep development and assessment separate. He is concerned that the committee is trying to do both at the same time. What are the consequences of failure other than shaming? Prof. Bollivar theorized that the Provost would be the “bad guy” since it is the Provost’s office which controls the purse strings.

Provost Green responded to the concern about making evaluation public by opining that intermediate steps don’t get disseminated. Any document that contains identified problems will also contain the steps that will be taken to address the problem, and so rather than having to feel embarrassed we show that we care about student learning. As for the question of enforcement, it is tied up with workload issues and Provost Green would rather employ the carrot first and save the possible sticks for when it is necessary. In response to a question about resources, Provost Green said that the assessment committee would not have a budget, and that if there are extraordinary needs money would come from the Provost’s office.

Returning to the issue of development versus evaluation, Prof. Chapman would like to see a focus on development and a removal of evaluation from the work of the committee. His concern is that programs will emphasize the good parts that make them look better while not attacking the big problems. Prof. Theune responded that attacking big problems takes years, so there is no need for programs to disseminate and claim they are doing more than they are actually doing. Prof. Matthews added that the only negative evaluation possible right now is a lack of information. Every program is different and is using different tools. According to the HLC we should be assessing our assessment but we’re five years away from that point.

Prof. Bollivar agrees that development is better than evaluation, but ultimately the Higher Learning Commission will want us to assess our assessment and so evaluation is needed. He repeated that assessment is a tool for improving the learning experience for students.

Prof. Thomas doesn’t think we can separate evaluation and development since we need to know which direction is the right direction to go.

**Curriculum Council** – Prof. Kerr

There are two minors that need a faculty vote. The **first proposal** is a new minor in exercise science. Prof. Chapman asked if new resources are needed or if this is a compilation of existing courses. The answer was that no new resources are needed. The rationale for the new minor is that it serves student career interests. There are two outside courses needed, and both those departments are in support of the minor.

Motion **passed**.

The **second motion** is a change to the environmental studies minor; some course alterations.

Motion **passed**.
Motion about course transfer credit. The key section is “matriculated students at Illinois Wesleyan can earn no more than 4 units of general education credit through a combination of AP, International Baccalaureate, and courses transferred from other institutions, except for courses in approved off-campus study programs. Online coursework may not be applied towards fulfillment of second language or science lab requirements."

Grammar change proposed by Prof. O’Gorman: “as such” changed to “accordingly.” Amendment passed.

Prof. Jeter asked two questions. First, why were second language and science lab sections singled out for exceptions (i.e. no online credit would be accepted for these courses). Second, it appears that only the registrar’s approval would be needed rather than the additional approval of the Dean of the curriculum.

Prof. Kerr responded to the second question that approval from the Dean of the curriculum is only needed when it is a general education course.

Prof. Jeter expressed his desire that departments approve online courses for credit, even for electives. His concern is that online courses would not be rigorous enough. It was noted in response that department approval is required for course substitutions in the major, but Prof. Jeter would like similar approval even for non-major courses.

Prof. Folse responded that students in nursing take the theoretical portion of a course online while taking the lab portion at IWU. She would oppose the removal of this possibility. Prof. Sheridan added that the exceptions for second language and science lab are due to limitations in technology and the experiential learning component. The larger problem that came up in previous discussions is that online courses are not coded as such, and so there is no way to single out online courses for special approval. Prof. Bollivar noted that Prof. Jeter’s concerns are not limited to online courses; there are many courses we accept from accredited institutions that may not be up to our standards, for example from community colleges. Provost Green emphasized that we only accept credit from accredited institutions, and the worst stories in the news involve non-accredited institutions.

Motion passes.

Finally there are changes to general education criteria.

IT passes. The major change was an increased emphasis on the reading of primary texts.

Contemporary social institutions: no changes

Second Language passes. The changes are mostly oriented towards changes in classroom teaching of second language. See report for details.

Nominating Committee – Prof. Delvin
Two proposals involving language changes to the constitution.

**Proposal 1**: Secretary position changed from elected to appointed.

**Proposal 2**: Allow electronic balloting for elections.

Paper ballots were handed out. Update: both proposals passed.

The slate of candidates for elected committees was shown. A significant problem is that there are five vacancies on Curriculum Council, and volunteers are needed. PAT has four vacancies and five candidates, so more nominations are required there as well.

Prof. Simeone asked for more details regarding the 50% number of faculty who responded to the call for nominations. Were there faculty that didn’t respond due to sabbaticals? Prof. Delvin responded that the nominating committee received about 70 forms, which includes people who left it blank due to sabbaticals or being over committed. There are about 170 faculty.

Prof. Tiede commented that we could reduce the number of candidates required from 1.5 to some other number, say 1.25. Prof. Chapman opined that the number of committees has proliferated and the amount of work has proliferated. We need a big idea to address this situation. Prof. Terkla added it doesn’t help morale to have benefit cuts and no or limited raises.

Prof. Duke led a round of applause in appreciation of the work of the nominating committee.

**PAT** – Prof. Rundblad

No questions.

**FDC** – Prof. French

Last deadline for CD, ASD, and instructional development grants is the Monday after spring break.

**Administrative reports**

**Provost Green**

Prof. Matthews reported on the self study. Assessment materials are gathered in the Mellon Center. We now have gathered 90% of the needed information. If there are updates please send them to Prof. Matthews. The resource room is open to the general public. If faculty are concerned about the information presented (in particular student learning goals, direct assessment measures, and indirect assessment measures) then please look at your program’s binder in the resource room.

Associate Provost Boyd reported that there are two pilot classrooms open in Shaw (namely Shaw 208 and Shaw 201). A number of faculty will be teaching in those rooms for the rest of the
semester, but there are open slots for faculty to teach a single class and try out the new instructional technology. There will be a furniture fair in Ames to give students and faculty a chance to give feedback about the furniture in the new classroom building. In response to a question, Associate Provost Body noted that Shaw 208 will hold 24 students, and Shaw 201 will hold 20 students.

Provost Green reported that up to ten $500 mini-grants will be available to help faculty integrate the campus reading into their classes.

**President Wilson**

Scholar’s day is March 24 and will be bigger this year than ever before.

A significant gift has been made by Bob and Nell Eckley. Bob Eckley was President of IWU from 1968 - 1986. His tenure involved a number of transformative events, including a strengthening of financial affairs, a significant growth in the endowment, and an increase in the university footprint of 71%. This last included purchasing a school and a canning factory. There was also the construction of a number of new buildings, and the recruitment of a number of strong faculty. Bob and Nell made a gift of $500,000 to endow a lecture series in Economics (first one next year), and a scholar’s program that will provide summer support for 4 or 5 students who wish to engage in summer research or artistic activity with faculty. This is very helpful for the People and Program pieces of the capital campaign.

Prof. Bushman reported that there are small mini-grants available ($500 and $250 to librarian) to target information literacy in particular assignments. These amounts are increased to $2000/1000 for course revisions and $3000/1500 for brand new courses. Look for an email soon. Questions can be directed to Prof. Bushman or Prof. Schmidt. There is also the possibility of grants being made available to fund workshops so faculty can work on student learning goals with regards to information literacy and writing in their discipline.

Prof. Amaloza reported that there will be a forum at 4:00 pm on the Tuesday after spring break in the Beckman auditorium in Ames. The topic is working with institutions in Asia as part of the Department of Education grant.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Shallue
Secretary of the faculty