Minutes											Faculty Senate

10-7-2008

October 7, 2008

Faculty Senate

The 2008 – 2009 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 McAfee Gymnasium 1102, 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: Nominations for the Luis Clay Mendez Distinguished Service Award are due to Dr. Jonathan Coit no later than 4 PM on 29 October. Information may be found at http://www.eiu.edu/~FacSen/pdf/mendez.pdf

Call to Faculty: The Apportionment Board, a Student Government board that distributes student fee monies to five fee-funded groups, is seeking a faculty volunteer to serve. Meetings of the AB are scheduled for Thursday evenings at 7 PM in the Arcola/Tuscola Room. Interested faculty should contact Dawn Van Gunten at dvangunten@eiu.edu to submit their names.

Call to Faculty: Faculty who wish to comment about a future policy on cell phone use in the classroom should email Chair Pommier (jhpommier@eiu.edu) by Friday, 17 October.

I.   **Call to order by Chair John Pommier at 2:00 p.m.** (Booth Library Conference Room)
      Present: J. Best, A. Brownson, J. Coit, C. Dale, M. Fero, R. Hoberman, M.-L. Li, K. Padmaraju, J. Pommier, J. Russell, J. Stimac, D. Van Gunten, J. Wallace, A. White, and C. Coon. Excused: M. Worthington.
      Guests: B. Lord (Provost and VPAA), M. Hoadley (AVPAA-Technology, Director of CATS), Wm. Hine (Dean, SCE), D. Jackman (Dean, CEPS), J. Johnson (Dean, CAH), J. Lynch (Associate Dean, CAH), J. Snyder (Associate Dean, LCBAS), G. Sterling (CAA Representative to Faculty Senate), L. Green (CAA), D. Hendrickson (CAA), J. Astrouski (*Daily Eastern News* reporter), and M. King (*Daily Eastern News* photographer).

II. **Approval of Minutes of 23 September.**
      Approval of the Minutes of 23 September (Russell / Hoberman) as corrected – Yes: Best, Coit, Dale, Fero, Hoberman, Li, Padmaraju, Pommier, Russell, Stimac, Van Gunten, and White. Abstain: Brownson and Wallace.

III. **Announcements**
   A. Chair Pommier reminded senators to respond to President Perry's invitation to the reception for Faculty Senate.

IV. **Communications**
   A. Email of 26 September, from VPSA Dan Nadler, re: student appointments.
   B. Email of 27 September, from Kyle Pruden, re: Warbler story.
   C. Email of 29 September, from Ed Hotwagner, re: Interfraternity Council representative.
   D. Email of 1 October, from John Allison, re: EWP.
   E. Email of 1 October, from Les Hyder, re: foreign language requirement.
   F. Email of 2 October, from Les Hyder, re: Public Agenda Meeting.
   G. Minutes of the Intercollegiate Athletic Board.

V. **Old Business**
   A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee: no report.
2. Nominations Committee: Senator Van Gunten asked that faculty interested on serving on the Apportionment Board please contact her at dvangunten@eiu.edu. Senator Pommier requested that Senator Van Gunten ask the Faculty Development Advisory Committee to revise their bylaws since an appointment made by Faculty Senate who can no longer serve can be appointed by the committee and not Faculty Senate. Provost Lord indicated that half of the appointments are through Faculty Senate and the other half are through his office, but that the bylaws should be reviewed. He asked Senator Van Gunten to contact him for additional information.
3. Elections Committee: no report.
4. Faculty – Student Relations Committee: no report.
5. Faculty – Staff Relations Committee: no report.
6. Faculty Forum Committee: Senator Padmaraju said that she has received responses concerning the draft Faculty Forum announcement and that the committee, along with Provost Lord, will meet to finalize the logistics of the forum. Chair Pommier asked that the Faculty Forum Committee invite Student Government to take part in the Forum.
7. Other Reports
   a. Provost's Report: In response to an email question concerning the Electric Writing Portfolio (EWP), Provost Lord indicated that the EWP is over 9 years old and that it started after the Integrated Core requirements were found to hinder transfer students from attending Eastern Illinois University. With respect to assessment, four goals were developed: 1) graduates will demonstrate the ability to write effectively; 2) graduates will demonstrate the ability to speak effectively; 3) graduates will demonstrate the ability to think critically, and 4) graduates will demonstrate the ability to function as responsible global citizens. As part of the original goal of writing effectively, the EWP was developed. Four submissions from various writing-centered or writing-intensive courses would be submitted, and provisions to review the completed portfolio were made as well. Based on student and faculty feedback, during the Fall of 2006 the Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL) met with CAA, Faculty Senate, and nearly every other major committee on campus to discuss potential revisions to the EWP. The Fall 2006 Faculty Survey had a response of 220 (~28.6 percent) of which nearly 80 percent indicated that they taught WC or WI courses and would like to see help offered to those whose writing was judged not competent. The Spring 2007 Student Survey had a response of approximately 3 percent. Overall concerns from the surveys indicated that students might be unmotivated to submit their best writing sample, might be unable to submit their best writing sample, and that poor writers were not identified and offered help. During the Fall of 2007 CASL offered a series of possible revisions to the EWP. On 25 October 2007 CASL recommended to CAA (agenda item #07-62) a revision to the EWP which included 1) making submissions electronic, 2) requiring only 3 submission, and 3) if after the second submission a student's writing is judged not competent, then they would be asked to submit a tested writing sample in order to if there is a problem with their writing. If they did indeed have poor writing, then they would be offered help. Provost Lord added that there are ongoing discussions between the appropriate faculty and the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Committee to see what type of help might be provided. Senator Hoberman said that in a letter dated 7 October 2008 [*sic*, the letter should have been dated 7 October 2007], 10 English faculty members offered strong objections to assessment and remediation being tied together. They expressed concerns that the appropriate professionals were not being consulted. Provost Lord indicated that the Faculty Senate had a productive conversation on the EWP remediation concern last year and that the entire procedure had been vetted by numerous groups across campus and that shared governance had prevailed. In response to a question from Senator Coit, Provost Lord indicated that CASL and other groups are in discussions as to who would offer the additional help. Provost Lord indicated that Dr. Throneburg, Chair of CASL, has informed him that the discussions are productive. Provost Lord handed out (see attachment at end of the minutes) a draft overview of the original EWP, revisions to the EWP, and rationale in making those revisions. In addressing the questions posed in the email, Provost Lord indicated that he had addressed the purpose of the EWP, that the remediation process is being addressed, that there are not plans at this time to offer any help to students in other disciplines, that if remediation becomes part of the curricular process then he will address it, and that outside evaluators only review the submission portfolio as in the aggregate, not individual submissions. Provost Lord stated that the IBHE is holding a series of meetings to discuss its master plan (Public Agenda) and that on 22 October at 1

PM in the Charleston/Mattoon Room (http://www.ibhe.org/masterPlanning/default.htm), they will be on campus asking for comments. Provost Lord informed that Faculty Senate that Dean Johnson, Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, would be retiring and that he hoped a search committee would be formed by week's end. Dean Hanner has already agreed serve as chair of the committee. Provost Lord said that the EIU Integrative Learning Experience link on the Academic Affairs' web site is active (http://www.eiu.edu/~acaffair/IntegrativeLearning/). Material will be added as it becomes available. Provost Lord asked the Faculty Senate to begin thinking about a potential policy on cell phone use in the classroom, especially with respect to the AlertEIU system. Faculty who have suggestions concerning a cell phone use in the classroom policy, should email Chair Pommier (jhpommier@eiu.edu).

b. Budget Transparency Committee: no report.

c. Awards Committee: Senator Russell reported that the Louis Clay Mendez Distinguished Service Award announcement is posted and that the deadline for the award nominations should be made be 29 October at 4 PM to Senator Jon Coit. Information for the award may be found on the Faculty Senate's home page (http://www.eiu.edu/~FacSen/pdf/mendez.pdf).

d. Bylaws Committee: Senator Coit began the discussion on the suggested bylaw changes. The general discussion was on the possibility of a write-in candidate for some positions, which normally require 10 peers to sign a petition. In the past write-in nominees receiving less than 10 vote have taken office. After the discussion, Senator Coit (White) motioned that the bylaws be approved as changed. Yes: Best, Brownson, Coit, Fero, Hoberman, Li, Padmaraju, Pommier, Russell, Stimac, Van Gunten, Wallace, and White. No: none. Abstain: Dale. The motion passed 13-0-1.

B. Chair Pommier asked if the Faculty Senate had any feedback for VPER Nilsen concerning Campaign Counting Guidelines or on the Probable Donor Naming Committee. Senator Best indicated that these appear well thought out and in his opinion are standard in the academy. Provost Lord agreed that these types of policies are very common in the academy. A general consensus approved each document. Chair Pommier also asked if the Faculty Senate had any additional thoughts on the Amethyst Initiative. Again, the general consensus was that the Faculty Senate agreed with the President's decision not to sign the proposal.

V. **New Business**

A. Dr. Michael Hoadley, AVPAA – Technology and Director of the Center for Academic Technology Support, (CATS). Dr. Hoadley began with a brief update on what CATS is doing with upgrades to classroom (over 200) and ATAC laboratory (over 650) computers as well as luncheon schedule for office staff to inform them of the technology available for faculty use. He passed around a handout (CATS Fact Guide) that introduced some of the contacts at CATS and that briefly explained the various services that CATS provides to the University. Dr. Hoadley stated that CATS will support faculty in all of their teaching endeavors, but encourages them to start small before fully implementing a large project. He added that talking with colleagues is beneficial since they are a great resource. Dr. Hoadley mentioned that the TEAM PIE Grants (formerly the TEDE Grants) Council is reviewing application criteria and that he expects that future submissions will need to e tied into college technology plans that each college has prepared. In response to a question concerning on-line teaching, Dr. Hoadley indicated that faculty need to complete a series of learning modules in order to be able to teach online courses. This is in keeping with a joint CAA/CGS policy on the issue (http://www.eiu.edu/~eiucaa/TechDeliv.pdf). Senator Stimac stated that the Online Course Development Institute (OCDI) lead by Julie Lockett is a great resource for developing an online course.

B. Dr. Darren Hendrickson and Lora Green from the CAA *ad hoc* committee on the foreign language proposal. Dr. Hendrickson indicated that the proposal would have required 3 semesters of a foreign language and that it passed CAA on 17 April. After being forwarded to the President and Provost, it was returned for reconsideration. An *ad hoc* committee was formed by the CAA to review the proposal. Senator White asked why the proposal was made to change from 2 to 3 semesters of foreign language. Dr. Hendrickson said that Dr. Canfield made the proposal and that wasn't positive, but that part of it was to address the proposal to make graduates of Eastern Illinois University more knowledge global citizens, increase enrollments in upper division foreign language course, and encourage added study abroad participation. Senator White asked if that wouldn't increase the number of semester hours needed to graduate. Ms. Green indicated that it wouldn't necessarily do that and that the proposal would also be in keeping with other Illinois institutions that are doing the same. Senator Russell asked about the impact on transfer students

since many take American Sign Language (ASL) and that ASL in the third semester is not offered at many community colleges since that is at the professional level. Both responded that Brenda Major and Rita Pearson are scheduled to discuss the transfer impact with the ad hoc committee next week. Chair Pommier indicated that Faculty senate representatives will meet with the *ad hoc* committee on Thursday, 16 October, at 1 PM in the Booth Library Conference Room. Senator Hoberman asked if the CAA is less sympathetic toward the proposal this year and Dr. Hendrickson replied that he is not sure. Ms. Green added that the *ad hoc* committee is scheduled to meet with the various administrative councils by 30 October and that the *ad hoc* committee will meet by 6 November to give their report to CAA. Senator Hoberman asked who should the faculty contact if they have comments. Dr. Hendrickson said that they should contact Dr. Les Hyder (lhyder@eiu.edu). Senator Russell asked if CAA was planning to take another vote on the matter. Dr. Hendrickson replied that they might, but that he wasn't positive. Senator Stimac asked why all of the concerns expressed last year prior to the CAA meeting by various groups were ignored or not addressed by CAA. Dr. Hendrickson said that he couldn't answer that question, but that some issues were considered to varying degrees. Chair Pommier thanked both members of the ad hoc committee for attending the Senate.

VI.   **Adjournment at 4:00 p.m.**

Future Agenda Items: Athletics, Faculty Benefits, Faculty Forum, Research, and Greening of Campus.

Respectfully submitted,

John Paul Stimac

Original EWP Procedures	NEW Procedures	Rationale
SUBMISSIONS Submission 1 – Eng 1001 or 1002 Submission 2 – Writing Intensive Course Submission 3 – Writing Intensive Course Submission 4 – Senior Seminar Submissions could be turned into portfolio during course or semester following course completion. Students who had not submitted a document by the time they complete a level (after completing ENG 1001G and 1002G, 60 hours, 90 hours, and Senior Seminar) had a hold placed on their records. Holds were removed after a document was submitted. This hold prevented students from registering. Students who received an EWP hold contacted their professor from a WC/W1 course and tried to submit an appropriate paper. Students who waited too long to submit, whose professors are no longer at the University, or who cannot find a paper from an appropriate class worked with a designated faculty member to produce a document to submit.	Three submissions are required for the portfolio. Submissions may come from any writing-centered or writing-intensive course, or from any other course for which students complete an appropriate writing assignment.* Only one submission is allowed from any one course. If a student submits from ENG 1001G/1091G, they may not submit from ENG 1002G/1092G. Students must deposit the first two submissions by the time they earn 60 credit hours; if they fail to do so, a registration hold will be placed at 75 credit hours. Students must deposit their final submission by the time they earn 105 credit hours. Transfer students who enter with more than 30 hours may request additional time to submit work to the EWP. Papers must meet the following criteria to be submitted to the EWP: 1. The paper must be at least 750 words in length (approximately 3 pages). 2. It must be written in standard English. 3. It must be developed in a manner consistent with the demands of the discipline for which it was written. 4. It must contain a connected writing sample with the development of ideas within and between paragraphs (therefore, lists, lesson plans and other such documents may not be submitted) 5. It may not be a poem, short story, play or any other work of creative writing. All papers must be submitted the semester a student is enrolled in a course. Students may not submit papers for courses after the semester ends. If students fail to submit a paper which they planned to submit, they will need to choose a new course/paper for the EWP submission. The student is asked to type in a description of the assignment that was given for the submitted paper. Faculty may edit the description that the student provides if they wish.	65% of faculty survey respondents and 63% of student survey respondents stated that submissions should be allowed from non WI/WC courses, only 32% of faculty said submissions should not be allowed from non WI/WC courses. Students reported that their best writing skills would be demonstrated in courses in their major (65%), more so than freshman English (20%), Senior Seminar (18%), or other courses outside the major (12%). Faculty commented that broadening submission options from courses other than just WI/WC may increase quality of papers and student motivation. Faculty survey respondents reported the average length of writing assignments was 3-5 pages. EWP completed portfolio readings by faculty suggested Senior Seminar not capturing best final writing; Submissions from ENG 1001/1002 generally strong. Studies have shown that students demonstrate better writing skills when they are enrolled in courses that focus on learning to write and soon after these courses are completed. Completed EWP faculty readers suggest it was difficult to rate portfolios with only 2 submissions, but 3 and 4 submission portfolios were similar in the degree readers felt able to rate them. EWP readers stated certain types of writing were difficult to evaluate, such as foreign language, poems, short submissions, etc. EWP readers and English faculty suggested that having a context for the writing assignment would be helpful for EWP readings.
ELECTRONIC Writing Portfolio Faculty rated and signed a form. Student walked form and electronic version of paper to EWP office. Form was filed and paper was saved to server.	Web-based submission. Students choose course from list linked to Banner data about course enrollment. Student uploads paper (faculty may set deadlines in the course regarding when paper must be uploaded). Faculty are alerted via email each week that papers are available to rate. Faculty submit ratings from website. All ratings should be completed by the grade submission deadline each semester. Submissions are made only during the semester the student is enrolled in the course.	Students' strongest complaint was inconvenience of original system. CATS developed an electronic submission system using Banner data in the late fall 2007/early spring 2008. The Electronic system was piloted with 12 courses in Spring 2008. The Electronic system was implemented campus-wide in September 2008.
THE RUBRIC Areas evaluated by the Primary Trait Analysis EWP Rubric: Focus Organization Development Style Mechanics Instructors looked at the Primary Trait Analysis EWP Rubric which gave	Instructors will evaluate the writing sample holistically with general attention to four areas: Content (meeting assignment criteria while conveying content accurately with well-supported ascertains) Organization (presenting information in a focused, logical, orderly fashion with connections made between ideas and conclusions drawn) Style appropriate to discipline (choosing appropriate vocabulary, using appropriate sentence structures, showing awareness of the purpose, topic and audience) Mechanics (adhering to the accepted conventions of grammar and punctuation, spelling words correctly, documenting sources appropriately if	In a faculty survey closed set question about how ratings were assigned for EWP submissions, 32% used EWP Primary Trait Rubric, 32% used the student's grade, 15% used their own rubric. Revision needs to include rating areas most faculty can and will use with submissions from their writing assignments. In a closed set question about areas of writing that the faculty assess: Mechanics (65%), Organization (69%), Focus (63%), Development (58%) & Style (55%). Other categories mentioned include content & critical thinking. Information from the survey indicated the current rubric not appropriate for some discipline specific writing.

explanations of each of the 5 areas as 4= Highly Competent 3= Competent 2= Minimally Competent 1= Not Competent Instructors rated papers using a single holistic score of 2-4, since a paper rated as (1) Not Competent could not be submitted. EWP readers evaluated the entire portfolio in each of 7 areas (purpose/focus, organization, development, style, audience, mechanics, and sources) as: 4=Strong 3=Adequate 2=Weak 1=Poor	applicable) The instructor will judge the student's level of writing competency using a single holistic rating as: 4) Superior (Skill performed consistently and thoroughly to meet collegiate-level writing expectations, generally without error) 3) Satisfactory (Skill well developed although some refining may be necessary to meet collegiate-level writing expectations; a few minor errors may be present) 2) Needs Improvement (Skill present but requires further development and consistency to meet collegiate-level writing expectations; several errors are likely present) 1) Unsatisfactory (Skill minimally emerging to meet collegiate-level writing expectations; numerous errors are likely present) EWP readers will continue to rate the entire portfolio in each of 4 areas as: 4=Strong, 3=Adequate, 2=Weak, 1=Poor	EWP readers mentioned problems with references/sources and critical thinking that they'd like an opportunity to evaluate. Instructors anecdotally reported difficulty rating writing only without reference to content. The Maryland University System uses the areas of Content, Organization, Style, Mechanics to discuss basic competency expected in papers. In the original proposal explaining EWP revisions, a model that contained a rating for each of the four rubric areas was suggested. Based on faculty feedback at meetings, a single holistic scoring system was reinstituted in the proposal and implementation of EWP revision.
STUDENT MOTIVATION TO SUBMIT QUALITY WORK Students can choose any paper from WI/WC courses that is rated a 2 or above. No motivation for submitting high-quality papers. Faculty are not using rubric or assigning holistic rating in a systematic reliable fashion.	Include individual EWP ratings of submitted papers on student degree audit. Students with superior ratings (writes with distinction on the EWP requirement) will receive a congratulatory letter. Poor ratings could also have a consequence of need for remediation (see next row).	Numerous faculty and students admitted to not taking the EWP process seriously since only a portion of the completed portfolios were read and there were no positive or negative implications for individual students based on the quality of work that was submitted or the instructor ratings that were given. Given choices in how to improve student motivation/quality of submissions, the most favored options were using degree audit (31%) or notation on transcription about quality of writing portfolio (28%)-- (less than 20% reported access to portfolio by employers would be motivating).
COLLEGE-LEVEL WRITING COMPETENCY Not being able to submit papers that were rated as not competent was supposed to encourage students and faculty to work together to improve the writing skills of poor writers. Writing revision was supposed to be a part of WC/WI courses to facilitate writing skill development. No other consequences/remediation.	Expand purpose of EWP to act as a junior-level diagnostic portfolio to determine if individual student's writing abilities are sufficient to meet the university's minimal expectations for writing competency. Instructor ratings for two EWP submissions will be averaged. Students whose first two submissions are "unsatisfactory" and/or "needs improvement" (mean score below 2) will be required to complete a timed writing sample or writing exam to determine whether they need additional instruction focusing on writing effectively. Completion of a one semester hour writing tutorial or other coursework will be required for successful completion of the EWP.	Faculty Survey – Clear Mandate for Remediation Component: 1. Closed set question: 80%+ faculty wanted some type of remediation (specific responses in section 2e); only 12% said remediation should not be part of the process 2. Faculty open-ended response about what works least well in current EWP: 10% wrote that they are frustrated that it does not identify/stop/remediate poor writers / lack of feedback to individual students,10% of respondents requested Entrance/ Exit exam to prevent students who cannot write competently from progressing 3. Faculty Survey re: type of remediation: 28% Should work with faculty; 44% Take an additional course; 61% Writing Center; 7% Other 4. Percentage of EWP submissions instructors rated as 2 (Minimally Competent – lowest option for submission) = 4% in 2003; 10% in 2004; 9% in 2005; 12% in 2006 5. 21% of reviewed completed portfolios were rated as "weak" 2005; 17% were rated as weak in 2006 6. Students may not take a Writing Centered course at EIU (approximately 20%). Number of students who didn't take ENG 1001/1002 at EIU appears to be increasing (2005=273, 2006=365, 2007= 404. Data based on exemptions posted to EWP ENG 1001/1002 requirement) 7. Students reported no revisions were made to 46% of EWP submissions from WI/WC courses, 27% reported 1 revision was required and 5% reported 2 or more revisions were required. 34% of faculty teaching WI/WC courses said that writing revisions were not

	required or revisions were optional, 51% reported one revision was required on writing assignments, 4% reported requiring 2 or more revisions 8. Portions of Washington State University's successful Junior Writing Portfolio used as model. At WSU all students provide a timed writing sample and submit papers from courses to portfolio. The need for additional writing assistance is based on timed writing test results and portfolio submissions. Options include 1 or 3 semester hour required courses.
OPTIONAL DEPARTMENTAL SUBMISSIONS Not available in current system	The EWP will offer the option of using this tool for departmental evaluation of writing. Departments/Academic units may require that students in their major submit additional or specific samples to a departmental EWP. If academic programs wish to gauge student progress in writing, the department could choose to require a writing assignment with defined parameters be submitted near the beginning and end of progression through the academic program. Academic units should work with CASA to define submission parameters for their majors. Departments can evaluate student's writing skills on dimensions that are most appropriate to their discipline.	NCA feedback—departmental assessment uneven across campus, consider options for departmental assessment of university undergraduate learning goals. – Currently 54% of departments include the assessment of students' writing skills in their assessment report. Faculty survey, All departments should assess writing = 62% Faculty agreed -Many faculty want to see writing growth – not possible with very different writing assignments in the large student-selected submissions to the EWP- may be possible with planned submissions within a major/academic program. Programs could identify where these submissions would come from and the type of appropriate assignments.