Minutes

2-25-2003

February 25, 2003

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

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 2:04 p.m. (Conference Room, Booth Library)
Present: R. Benedict, D. Brandt, G. Canivez, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, L. Clay Mendez, J. Dilworth, B.
Lawrence, M. Monippallil, W. Ogbomo, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Excused: F. Fraker, S. Scher. Guests: J.
Allison, J. Chambers, J. Cosbey, M. Herrington-Perry, M. Hogg, D. Hopgood, B. Lord, D. Markelis, N.
Marlow, R. Murray, T. Shonk.

II. Approval of the Minutes of February 18, 2003.
Motion (Wolski/Dilworth) to approve Minutes of February 18, 2003, Yes: Benedict, Carpenter, Carwell,
Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Wolski, Zahlan. No: Brandt. **Passed.**

III. Announcements: None.

Communications:
      A. E-mail message (19 February) from John Allison re: EWP (memo attached)
      B. E-mail message (21 February) from Bill Weber re: questions on textbooks
      C. E-mail message (21 February) from Les Hyder re: meeting with Senate
      D. Other Communications: John Allison reported that the Radio/TV Advisory Board has
           amended its bylaws so that any three members can ask for a special meeting. At its last
           meeting, the Advisory Board also voted to recommend a search for an FM-Station manager.
           In an e-mail message (24 February 2003), Gail Richard offered the following clarifications to
           what was said or asked at the 11 February 2003 Faculty Senate discussion re: Athletics: In the
           11 February Minutes, p. 2, 1st paragraph, the Athletics budget has not increased by 400%;
           external funding for Athletics has increased by 400%. On p. 4, 2nd full paragraph, numbers
           presented are from 2002, not fall 2000. In response to Ogbomo's request (p. 5) for additional
           information re: coaches' salaries, Dr. Richard provides the following: Head coaches'
           salaries—Lowest (12 months) is $26,000; highest (12 months) is $87,600; next highest (12
           months) is $79, 400. "Example of comparison to other OVC schools, EIU Men's Basketball
           Coach ranks 8th in salary level out of 9 schools," and "64% of Athletics Department salary
           budget comes from appropriated dollars. This covers a variety of coaches and staff (e.g.,
           athletic trainers). Any new positions or increases in coaches' salaries have to be funded by
           athletics local funds/revenue," Richard writes.

      Hearing no objection, Chair Zahlan suspended published order of business and moved directly to
VI. A. Electronic Writing Portfolio.
  VI. A. Electronic Writing Portfolio (Discussion with Tim Shonk, Janet Cosbey, Daiva Markelis, Robin
Murray and others). Shonk: I have to admit to opposiing the EWP in the CAA vote (it was an 8 to 3 vote; I was
one of three faculty members), so that gives you my perspective…. There was a great deal of confusion about the
Electronic Writing Portfolio; some saw it as a requirement that was going to replace the writing-competence exam;
some saw it as a collection of student work that they'd be able to take with them when they go to apply for jobs;
some saw it as a means for assessing grading, the way we grade our essays in classes; some saw it as simply a way
of verifying that students had completed intensive-writing courses. …Others, especially the students, felt that the
papers in the portfolio would be collected and judged by someone, and would be given a pass or fail grade, in
replacing the writing-competence exam. So there's a good deal of confusion , I think, derived from what I saw as

CAA's mistake in approving in principle the writing portfolio before we saw the details, and the approval in principle took place the year before I was on CAA. …If memory serves me—and I've checked with Ron Wohlstein and I printed a copy of the February 10, 2000, CAA Minutes, in which the portfolio was approved—a rubric was presented with it for wholistic grading; but since the point of it—and I'll quote to you from page 3 of the writing-portfolio document—since the instructor was simply going to provide a statement that 'the paper is or is not of competent writing quality," we felt no purpose would be served in having a four-point scale, or very competent, or most competent, or minimally competent, if all the instructor was going to sign off on was competent or not competent. What would be the point of it? So, consequently, we took the rubric out of the writing portfolio, feeling it was an unnecessary complication.

So, when we got the new rubric this year, some of us were a little confused; we didn't know where it came from. My understanding…was the rubric we saw with the original draft was written for a purpose different from the Electronic Writing Portfolio… The problem with the rubric that I have is that it interestingly enough has a four-point scale, which is the same kind of that that the writing-competence exam had, with similar sorts of details. The big difference, of course, is that with the writing-competence exam readers were trained; there was an attempt to bring them all to a similar level of judgement; there were anchoring sessions that we would all be on the same page; and with this rubric, of course, there are none. I also have a worry that the rubric, especially for Unit B people, especially for non-tenured faculty, will become a de facto grading standard in all the gen. Ed. Courses. These people who are looking for tenure, or have their contracts renewed year to year, can't help but think, Someone's looking over my shoulder; I'm marking this 1,2,3,4; and I can't help but think they're going to be looking at how I'm grading papers. Conflicts, I think, can also arise from this rubric, in that, the way the rubric is set up, some errors are seen as minor; others are major. …If you're in an advanced-comp. Course, phrasing, usage are very important because you're trying to teach them to improve their style; so while it might seem of minor importance in the EWP rubric, it might be of major importance in my course. Problems of form might be minor in the EWP rubric; in a business-writing course those might be of primary importance. So there could be conflicts between the EWP rubric and the requirements that one would have for one's class; so I might give a student a D on a paper and give it a 3 or 4 on the rubric of the EWP, or vice versa. I don't know how I would explain that to students.

…I also saw with this a real problem with governance, in that we had an assessment group that sent out the edict last fall that we would all start using this rubric; and to my knowledge it didn't go before any of the faculty-governing units; it did not go before CAA before it was sent out, did not appear before Faculty Senate. So it's a rubric that's going to influence perhaps the grading methods across the university; and my other concern is that, according to page 4 of the original document, there this statement: 'If writing competency is not reached by a large portion of the portfolios, then measures should be taken to ensure more effective writing instruction at the university." When we discussed what would that large portion be, what numbers are we talking about, nobody seemed to know. Who was going to be reading those, and what steps would be taken, and who would implement those steps? My worry is that we're getting assessment intruding into the classroom now. People are going to assess these portfolios; but, again, I'm not clear on who is going to be reading them, what standards they're going to be using. Consequently, they're going to change—according to this, if they find many of them not competent—the way we teach writing. CAA was assured several years ago, as the assessment process began, that assessment would not intrude into the classroom, and we all thought that was good and wise. However, we have seen it happen; we've added an hour to the senior seminar, for the purpose of having a week of assessment activities. And with this rubric, which may become a de facto official grading standard for writing throughout the university, it will intrude once again.

We are told that we will assess student-writing progress via a number of scores in the rubric—that is, we'll give a student a freshman score of 2, a 3 in the junior year for the paper submitted, perhaps a 4 in the senior year and so on. My understanding is that they're going to use these numbers, assigned to the papers submitted for the portfolio, to see what sort of progress students are making; but, it seems to me, when you have numbers being

assigned by different instructors, in different courses, with different assignments, for different purposes, with different requirements, those numbers will be essentially meaningless as data. I don't see how you can come to any conclusion with the rubric numbers assigned. So those are my concerns.

Murray: When I received the draft of the portfolio plan, from Dr. Calendrillo, the previous WAC [Writing Across the Curriculum] Director (and I'm no longer associated with WAC), the plan itself did have criteria for evaluating the papers. There were five different criteria listed there, on which the papers would be evaluated, to determine whether or not they were competent. There were four different categories that were included on the original rubric, original submission form; and we, after talking with faculty, determined it was better to just have the two categories of either competent or not competent. So the rubric then, after that, did become irrelevant. Prior to that there were the four categories, and that actually went through with the plan that went through CAA; with that plan the rubric was relevant because it did have the four categories… So those criteria were in place on the original plan that we did receive from Dr. Calendrillo and did initially go through CAA…prior to formal approval. …Cosbey: And I concur. Murray: According to the original plan there were those four categories: not competent, minimally competent, competent and highly competent. Those all four were in the original plan. …Writing as a discipline does vary so widely that it's really difficult to discuss it in relation to the writing that's done in gen. ed. So we did have a problem with the idea of looking at it in terms of assessment; so WAC does agree with Dr. Shonk on the issue of major courses being actually assessed on a second-tier level. When it comes to gen. ed., we thought it was sort of out of our hands…

Markelis: I hate assessment. As the Director of the Writing Center, I find myself in the situation that I really didn't want to find myself in. I'm beginning to understand it [assessment] a little more and see it for the messy process that it is. There's probably two things that I feel very strongly about, and one is that—even though this assessment instrument is not perfect—it is on par with what many other universities have; many universities have no assessment instrument… What I feel strongly about is that we get away from the writing-competency exam, not only because some of the other universities are not using it, but because there's good reasons not to use that. The number-one reason not to have an exit exam is that I think it doesn't really reflect the best writing that students are capable of… I also believe it's hard to get prompts that are consistent, to get students to answer these prompts over a number of years. I also feel that that's the kind of writing that doesn't reflect the kind of writing out students do in courses and will be asked to do, so that's better reflected in this idea of a portfolio where students have had a chance to revise their work. The current EWP…needs to be electronic; we need to find funding for that because I've had many students complain about having to lug the things down to the 9th Street hall… I think the whole thing of the student to instructor, from the instructor back to the student, and then down to the 9th Street hall—if it were done electronically, as many other universities are doing, I think that would be an improvement.

Allison: One of the concerns I have about the writing portfolio, and also had about the writing-competency exam, but even more about the portfolio, is that—in this case with the portfolio—the understanding is that if writing competency is not reached by a large proportion of the portfolios, then at some point measures should be taken to ensure more effective writing instruction at the university. So it would seem, then, that what's really being assessed here is the teaching of writing; but, of course, what instructors aim to accomplish in particular courses will vary from course to course, for one thing. Second, who will then be the gurus to eventually assess all those portfolios and then decided, for example, that people in the English department, many of who are writing specialists and were hired because they had specific training in rhetoric, change their program and revamp themselves? It occurs to me that perhaps, if we really believe that we are doing effective hiring, and that CAA makes reasonably intelligent decisions in determining what course offerings are open for students, that the most reliable assessment of students' writing will be the grades they receive, in writing courses and other courses in which they do writing. I just can't see the utility, in the long run, of what's happening now. Something else that disturbed me about the change-over, from the writing-competency exam to the writing portfolio (and this is not necessarily to make a case for the…exam): Keep in mind that service for the writing-competency exam was

recognized; it was especially valuable for younger, newer, tenure-track faculty; the work that they did was recognized; it was voluntary; it was indicated in the portfolio; it helped count toward tenure. That is not the case now. Second, people were compensated for their work; there was a stipend; now there is nothing. And this is the context of an additional fact: The workload is really inequitable for people in Arts and Humanities, for example, who teach writing courses to begin with, and also a good number of gen. ed. classes… The get the brunt of it, and I can tell you that, if a person is doing the job conscientiously, it's time-consuming…

…Cosbey: …I didn't like assessment when I was initially involved, but I've become a fan of assessment for a number of reasons. I think it's really important that we do that at the university level, and that we—as faculty—are the ones who are in charge and develop the assessment plan; and I've also been interested in the scholarship of teaching and learning. So for that reason I've changed my feelings about assessment, although I think I'm a lone voice in the wilderness. [At this point Dr. Cosbey passed around several handouts.]… This [EWP] rubric is what I use to evaluate the writing of my students, so I didn't see it as a problem, was sort of surprised, I guess, when people saw it as a problem when we decided last spring, after a series of meetings with WAC, to begin using actually three of the four categories. …We were dealing with quantitative and qualitative assessment. We don't just want to gather data; we have to do something with it; we have to have it say something to us. And we believed that if we were saying every student who [submitted an essay] was minimally competent, that wasn't really giving us any information. …So we wanted to go back to what we originally intended and use these different categories. Our thought was, perhaps, at the lower level people would be more likely to have 2; [and later] there would be more people in the higher end. So we just wanted to be able to make some kind of statement about writing as a process and how it is changed over time. Maybe we'll find that's not true, but we won't know unless we try it…

Hogg: A very brief, additional note: In viewing assessment, we have to view assessment as an on-going, continuous process. It's not something that's an isolated incident; it is something that has to be faculty-driven; and it is something that we like to see progress in our students over time, from freshman year to senior year. So to confuse assessment with evaluation, if there is any confusion in the room about that, they are two distinct issues. And, true, you could have a student turn in a paper that you grade in class, and you could read that same paper for the assessment process, and they can work together and should be working together in a lot of cases; but it's not meant to duplicate work, or to add extra work at all, but to supplement and enhance the writing that's already being done in course work. Allison: It doesn't follow that, if a person is troubled about elements of the writing-portfolio process, the person is also opposed to assessment in principle; so I hope you realize that. If I were opposed to assessment I wouldn't be teaching. Keep in mind that a submission that a student makes in a particular course is usually one among a number, sometimes many, essays; usually the student will submit the best one, not the worst, and quite frequently one that the student has been allowed to revise with the direct help of the instructor. So, make no mistake about it, the portfolio can't really be an accurate assessment of the student's overall capacity for writing. More likely, the grade the student has earned in the writing course, on the basis of achievement over at least fifteen or sixteen weeks, say, that's more likely to be reflective of the student's writing…

Murray: John has a good point because he's talking about English courses where there is a lot of writing…, but in a lot of gen. ed. courses there may only be one paper…; but that means, then, that one essay may be the only essay from that course that a student would have the opportunity to use in the portfolio. Allison: Not much of a sample. Murray: Again, perhaps not much of a sample from that one course, but you do at least have the opportunity to receive submissions from four different courses from that student… Ogbomo: In some of my courses I do require students to do group work; I give them an assignment and they have to write a paper in the group. The problem I still haven' ' been able to address is there is still only going to be a grade, even though they have to do a number of rewrites; but what happens if three students, in a group of four, decide to take that particular paper as the one they are going to turn in, and then you have the same wording [in three essays submitted in three portfolios]. Wouldn't they be accused of plagiarizing, or copying each other's paper? How do you address such a problem?

…Murray: That's a good question. I think it's a philosophical question because, from my perspective, that's a collaborative paper and they should be able to submit that work… Markelis: I would probably also accept that, given the way that writing works…; it involves revisions and it involves many ideas, and that [collaboration] is an important skill that we're beginning to value more in writing. I don't necessarily see a problem. I don't think everybody is going to begin submitting multiple [collaborative] papers… Shonk: …There was a good point made that evaluation, which is what the writing-competence exam did, and assessment, which is what the EWP does, are different things; so I've never understood the linkage, why putting in one necessarily means we get rid of the other… Carwell: What is the purpose of the Electronic Writing Portfolio? Cosbey: It's a gen. ed. goal—to assess the gen. ed. goal of writing effectively. Carwell: To assess the gen. ed. goal of writing effectively. Second, one thing about the writing-competency exam, from someone who's graded far, far too many of those, is that you knew the person who wrote the exam [had submitted his/her own work]… I'm questioning whether you're really getting the ability of the student, their own writing, when you say collaborative papers are all right. I'm perhaps not so much worried about collaborative papers as basically someone else doing the paper for them, fixing all the problems for them, and submitting it then. Looking at this rubric, can you tell me what "rich language" is? …If this is what we're supposed to use, what is "rich language"? Murray: Quite honestly, I'm not that attached to this rubric. Carwell: Well, then, why do we have it? Murray: Because it's very general. Carwell: But if it's so general that no one can tell me what it means, doesn't it become somewhat pointless? Markelis: I would use it in the traditional, poetic sense of language that is varied, that shows sophistication. Carwell: So, its "sophisticated and varied sentence structure and length that enhance effect; precise and/or rich language." So if they've got rich language but it isn't precise, then that's good? It says, "and/or," so I assume that means either one… And above it [on the rubric]: "Depth and complexity of ideas supported by rich, engaging, and/or pertinent details." So you can have something that is rich and engaging but is totally impertinent; yet, that will count as "highly competent"?

Murray: Let me say something about the plan itself. Sure, this rubric talks about writing in general; but the point of the plan, and the submissions from actually major courses (because you don't get them just from gen. ed.), is that the criteria of the discipline also will impact upon how the faculty member will assess the document… Carwell: It just seems you have a rubric that is deliberately so vague that you can pretty much make it into whatever it is you want to make it into. Murray: It's really just a guide, is what it is, for faculty… Carwell: In other words, it's all right to ignore it if you want to. It's just a guide; you don't have to pay any attention to it… When they are forced to trudge all the way down to 9th Street and hand in their portfolios, what happens to them then? Does anybody look at them again, or do they just sort of sit in a filing cabinet somewhere? Who will look at them again? Cosbey: We're working on that. Murray: In the fourth year; we're only in the third year. Cosbey: We have one more year, and we're working on that now. So if you have ideas or suggestions. Clay Mendez: In the upper-division [Spanish] courses that I teach, all the writing that is done in them is in the target language, in Spanish. Who in this [EWP] process is going to be trained and qualified in assessing that kind of [submission]? Markelis: The way that I understand it right now is that the document is acceptable in that language. I see that as a flaw. I think it should be in English…

Monippallil: I believe that the university and the faculty have an…interest in assuring that the students, when they graduate from this institution, are capable of writing competently. That is a basic goal that the institution has; that's a basic demand of the state and of the parents—and also of the employers. In my opinion, that goal can be met in multiple ways. For example, if a student comes to Eastern with an ACT score of, say, 27, it's a reasonable assumption that a student would not have received the score of 27 without having a basic competence in writing effectively in the English language. …I would go further and say that students who have received grades of A, and maybe B, in the English composition courses, have already demonstrated their ability to write effectively at that stage. If that's the case, probably 25% to 30% of the students have already demonstrated their ability to write competently, and they should not be subjected to this particular rubric, in my opinion; this is nothing else than a hassle factor when they have otherwise met the requirements. For students who have not met the requirements in the writing courses, or who are not part of the Honors Program…, they can demonstrate along the way that they

have attained the competency level in different ways. For example, if a student received a grade of A in a writing-intensive course, under the assumption that 35% of the grade will be based on the ability to write well, I would say that at that particular point the student has met the goal; and that would, again, limit the pool of students who have to go through this [EWP] process. And right now, as I understand it, everybody is needlessly being hassled and subjected to this unnecessary regimen without a clear goal as to what the purpose is. If that's the case, when it really comes down to maybe one-third of the students, then those students will have to demonstrate that they can write competently, and that could be through a writing-competency exam, or through the portfolio…

   Lawrence: I don't teach a language, but I teach a course in which students are learning to write scientific papers for the first time; and I know that my expectations, for the kind writing that's done in science, is really different from the kind of writing the students would be doing in a gen. ed. course or an English-composition course. If you're tracking students along the way, and expecting the numbers to be increasing as you go, I find it hard to believe that those numbers are going to mean anything, because you really cannot compare the kind of writing that goes on in a gen. ed. course to the kind of writing that I expect in a course [where] my students are learning to write all over again, and they're seniors. Dilworth: …Are students not going to be allowed to graduate if their writing competency is sub-basement? Cosbey: Well, they have to keep taking the course… They will have to find one [a course] where they have a competent paper. …Ogbomo: One of the problems here is [the presumption] that writing can be assessed across disciplines. What is good in history may not be good in English. …We need to look at how we can decentralize this process, so that we don't penalize some students who have competence buy may not be writing in a particular jargon or language that we, the faculty, are used to.

   Shonk: You're [Carwell] quite right. This is something that's always bothered me about the EWP because regularly the writing-competence exam had a failure rate in double digits; now some of those were transfer students…, but there was always that failure rate. Consequently, now—and it was asked at CAA when this [EWP] was proposed what percent of students did they anticipate would not complete the EWP, and the answer was zero; they expected 100%--students with shaky writing (and that's being generous) are going right on through; and I worry what that's going to say about our degree and our programs when they go out into the business world with these writing skills. …As I understand it, all of the essays [submitted in the portfolios] will be competent. …Why is the assessment committee going to read those essays again? What point are you reading them for? Cosbey: We're not going to be reading them. …As I said earlier, we have not yet developed exactly what our plan will be for doing the qualitative assessment because questions have been raised and this has been discussed at great length for the past three years; but we are going to be working on this…, so if you have any ideas, if you have any suggestions as to how we could assess these, we would be glad to hear from you. …Shonk: But who's going to be reading them? Cosbey: We don't know yet who's going to be reading them; we're working on it this semester… Shonk: And we don't know why we're going to read them? Cosbey: Oh, we know why we're going to be reading them: To get a feel for what's there; to see what's there; to look at our students' writing. We can't just collect data; we have to do something with the data.

   Murray: …I'm going back to the idea of discipline-specific writing. I totally agree with that, that the writing in different disciplines have different criteria for evaluation… Actually a part of the original plan was that the discipline and the criteria in that discipline would impact upon whether or not a paper would be competent or not competent. We, in the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, felt that so whole-heartedly that we battled against the way assessment was going to be put in place, where gen. ed. and discipline-specific writing would be compared to one another when they really have so little in common… Canivez: I think I can agree, in part, with the discipline-specific component that does make sense, and that writing can be evaluated within that context. The problem with that, then, becomes the burden of the process is left on the faculty member who teaches the writing-intensive classes. So there's, in turn, a sort of bias in that sense, that those faculty become burdened with the evaluation component, where other faculty—who don't teach that kind of class—are not. So there's inequity as far as that is concerned. I think there are certain components of writing that are universal, and the problem I've seen with the writing had nothing to do with the domain; it had everything to do with run-on sentences, incomplete

sentences, spelling that wasn't right, subject-verb agreement that wasn't right, and on and on. …That's where I think there's a difference, in the context that my understanding was that the writing-competency exam was to sort of get at some of those kinds of components, and the people were trained, and their participation in evaluating that was based on training and service credit and that sort of thing; and I'm a bit concerned about that component as well.

Markelis: …The problems [in students' writing] that people speak about, I think, are endemic, that [other institutions] face, and different institutions are struggling with ways to make writing better. Herrington-Perry: …At the end of the process, when we do have some completed portfolios, we are going to assess a sampling of those portfolios. It's absolutely true that we don't have the details worked out yet; but I want you to understand that the goal of this assessment process is to be able to tell you some very specific things about the strengths and weaknesses of your students' writing. …The other thing is that the move back to the scoring rubric was really predicated on a couple of things: It's more important to know how well students write, than just to know they write competently; again, it will allow us to provide you with specific feedback about what students are doing wrong, and what they don't. But it also recognizes that you, as the faculty, are the people in the best position of being able to determine how well your students write or not… Shonk: …Why is there the need to give these writing samples numbers, if you're going to read them and make your own determinations on you own criteria? What's the point of the numbers? Herrington-Perry: We hope the faculty members will tell us specifically what the strengths and weaknesses are. And, again, the plan of the second-tier level is to provide an overview—you know, this is the EIU student population; these are the generic strengths and weaknesses; and these are some plans we have to help you work with your students to improve their writing…

…Canivez: Evaluations are done for multiple reasons. There's evaluation of the students for their own education; but another component of evaluation is really a kind of institutional evaluation of where is the general student body. I think what happened is we're getting all of these things that are sort of coming together at the same time, and so that may be what we're dealing with here; we're sort of using the process to serve more than one evaluation, or more than one assessment. Ogbomo: I think the point has to be made that those who raise questions about the process are not necessarily opposed to it… Cosbey: …I think it would be beneficial to have more meetings like this. …I think having a series of conversations about writing would be helpful. Markelis: I agree.

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

V. Old Business:

A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive Committee: Carpenter reported on the CUPB meeting of 21 February 2003, during which the council was divided into four subgroups, each of which was and is to identify Eastern's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

2. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: No report.

3. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.

4. Elections Committee: Senator Brandt handed out to Senators the elections packet of nomination form, candidate questions, etc., which he intends to have distributed campus-wide Friday, 28 February, **the nomination forms and candidates' responses to questions to be received by Brandt no later than 2:00 p.m., 7 March 2003.**

5. Nominations Committee: No report.

6. Other Reports: Senator Dilworth reminded the Senate about the Teaching Roundtable that will take place 5 March 2003, from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Charleston-Mattoon Room, and this will be sponsored by the Faculty-Development Steering Committee.

B. Functioning of Council on University Planning and Budget. Senator Monippallil distributed a proposed resolution for changing the composition of the CUPB. [Copy attached to these Minutes.]

VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Future Agenda Items:

Electronic Writing Portfolios; Athletic Programs; International Programs; Faculty Development; University Foundation; Administrative Search Procedures; Computer-Privacy Policy; Shared Governance Concerns; Evaluation of Chairs; Temperature Control in Classrooms and Offices; Facilities-Naming Procedures; Faculty Representation on Board of Trustees; Increased Workload and Overload; Distance Education; Timing of Commencement; Planning for University Events.

Respectfully submitted,
David Carpenter

PLEASE NOTE: Faculty should send their responses to the proposed resolution re: CUPB to Dr. Monippallil or Dr. Zahlan.

PLEASE NOTE: Faculty should send their ideas and suggestions about future technological needs to Senator Doug Brandt (cfdeb@eiu.edu).