

1-27-2015

January 27, 2015

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 27, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1026.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1026](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1026)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

27 January 2015 meeting

(The 2014-2015 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at: <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>)

\* Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting. (J. Oliver)

### I. Call to Order by Chair Sterling at 2:00pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)

Present: J. Ashley, T. Burns, S. Eckert, J. Ludlow, M. Mulvaney, J. Oliver, A. Rosenstein, S. Scher, G. Sterling, S. Stowell, D. Viertel, S. Ahmad (Student VP).

Guests: A. Anthony (CAA), M. Gronnvoll (CAA), D. Hernandez (DEN), R. Jones (CAA), S. King (CAA), B. Lord (AA), J. Lord (LCBAS), S. Ruholl (CAA), R. Seigel (Staff Senate), R. Throneburg (CAA)

### II. Approval of Minutes of 13 January 2015

Minutes from 13 January 2015 Senate meeting were approved. Motion made by Senator Viertel and seconded by Senator Eckert. All in favor? - Unanimous

### III. Communications

- a. CAA Minutes from 1/15/15 and Agenda for 1/22/15
- b. IAB responsibilities from IGP 84 – Sterling mentions – Sent to me by ‘anonymous’ faculty member
- c. Gen Ed and Learning Goals summary

### IV. Presentation to the Senate: Rich Jones and Rebecca Throneburg: CAA Learning Goals

Throneburg – Wanted to present on where we are at in the process before any voting action by CAA. Seeking feedback from you.

Learning Goals 5-Year Plan. We are in year 2 of the plan. Year one involved workshops and redefining university learning goals.

Year 2 is a big year – how to infuse learning goals into general education courses. Purpose of the plan to better prepare EIU students with Skills and knowledge that employers and graduate schools want. To help them be better, informed, engaged citizens. Goals are consistent with EIU mission. Working towards a more systematic curriculum. We are collecting EIU data, best practice info from AAC&U, lots of on-campus discussion with faculty to support the initiative.

Ashley – I agree with your initiative. I agree that CAA’s primary mission is the Gen Ed. Last year was the syllabus policy. This year is infusing learning goals into Gen Ed. What is year 3, 4, & 5?

Throneburg – Year 3 - infusing learning goals into the major – these are university learning goals.

Ashley – don’t we already have that with assessment?

Throneburg – Yes, we (you) have already been asked to assess 3 of the 4 learning goals over time.

Ashley – OK – so what’s the plan for year 4 & 5?

Throneburg – Year 4 - finish/complete what we have started. Synching year together. Year 5 – re-do the learning goals study to see what has changed since initial implementation.

Jones – Voluntary System of Accountability is being used. CLA is being used. Nationally normed and reputedly measured. Our task = finding a better way to assess and infuse the learning goals. Right now data shows that EIU students fall below norms of the VSA.

Jones – in the value added framework, we want to position the EIU education as more than just job-prep to students but ‘value-added’, we are producing graduates prepared for the work force but more importantly 21<sup>st</sup> century learners and citizens. Skills that employers seek are connected to the new learning goals, such as critical thinking and integrative learning. We are trying to embed value added components into this process so we can tap into the value-added frameworks.

Jones – In terms of Gen ED at EIU, our curriculum closely resembles IAI standards. With exception of Senior Sem, we are lined up with IAI recommendations (math, writing, speech, social beh, sciences, etc). We are trying to keeping track of IAI language, descriptions, courses that are aligned with IAI. We are trying to be more deliberate about communication in and between IAI reps on campus and with CASL and CAA (etc). IAI panels make important decisions – we want to know about those decision more quickly.

Rosenstein – who is involved with the Illinois Articulation Agreement?

Jones – institutions – voluntary, but most publics and most privates in Illinois (2 year and 4 year).

Rosenstein – so it's voluntary right now, but overtime it might be mandatory?

Throneburg – we used to be a non-transfer friendly institution. The last major EIU gen ed revision of the late 1990s was based on IAI so we would become more transfer-friendly between 2-year institutions.

Rosenstein – so while its voluntary, it's in our best interests. When was last IAI revision, and when will the standards be revised again in the future?

Throneburg – 2000 was last major revision of IAI standards. There have been smaller panels that have modified standards for individual academic disciplines and segments.

Rosenstein – so is this a moving target? Will continue to change?

Jones – not necessarily – the segment descriptions are not moving targets - some components have been constant for many years

Scher – aren't the IAI standards an 'on-going' process?

Throneburg – major panels and course panels

Scher – having IAI is a great standard. I am surprised that only 47% of our Gen Ed courses are aligned. Having consistent IAI standards at 2-year and 4-year level is great-it helps students at home during the summer take courses from 2-year colleges that are aligned with EIU courses.

Lord – let me provide a little context on IAI – started many years ago – a need for students to better move from 2-year to 4-year schools. No institution is required to follow IAI standards. We do it because it helps our students. IAI standards do not drive our general education curriculum, but it does inform it. We choose to follow IAI standards because it helps our students.

Scher – you talked about 'if' this becomes mandatory? (Gen Ed learning goals). Will it become mandatory?

Throneburg – not necessarily and not sure. I don't know if there will be any accountability funding. But I would rather be prepared for it than falling behind.

Scher – question – the learning goals tagged to specific courses - how will they be validated and renewed. Related to English 1002 course and it's role. Question for psych major - A second writing class is a valuable thing, but should psych students have to take a 2<sup>nd</sup> writing course in the Humanities?

Throneburg – Tim Taylor is the director of composition and involved in this LG initiative. We offer foundation classes in writing. He suggests a 2<sup>nd</sup> class to build those skills. Building an argument in writing. Tim suggests that the 2<sup>nd</sup> class be more focused on that.

Scher – I see evidence in senior psych classes that they need more practice in writing in those classes. Maybe I am suggesting that the 2<sup>nd</sup> writing class taken by students is more 'discipline-specific'.

Jones – Tim is aware of this topic/issue. He has been involved in this process.

Jones – speaking of IAI – I reviewed segment descriptions for the IAI descriptions. I pulled out language related to EIU's 5 learning goals. I pulled out anything related to writing. Frequent in Humanities and Fine Arts. Data from this exercise supported the proposed model that our group is suggesting. (Communication in Fine Arts)

Throneburg – during past summer symposium, we had not reviewed IAI guidelines so closely as this. This activity reinforced the importance of writing in the curriculum, such as in the humanities. We also looked at the IAI, and variables such as class size and instructor characteristics. Results -75% of our GEN ED classes during Fall 2014 were 26 or less students. Large classes are minimal on this campus. Isolated across EIU campus. We saw a trend with instructors in Gen Ed. FA12-SP13 = Only 40% of GEN ED taught by Unit A faculty. An increase of Unit B since that time may have decreased this number.

Throneburg – we reviewed 2012 faculty survey. EIU faculty in general. Filtered out Gen Ed instructor data. We focused on every course proposal with Gen Ed component/goal. We found that GEN ED and NON Gen Ed course instructors both consistently targeted learning goals in course syllabi. We reviewed critical thinking in EWP submissions – 53% of papers asked for lower level critical thinking.

Throneburg – new info – GEN ED specific data – SPRING 2014 - Curriculum Map – survey to each department – asked for 1 primary instructor to fill out the survey - in which GE courses do learning goals have learning objectives, teaching, and assessment. Sifting through the data, we looked for connection between professors who were focused on the 3 objectives (at the levels of A LOT, SOME, LITTLE). Ex - Senior Seminar results focused on writing goals. This helped us as we try to determine which model may be most helpful to use moving forward.

Throneburg – presented more data for learning goals present in the behavioral sciences

Ashley – how would that self-reporting data be any more reliable than the faculty analysis forms?

Throneburg – does it have to do with writing?

Ashley – the focus being on the ‘self-reporting’ – the concerned focused on the ‘self-reporting’

Throneburg – analyzed data in Gen Ed meetings - we reviewed data during the Fall 2014 semester - ~40 faculty working together – trying to interpret the data and construct a model to use from the data.

Throneburg – Key question - how should learning goals be assigned? We discussed options – should Dept choose LGs? Courses assigned LGs? Combo of dept choice vs assigning LGs? We created up to 6 models of infusing learning goals that were voting on

Throneburg – CAA meeting notes are available on website – we then voted as a larger committee – a ‘straw poll’

Throneburg – Q1 discussed / voted on – should all GE courses target critical thinking? – Yes 22, NO 2, Abstain 1

Throneburg – Q2 discussed / voted on – should students be required to have a certain # of courses that focus on each learning goal in order to graduate? Concern - If dept chooses courses for learning goals, could students avoid courses related to certain learning goal? (Yes – 11, No – 14). Concern – this could make advising a potential ‘nightmare’.

Throneburg – Q3 discussed / voted on – Which method should be used to determine which learning goals are infused into Gen ED courses?

- a) Department choose- 5, b) Assigned – 1, c) Combo model – 17

Throneburg – so....The Proposed Model - the ‘Combo’

- 1) Critical thinking – all Gen Ed courses
- 2) 1 LG assigned to each segment based on data
- 3) Department choose 3<sup>rd</sup> goal that is most suited for individual dept. courses

Ashley – doesn’t that do what 14 people voted not to do in the straw poll?

Throneburg – not exactly – the 14 people wanted an extra graduate requirement to ensure each LG was covered.

Jones – this builds on the IAI discussion and curriculum mapping. This proposed model is supported in the mapping data. Out of all learning goals, Critical thinking infused throughout Gen Ed Curriculum the most, quantitative reasoning the least since it was the newest. More current EIU faculty suggest they are infusing CT more than any other LG. Analyzed additional data where current

learning goals are present in the EIU curriculum (Arts & Humanities data analyzed, Social & Behavioral Sciences data analyzed, etc.)  
Ex - Writing is widespread in the data – specifically arts & humanities. Speaking is present, but not widespread in the data. CASL reports speaking has been adopted more in the past few years. Citizenship – strongly present in the Humanities and Fine Arts. This data supports the segment assignments presented already.

Throneburg – presented more data on where students will be exposed to the 5 learning goals across the curriculum – table presented. Senior seminar would integrate all 5.

Jones – presented the Learning Goal ‘Intensive’ Criteria doc – reviewed current EIU criteria for writing intensive and cultural diversity designation for courses, reviewed benchmarks and guidelines from AAC&U, and reviewed ‘model university’ data - universities recognized for doing this well already. Also discussed the common themes being infused with learning goals. We also discussed how ‘user-friendly’, parallel resources will and must be in place for instructors to be successful with this process.

Jones – LG Intensive Courses – doc includes expectations and information for each LG and faculty resources to assist with infusing. Faculty Development will represent an important key in this process.

Rosenstein – question on assignments/graded evaluations – will there be standardized parameters established? Example - in an introduction class. What will CAA require in terms of quantified assignments?

Jones – we are not going to quantify expectations with assignments/grading. UNCC is a model institution – we have referred to their model as an example. They have removed specific quantifiable parameters with assignments. CAA plans to leave it in a narrative explanation at this point – similar to DCC types of guidelines.

Rosenstein – another concern is that some departments have aligned assignments to an accrediting body. How will that be affected?

Jones – being explicit on course proposals is suggested. More feedback is needed on this topic. Example - Course Proposal for Learning Goals in Intensive Courses doc – rough draft – Critical Thinking example. Course proposal will request Narrative Responses and a Sample Syllabus.

Ashley - so in year 3 for major courses, will we have to provide justification and qualifications for our major courses as CAA may ask for Gen Ed?

Throneburg – probably not

Rosenstein- asks a question about generalized rubrics being used to assess the learning goal in individual classes across the curriculum in different majors. – how will this be possible?

Jones – assessment resources and examples will be provided, but a singular rubric will not be required by different faculty in different majors.

Rosenstein – what if a rubric does not align from one dept to the next?

Jones – I always modify or adapt rubrics to individualized courses that I instruct

Throneburg – your questions are similar to what our Gen ED committee brought up during previous discussions. They requested examples of proposals and rubrics that would work for different content and courses.

Throneburg – we will continue to discuss and propose a baseline structure that will work across the curriculum

Ashley – are we building a brand new Gen ED program? Or integrate these standards into existing Gen ED?

Throneburg – the goal is to ‘infuse’ new standards, not rebuild the existing Gen Ed.

Ashley – will departments have control over adding more classes to Gen Ed if needed (a better fit), or will it be locked/finalized?

Throneburg – we have not discussed ‘locking’ the new Gen ED

Jones – discusses the sample syllabus further

Ludlow – I am a little concerned about our attempts to ‘measure’ and ‘demonstrate’ – they seem to move us away from our most recent initiatives and how I instruct my current courses. Is this proposed process actually going to reduce our flexibility as instructors? I understand why we are doing this, and why we will be held accountable, but I don’t want to throw out what is beautiful about learning at different stages of the curriculum in our effort to ‘measure’ in the classroom.

Throneburg – we don’t want that either. But we want to see more than ‘summary’ and basic knowledge acquisition in classes that are supposed to encourage critical thinking.

Jones – discussed course proposals and learning goals in more detail

Stowell – referring to Ludlow – APA established tiers of learning objectives in our courses – are we continuing with that discussion/initiative?

Throneburg – response- feedback from critical thinking discussion group would suggest continued attempts at progression of learning objectives and continued learning progression at different tiers

Throneburg – an additional step would be the creation of a long-term, standing General Education committee? Many other Illinois universities have it, we don’t (shows table with peer institutions included). North Central asked where our committee was. NIU have committee and coordinator. ISU, SIU-E, WIU, SIU-C, & U of I-S are compared in the table.

Rosenstein – is a director of Gen Ed a paid position?

Throneburg – some may. More importantly, all have a general education committee that encourages faculty involvement.

Ashley – with required assignments, yes we have a reduction in enrollment so we have reduction in faculty. If enrollment rebounds, the number of faculty won’t rebound as quickly. Will existing EIU faculty be crippled with assessment intensive Gen Ed courses?

Throneburg – we have been thinking of alternative assignments that are not as labor-intensive for potentially large classes. There are additional resources available to help the instructor of large classes.

Throneburg – ‘Next Steps’ slide – developing formal proposed docs – discuss docs with Gen Ed and LG committees – refine model for infusing LG’s into Gen Ed – LG intensive course criteria – create standing general education and LG committees – Newsletter to Faculty by late February – Opportunities for Faculty Input – Forum on March 5 (2-4 pm), Finalize proposal, Revisit councils and committees after Spring Break, Spring Workshop (April 7 – 11 am) – Make Adjustments based on Feedback, Vote on proposals, Senior Seminar Discussion – should it be moved to Sophomore level will be discussed (summer and fall 2015)

Ludlow – in English undergrad studies committee - we have been asked to send some English and History syllabi to Mary Herrington Perry? – how does this fit into this process? Bailey Young sent us a text of concern regarding the email.

Throneburg – the syllabi collection was for the purpose of seeing sample syllabi – to see examples of assessment and to determine how uniform multiple sections of the same course are. How consistent are they? How much do they vary? That is why we requested the syllabi. It’s to look at current practices on campus. But the email did not articulate this purpose very well. My apologies. It’s not about being in compliance with the new syllabus policy.

Ludlow – thank you for the clarification. Colleagues are asking me ‘why’ the request for my syllabi.

Scher – in our department-Intro to Psych - 3 to 5 people teach this course each year - there will be some turnover with instruction year to year - should departments develop consistency within certain sections of classes like Intro to Psych? This seems to be difficult and ‘touchy’ task, especially in our department - establishing minimum course content and alignment with learning goals.

Throneburg – CAA would like for some consistency between course sections – core types of assignments across all sections

Scher – it's possibly a logistical concern – one colleague may construct the course proposal and get it approved, but a different colleague might actually instruct the course – leading to some variance between course proposal and course instruction/delivery over time – departments probably need to have ongoing discussion with this type of situation

Throneburg – this topic has been examined in research – examples of huge differences between sections of the same course

Scher – example - it will be a challenge for some of us in Psych to integrate a learning goal like 'citizenship'. Diversity – no problem, but with some LGs like 'citizenship' - yes

Ashley – what if an existing Gen Ed course better fits a different component of Gen Ed better?

Throneburg – CAA looked at this – we had a few concerns about a few courses – some in social behavioral sciences - there is some flexibility to change focal LGs in specific courses – but we will stay with IAI guidelines as much as possible

Scher – but does that not defeat the purpose & goals of this LG initiative? We might have students missing some LGs.

Throneburg – overall we would like to see some consistency in assignment to each learning goal to specific classes

Sterling – there are some departments that enforce limited control over the content in the courses – or limited guidelines are provided to the individual instructor – individual autonomy is provided. Ex - ancient philosophy course. So what was proposed to CAA (course proposal) turns out to be significantly different than what is actually being taught in the course (course syllabus). Concern = the syllabus policy – will dept curr comm have to continually compare CAA course proposals with actual course syllabi being used by faculty? – How will consistency be enforced? Is it CAA's responsibility? Or the Provost? That is my concern - very little positive change will occur unless there is serious, consistent syllabus evaluation with possible consequences.

Throneburg – the syllabi review process has to be ramped up – course review will have to be enhanced – what was proposed versus what is being taught will need to be regularly reviewed. Possible 'probation' for a year? (SIU-E process mentioned – used as a model for what the Gen Ed committee process is for the syllabus review process).

Ludlow – Probation? - the dept? the instructor?

Throneburg – the individual course of the Gen Ed program would be on 'probation'- places the impetus on chairs for what their faculty are actually teaching

Jones – new faculty members do ask for guidance on course proposals that they have been assigned to

Throneburg – we also need a stronger policy on course review

Stowell – and we need to separate the evaluation of the curriculum vs evaluation of the instructor. Enforcement of policy seems to lie with the dept. chair or DPC. Often times a lack of tradition of checking syllabi. Ongoing goal is to establish a rigorous curriculum for the benefit of students. In Psych, we are having common core discussion starting with Intro to Psych – especially for first time instructors that we don't know – setting content expectations for new faculty will gradually change and establish a new culture

Mulvaney – does Faculty Development include developing course proposals during the faculty orientation training at the start of each year? I think new faculty would benefit from this. Do we know if it is covered in the orientation?

Jones – not sure, we will look into it. We did cover Learning Goals this past year during the orientation.

Throneburg – comments on the email – the email was not clear – I should have written a better email clarifying what the syllabi request was for. Maybe it should have come from the Provost office? Can Kathy help us in this process?

Sterling – the concern is that many professors are fearful that administrators will be evaluating course syllabi. The email caused fear.

Scher – the issue is based on the fear that administrators could possibly dictate what is being taught in our courses.

Lord – this memo was not vetted in my office as well as it should have been. In the future we will try to be more clear in requests.

## V. Old Business

### A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive = Sterling – no report. Oliver – suggesting we add a more complete description and history of the Luiz Clay Mendez Service Award. I have also added hyperlinks to the D.A.F. past recipients. Bruns – info could also be available via the Keep. Scher – I will help provide information on past award recipients and on Mendez.

2. Nominations = Rosenstein – two vacancies on Fac Dev Adv Comm – 1 LCBAS, 1 COS – committee received 2 nominations from LCBAS and 5 nominations from COS. Random selection process utilized to finalize candidates for vacancies. Results = Mikki Sherwood (LCBAS rep) and HongShan He (COS rep).

Motion to accept nominees? – Ashley and Eckert – all in favor? (unanimous) – motion carries.

Still need to fill vacancy on the Registration – Records Advisory committee. Working with Mary Herrington Perry on getting a copy of the bylaws to determine if the vacancy must be a senator or a faculty from across campus.

3. Elections = no report

4. Faculty-Student relations = no report

5. Faculty-Staff relations = no report

6. Awards = no report. D.A.F. docs are being finalized and will be circulated this week.

7. Faculty Forum = Bruns – as mentioned by R. Throneburg, upcoming Faculty Forum on March 5<sup>th</sup> – 2 to 4 pm.

8. Budget transparency = no report

9. Constitution and Bylaws Review = no report

10. Committee on Committees = Eckert – synchronizing list of all committees. Some questions still exist.

11. Other Reports:

a. Provost's Report – Thanks for taking the time to converse with CAA reps about this enormous task. Last presidential candidate on campus this Wednesday (tomorrow). Board of Trustees meeting upcoming on Tuesday – focus will be on presidential search. I was in Springfield on Friday with other provosts – no additional clarity on the budget situation in Illinois was provided.

b. Other – none

### B. Other Old Business:

## VI. New Business

### A. Future Agenda: Spring 2015 Meeting Dates:

February 10 (VP Nadler: Intercollegiate Athletics Funding)

February 24 (Minority Recruitment and Enrollment)

March 10 (?)

March 24 (?)

April 7 (?)

April 21 (Election of Officers)

B. Other New Business –

## VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.