Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
March 27, 2014  
Approved Minutes

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was called to order at 2:35 p.m. on March 27, 2014 in the Board Room, Morris University Center by Past President Rhonda Comrie for President-Elect Tom Foster.

Present: Comrie, Chleboun, Foster, Goebl-Parker, Hildebrandt, Liebl, Taylor, Wrobbel

Excused: Moffett, Yager

Announcements:

AQIP: Rhonda and Tom each attended an AQIP session during the AQIP check-up visit.

English as a Second Language Institute (ESLI): Joel Hardman, Associate Professor, Department of English Language and Literature and Ron Schaefer, Director, Center for International Programs will be guest speakers at the April 3 Senate meeting.

Director of Student Financial Aid candidates will be invited to campus in mid-April. One session will be scheduled for faculty and staff to attend and meet individuals.

Lobby Day – April 2, training session required before attending

New committee to examine hybrid and online approval and scheduling processes – includes Susan Yager (Faculty Senate), Kimberly Monke and Matt Schmitz (ITS), Kathy Ketchum (Nursing), David Knowlton (Education), Janice Jopline (Business), Larry LaFond (CAS), Mary Ettling (Educational Outreach), and Zenia Agustin, Laura Strom, and Sue Thomas (Provost’s Office)

Rhonda Comrie turned the meeting over to Tom Foster.

Consideration of Minutes: The minutes stand approved as submitted.

Reports from Council Chairs

UPBC: Morris Taylor reported that tomorrow the council will be doing the rankings of requests. There is no news at this time on the budget.

Faculty Development Council: Faith Liebl submitted a report that is filed with the minutes. There was a discussion regarding some possible ideas for restructure of the Council to add program reviews to the Faculty Development Council from Curriculum or move Assessment from Curriculum to Faculty Development. Tom Foster suggested that program reviews could become part of Faculty Development Council’s responsibility. By reviewing the programs systematically, they could offer faculty development by first determining if everyone is having similar problems completing the forms and then offering to improve the forms. If anyone has any input, they are to contact Tom Foster.
Curriculum Council: The Grading and Evaluating, Course Repeat Policy – 1J2 is ready for a first read at the April Faculty Senate meeting. Duff reported an issue with the grading policy that was revised a few years ago concerning attendance and a grade of ‘F’ or “UW” (“NS” means never show for class). Scott Belobrajdic brought this to Curriculum Council. There was a discussion about online courses and what would be considered attendance in online courses. Tom Foster suggested that the new subcommittee bring the topic of hybrid and online courses and how to handle on-line attendance. Tom Foster would like to see a change in what programs, new programs and course reviews look like shifting the responsibility to departments to get it right the first time. If the Registrar has issues with Banner, they can deal directly with the departments. The Curriculum Council of the Senate can then take a more holistic view. Tom and the upcoming Curriculum Council Chair will try to work that into the Curriculum Council agenda next year.

Rules & Procedures Council: Shelly Goeb-Parker reported that there has been a shift in apportionment. Shelly is notifying the Deans about elections. The Chancellor and Provost evaluations went out. Jonathan Pettibone put together a definition of faculty language to include clinical faculty. They are working on coming up with the math for representation. Shelly will bring numbers for discussion. There was a discussion. Shelly and Tom Foster will follow up on the clinical faculty proposal.

Welfare Council: Mark Hildebrandt reported that the Council conducted an Ombuds search and interviews and came up with three qualified candidates. The names will be forwarded to the Provost for approval of one. The Welfare Council approved the Ombuds annual report, which will be distributed before the Faculty Senate meeting April 3. Mark reported that the Family Friendly policy was just approved at the Welfare Council meeting being held at this time. Mark credited a list of people for their recent work: Tom Jordan, Ken Moffett, Erin Heil and McKenzie Ferguson. The policy including the Leave policy, with a few minor corrections (some typos and “recommendation” was changed to “assessment”), will be posted on Faculty Senate SharePoint for the April 3 meeting where it will get a first read.

Following the meeting, Mark Hildebrandt sent to Executive Committee an email with the four names of the candidates of the Ombuds Search:

Fri 3/28/2014 12:17 PM
Hi All,

As a follow-up to yesterday’s FSEC meeting, the WC is prepared to recommend a candidate as a new Ombudsperson. The four candidates interviewed by the WC on March 20 were: Matt Petrocelli, Joel Hardman, Kris Jarosz, and Huei Li Chin. The WC felt that 3 of the candidates were highly qualified. We will forward their applications along with the name of our preference to the Provost’s Office following the FS meeting on April 3.

Thanks,
-Mark,
Co-Chair of Welfare Council
Graduate Council: Steffany Chleboun submitted a report that is filed with the minutes. Steffany added that they have a bottleneck of program reviews at this time. There was a discussion.

Past President: Rhonda Comrie reported that she attended the UPBC meeting. Enrollment Management Council will meet in April, but did not meet in March.

President Elect: Tom Foster reported that the NSSE results were distributed by the University Quality Council, and Tom provided a copy for the executive committee. The copy will be filed with the minutes. Tom pointed out that the control group that included SIUE was not the usual group. From this point on, the NSSE will be administered every other year and the Student Engagement every off year. UQC was concerned that SIUE is never ahead. Tom would like the Council Chairs to contact him if they notice things that need to be done more efficiently and on schedule in order to improve areas. Send Tom ideas of how to improve areas.

President: Susan is meeting with the Provost, Chancellor and Diversity Council; and Tom Foster is attending the Board of Trustees meeting on April 17.

Unfinished Business: None.

New Business
All the policies listed on the agenda, except the Policy on Instructional Use of Social Media (approved by Welfare Council) and operating papers revisions, will move to the Faculty Senate for a first read:
- Grading and Evaluating: Course Repeat Policy – 1J2
- Faculty Development Council Operating Papers revisions
- TEAC Operating Papers revisions
- Faculty Friendly (all related items)
  -SIUE Faculty Parental, Family, and Extended Leave
  -SIUE University Committee for Family-Friendly Policy Implementation Operating Papers
Other items under New Business that will go on Faculty Senate May agenda are:
- Council Chairs for 2014-2015
- General Education Chair for 2014-15
- General Education Committee for 2014-2015
- Faculty Ombuds Service 2013 Annual Report
There was a discussion about the slate of Council Chairs. Faculty Development Council Chair Faith Liebl reported that the Council may have two people interested in co-chairing. Anne Flaherty is willing to serve a second term as General Education Committee Chair.
SUAA: it was agreed to have a SUAA representative speak at a senate meeting.
Public Comment: Morris commented about surveys that when people lose trust in system it takes time to regain trust. It was suggested to do a simple follow-up survey (1 question survey). There was a discussion.
Adjournment: With no more business Tom Foster adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Approved as amended on April 10, 2014 by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Vicki Kruse/University Governance
~
Faculty Development Council Report, March 2014


Operating Paper Revisions: Revisions to the FDC and TEAC operating papers were approved. FDC Operating Papers were revised to provide flexibility in the number of members and to update the description of the faculty development ex officio representative. The TEAC Operating Papers were revised to increase the amount of one of the Teaching Distinction Awards, which is awarded to one clinical or non-tenure track faculty, to $1500. The proposed revisions will be presented to the full Senate during the April meeting.

EUE Applications: 21 EUE applications requesting ~$260K in funding reviewed by three separate panels. One of the 21 applications was reviewed by all three panels. After discussion both within and between panels, 12 of the 21 proposals will be recommended for funding.

Graduate Council Report

mtg from March 20, 2014

- GC took a moment to welcome Ryan Dodd to the Graduate School
- Dean Weinberg provided overview on presentation given to HLC
- Michael Ruggless has resigned as student representative on GC and Programs Committee—he has taken a job at St. Louis University.

The Graduate Council approved 3 program changes. Details of the work appear below.

I) Program changes:
1) 91A Curriculum and Instruction (SOE-13-990)—development of an option in Adult Education
2) 91A Educational Administration, EdS (SOE-14-1007)—development of option for Teacher Leader
3) 91A Educational Administration, MSEd (SOE-14-1008)—development of option for Teacher Leader

Other:
- GC approved the appointment of Jason Stacey as GCOA chair
- Dean Weinberg clarified discrepancy in numbers presented during presentation of ICR distribution at previous GC meeting related to the Research Institute
- Members of ERP presented a proposed form for units to report ICR distribution. GC recommended that ERP continue to work on document including modifications for particular items, working with Associate Dean to address any concerns, fully vet through ERP, and represent.
Comparison Group 1: Great Lakes Public

This section summarizes how this group was identified, including selection criteria and whether the default group was used. This is followed by the resulting list of institutions in this group.

**Great Lakes Public** institutions (N=31)

Bowling Green State University (Bowling Green, OH)
Eastern Illinois University (Charleston, IL)
Eastern Michigan University (Ypsilanti, MI)
Grand Valley State University (Allendale, MI)
Illinois State University (Normal, IL)
Indiana State University (Terre Haute, IN)
Lake Superior State University (Sault Ste Marie, MI)
Miami University-Oxford (Oxford, OH)
Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI)
Northern Michigan University (Marquette, MI)
Oakland University (Rochester Hills, MI)
Ohio State University at Newark, The (Newark, OH)
Ohio State University-Lima Campus (Lima, OH)
Ohio State University-Mansfield Campus (Mansfield, OH)
Ohio State University-Marion Campus (Marion, OH)
Ohio State University, The (Columbus, OH)
Purdue University-Calumet Campus (Hammond, IN)
Shawnee State University (Portsmouth, OH)
Southern Illinois University Carbondale (Carbondale, IL)
University of Akron (Akron, OH)
University of Cincinnati (Cincinnati, OH)
University of Michigan-Flint (Flint, MI)
University of Southern Indiana (Evansville, IN)
University of Toledo (Toledo, OH)
University of Wisconsin-Platteville (Platteville, WI)
University of Wisconsin-River Falls (River Falls, WI)
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (Whitewater, WI)
Western Illinois University (Macomb, IL)
Western Michigan University (Kalamazoo, MI)
Wright State University (Dayton, OH)
Youngstown State University (Youngstown, OH)
**NSSE 2013 Snapshot**

**Southern Illinois Univ Edwardsville**

**Snapshot**

NSSE asks first-year and senior students about a wide range of educationally purposeful activities (for more information, see page 4). This Snapshot is a concise collection of key findings from your institution’s NSSE 2013 participation. We hope this information stimulates discussion on your campus about the undergraduate experience. Additional details about these results, including statistical test results, can be found in the reports referenced throughout.

**Engagement Indicators**

Sets of items are grouped into ten Engagement Indicators, which fit within four themes of engagement. At right are summary results for your institution. For details, see your Engagement Indicators report.

**Key:**

- Your students’ average was significantly higher (p < .05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
- Your students’ average was significantly lower (p < .05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- No significant difference.

**Theme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Indicator</th>
<th>First-year</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning (HO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning (RI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies (LS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning (QR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning (CL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others (DD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction (SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices (ET)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions (QI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High-Impact Practices (HIPs)**

Due to their positive associations with student learning and retention, special undergraduate opportunities are designated "high-impact." For more details and statistical comparisons, see your High-Impact Practices report.

**Administration Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Resp. rate</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to your Administration Summary and Respondent Profile reports for more information.

**Additional Questions**

Your institution administered the following additional question set(s):

- Academic Advising

Refer to your Topical Module report(s) for complete results.
NSSE 2013 Snapshot
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Academic Challenge: Additional Results

The Academic Challenge theme contains four Engagement Indicators (HO, RI, LS, QR) as well as several important individual items. The results presented here provide an overview of these individual items. For more information about the Academic Challenge theme, see your Engagement Indicators report. To further explore individual item results, see your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons, the Major Field Report, or the NSSE Institutional Report Builder (described on p. 4).

Time Spent Preparing for Class
This figure reports the average weekly class preparation time for your first-year and senior students compared to students in your comparison group.

Reading and Writing
These figures report the average number of hours your students spent reading for their courses and the average number of pages of assigned writing compared to students in your comparison group.

Challenging Courses
To what extent did your students' courses challenge them to do their best work? Response options ranged from 1 = "Not at all" to 7 = "Very much."

Academic Emphasis
How much did students say their institution emphasizes spending significant time studying and on academic work? Response options included "Very much," "Quite a bit," "Some," and "Very little."
Item Comparisons
By examining individual NSSE questions, you can better understand what contributes to your institution’s performance on Engagement Indicators and High-Impact Practices. This section displays the five questions on which your first-year and senior students scored the highest and the five questions on which they scored the lowest, relative to students in your comparison group. Parenthetical notes indicate whether an item belongs to a specific Engagement Indicator or is a High-Impact Practice. While these questions represent the largest differences (in percentage points), they may not be the most important to your institutional mission or current program or policy goals. For additional results, refer to your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons report.

First-year

**Highest Performing Relative to Great Lakes Public**
- Discussions with... People of a race or ethnicity other than your own (DI)
- Discussions with... People from an economic background other than your own (DI)
- Instructors... Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments (ET)
- Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information (HO)
- Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source (HO)

**Lowest Performing Relative to Great Lakes Public**
- Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept (RI)
- Quality of interactions with... Other administrative staff and offices (QI)
- Participated in a learning community or some other formal program where (HIP)
- Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge (RI)
- Quality of interactions with... Faculty (QI)

Senior

**Highest Performing Relative to Great Lakes Public**
- Completed a culminating senior experience (CHIP)
- Worked with other students on course projects or assignments (CL)
- Asked another student to help you understand course material (CL)
- Explained course material to one or more students (CL)
- Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (QI)

**Lowest Performing Relative to Great Lakes Public**
- Quality of interactions with... Academic advisors (QI)
- About how many... courses have included a community-based project (service-learning) (CHIP)
- Inst. emphasizes... Providing opportunities to be involved socially (SE)
- Inst. emphasizes... Attending events that address important social/econ./polit. issues (SE)
- Inst. emphasizes... Attending campus activities and events (SE)

---

a. The displays on this page draw from the 53 items that make up the ten Engagement Indicators and six High-Impact Practices. Key to abbreviations: HO = Higher-Order Learning.

b. RI = Reflective & Integrative Learning, FS = Learning Strategies, FR = Quantitative Reasoning, CL = Collaborative Learning, DI = Discussions with Diverse Others.

c. SF = Student-Faculty Interaction, ET = Effective Teaching Practices, QI = Quality of Interactions, SE = Supportive Environment, HP = High-Impact Practice.

Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your Institutional Report and available on the NSSE Web site.

b. Combinations of students responding "Very often" or "Often."

c. Combinations of students responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit."

d. Rated at least 6 on a 7-point scale.

e. Percentage reporting at least "Some."
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How Students Assess their Experience
Students' perceptions of their cognitive and affective development, as well as their overall satisfaction with the institution, provide useful evidence of their educational experiences. For more details, refer to your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons report.

Perceived Gains Among Seniors
Students reported how much their experience at your institution contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in ten areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Gains (Sorted highest to lowest)</th>
<th>Percentage of Seniors Responding &quot;Very much&quot; or &quot;Quite a bit&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing numerical and statistical info</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other backgrounds (econ., racial/ethnic, polit., relig., nation., etc.)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving complex real-world problems</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an informed and active citizen</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with SIUE
Students rated their overall experience at your institution and whether they would attend your institution again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Rating Their Overall Experience as &quot;Excellent&quot; or &quot;Good&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year SIUE: 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Public: 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior SIUE: 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Public: 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Who Would &quot;Definitely&quot; or &quot;Probably&quot; Attend This Institution Again</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year SIUE: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Public: 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior SIUE: 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Public: 82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is NSSE?
NSSE annually collects information at hundreds of four-year colleges and universities about student participation in activities and programs that promote their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending their college or university. Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience that can be improved through changes in policy and practice.

NSSE has been in operation since 2000 and has been used at more than 1,500 colleges and universities in the US and Canada. More than 90% of participating institutions administer the survey on a periodic basis.

Visit our Web site: nsse.iub.edu

Try the Institutional Report Builder
The NSSE Institutional Report Builder, to be updated with 2013 results in early fall, is an interactive tool for participating institutions to instantly generate custom reports using their NSSE data. Create tables of Engagement Indicator statistics or item frequencies that compare subgroups of students within your institution, or that compare your students to those from a customized comparison group. Access the Institutional Report Builder via the Institution Interface.
nsse.iub.edu/links/interface