Dear AP Council Members,

There was limited business at the Senate meeting today; however, for the first time this year there was some action. The Senate adopted a Revised Solicitation Policy, 6.1.14. As our colleagues correctly pointed out, you may view the “existing policy” by going to A-Z, Policies, and typing in “solicitation” to find 6.1.14. The “Revised Policy” will read:

No solicitation may occur on university property except as permitted by University Policies. Solicitation by University units consistent with their mission is not prohibited by this policy.

The University Mass Electronic Communication Policy prohibits any member of the campus community from using University resources to send unsolicited, mass electronic communications or “Spam” on-campus or off-campus for any content outside the scope of its university mission. With few exceptions, mass-electronic communications require permission from the recipients and the communication must offer an option to be removed from the list at any time.

Solicitations are permitted by the University Foundation under the Division of University Advancement, the ISU Student Foundation, the annual State Employees Combined Appeal drive, and any others mandated by State law or Proclamation of the Governor. Unusual exceptions to this policy may be made through a request directed to the Chair of the Academic Senate, who shall make a recommendation to the President of the University.

Any member of the University community may, on his or her own initiative, permit a solicitor in his or her office or room on University governed grounds to transact business. Both shall be subject to any published regulation pertaining to the facility in which their transactions take place.

They did not give a timeframe when the new policy would be posted on ICampus. If you have any questions, I can forward them to Larry Alferink.

There was also an attempt to revise the University Mission Statement; however, due to some questions concerning the grammar involved, the Chair of the Senate decided to forward the revision to the Academic Affairs committee.

The Provost presented information concerning applications to the university, noting that while the transfer applications are down a bit, as are the numbers of Native American and Asian American freshman applicants, there is a 5% increase over all. The Provost also talked at length about the drain in recent years on the Academic Impact Fund, he also
declared that this was not a crisis. There were some questions about what we should do. If there are fewer hires, should there be some re-allocation based on student need? If there is any concrete plan offered concerning the direction of hires or re-allocation of funds, I will pass it along.

Steve Bragg returned to the Senate this week and thanked everyone for their patience in recent weeks. Basically he re-iterated that although we have received a 1.9% increase in state funding this year, it basically will not cover inflation. He promised more news as the Capital Bill drama unfolds in Springfield.

Last, but not least, Senator Waterstraat of the the Academic Affairs Committee reported that after their assessment of the Plus/Minus Grading System, they found no reason to change from what we have now. Students generally rejected the Plus/Minus system and there is no concrete evidence that students would benefit from a change to it. Apparently, this is a dead letter.

I am sure there will be plenty of interesting news to come. Stay tuned and thanks for your patience.

Sincerely,

Ron