

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2008/2009
APRIL 17, 2009
1:20 PM – 2:29 PM
PAC Conference Room “C/D”**

Senators Present: L. Bogle, W. Carpenter, V. Cook, K. Eisenhart, D. Felix, L. Fisher, J. Gilliam, L. Giordano, , W. Kline, E. Kullick, , J. Martin, C. McFarland, B. Never, C. Olivier, P. Salela, T. Sullivan-Stewart, H. Thompson, T. Ting, P. Wassenberg, and J. Hall presiding.

Senators Absent: B. Siddiquee

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests:

D. Atwell, D. Bettis, T. Bodenhorn, B. Catherwood, , B. Clevenger, K. DeBarr, H. Dell, M. Duley, D. Ferk, A. Fitzgerald, L. Gavyhorn, J. Goldberg Belle, E. Hadley-Ives, S. Hanine, N.Karuppaswamy, K. Kirkendall, J. Klein, R.L. Kynion, P. Langley, M. Leonard, J. Lyon, D. Matthews, K. Moranski, K. Murray, C. Pelka, , R. Rathjen, K. Redfield, R. Ringeisen, L. Runyon, K. Rutherford, R. Schweilchart, C. Shelley, E. Staley, L. Stonecipher, E. Wojciki,.

The Senate was called to order at 1:20 p.m. with James Hall, vice chair presiding.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Gilliam and seconded by Thompson to approve the day’s agenda.

Eisenhart made a motion to amend the Agenda adding Resolution 39 -2 to new business.

Hall welcomed new senate members. Introductions were made

The call for nominations for chair and vice chair was made. The election procedures were explained to continuing and new senators.

Salela nominated Hall as chair, seconded by Eisenhart.

Carpenter nominated Ting for Chair, seconded by Gilliam.

A motion to close the nominations was made by McFarland and seconded by Eisenhart.

Eisenhart nominated Fisher for Vice Chair, seconded by Gilliam.

Martin nominated Baker Siddiquee for Vice Chair, seconded by Eisenhart.

Olivier nominated Carpenter for Vice Chair, seconded by Eisenhart.
A motion to close nominations was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Olivier

New Business:

Resolution 39-1 Conditional Admission Policy for Undergraduate International Students [1st reading]

A motion to approve resolution 39-1 was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Fisher.

Dana Atwell explained that the admission policy would advance the strategic goals for the institution to increase diversity when admitting international students. This policy is based upon the existing infrastructure within the established ESL program at UIS. An overview of the program was provided.

Moranski explained the foundational history related to the need for this policy. A recommendation from the Undergraduate Council is being made to adopt this policy. Wassenberg noted that UIS has a long history of bringing in conditional students to allow these students the ability to get a degree. Without this type of policy, these international students would not be able to achieve a degree. Hall supported these thoughts. Martin asked if other campus resources would need to be allocated for this purpose that are not currently being allocated. Moranski answered that this has been discussed and the functions would be staffed by Dana Atwell and one adjunct. Leonard indicated that in the past, ESL conditional admission was a part of the CTL. It was discontinued upon the death of a faculty member.

Resolution 39-2 No Confidence in the Chancellor [1st reading]

Eisenhart made a motion to approve resolution 39-2, Fisher seconded.

Eisenhart asked that Resolution 39-2 be tabled until the first or second meeting in the fall until the report of the investigation is completed.

Carpenter asked if we could set a timeline for the report. Eisenhart clarified that she is moving to table the resolution until the report is completed. Eisenhart withdrew the motion to table.

Ting asked for clarification regarding an e-mail sent by the chancellor earlier in the week. She asked if the chancellor would see the capitol campaign through to completion and how much money has been raised at this time. The Chancellor said his intention is to see the campaign through to completion. \$ 22 million has been raised. Ting asked what the money would be used for. The Chancellor indicated the first need that has been identified is student scholarships and the second need is for additional faculty development funding.

Ting asked what the responsibilities of the Chancellor are. The Chancellor indicated he was responsible for the entire campus.

Martin asked if the Campus Master Plan in part or in whole was considered by the Chancellor to be an academic matter. The Chancellor indicated that the answer varied

depending on the purpose of the planning activity. The last Master Plan activity was to correct errors to the exterior areas of campus that were not addressed through the initial master plan process. In order to further develop external areas, the master plan had to be amended.

Langley noted that the last Master Plan activity was not shared with faculty or the Campus Senate Executive Committee prior to being shared with other entities. It was reported to the Board of Trustees and to the press prior to faculty being made aware of the changes noted to the Master Plan.

Berman noted that the Master Plan was done in the late 1990's and had many stakeholders both internally and externally to the campus who were involved. The item being discussed was an addendum to the actual Master Plan. The chancellor noted this only addressed the land outside of the ring road.

Hall noted the issue was more that the Board of Trustees had received this Master Plan at a Board meeting prior to any notification to the Campus Senate Executive Committee.

Martin asked if any changes or modifications were made to the areas inside the Ring Road. The Chancellor noted the public safety building and some residential space was added.

Fisher stated that what has been noted in the resolution is unilateral decision making. She indicated that stakeholders need to be included in these types of decisions in the future. Campus climate is very important and needs to have faculty input.

The Chancellor indicated the issue is that we need to define what is academic policy? The Chancellor noted willingness to work on this issue.

Hall noted he does not believe that everything is academic policy. However, these discussions need to take place for clarification.

Ting stated that last Monday's vote indicated a lack of confidence in the chancellor's overall leadership and asked how the Chancellor felt about the vote of no confidence. The Chancellor noted his background at Research 1 universities has led him to believe that faculty do not want to be involved in every aspect of the university. The Chancellor is open to discussion.

Giordano discussed the feelings of the Academic Professionals regarding this resolution. APAC strongly opposes this resolution. APAC believes the resolution is flawed and that it makes assumptions and judgments before an investigation had taken place.

Langley reported that in 2006 (as part of the Chancellor's 5 year review) perceptions of the faculty regarding the chancellor were collected. The SEC met with the chancellor at that time to review faculty perceptions. Additionally, in 2004 a report regarding athletics was given to the chancellor. In 5 years, the Chancellor has not initiated a meeting with

the IAC. Other issues, including student affairs, were discussed with the Chancellor in 2008. Each time the Chancellor has indicated a willingness to work with faculty. Langley stated that she has heard this promise before. It is time to turn a corner and include better communication and a closer relationship between faculty and the Chancellor. At this time, nothing has substantially changed. Langley noted that the faculty have communicated the need for a closer relationship with the Chancellor. The Chancellor responded that the provost is his liaison to the SEC. The Provost meets with the SEC each week. The Chancellor believes he is genuinely trying to meet the communication and shared roles.

Hall reiterated the need for the Chancellor to be more consultative with faculty, not just the Provost. He asked for an improved process and the chancellor agreed.

Fisher commented that this discussion has been healthy. She reiterated the importance of the vote last Monday and the perceptions of the faculty who voted. Fisher defended the right of the faculty to debate the question of no confidence as a legitimate way to address concerns that are not being resolved using traditional channels. Fisher noted that voting on this issue in the fall seems appropriate due to the nature of considered deliberation and timings.

Fisher asked for clarification regarding the SJR article that quoted the Athletic Director as not having read the 2004 Athletic Report. Does the Chancellor believe this to have been true? The Chancellor stated the Athletic Director was hired to address these specific concerns, but they weren't presented in the form of the report. The Chancellor noted that reaction to the 2004 task force resulted in a new AD and IAC committee. The Chancellor was not pleased by the response to the question by the SJR reporter.

Eisenhart moved to table the resolution. McFarland seconded the motion. The senators voted unanimously to table the resolution. Hall thanked the Chancellor for attending.

Martin nominated Gilliam to serve on the committee overseeing the investigation called for in Resolution 38-27. Ting seconded this nomination.

Never asked that consideration be given for future senate meetings that may have contentious issues scheduled on the agendas for the audience to be educated in the procedures that will followed. Additionally, audience members should be put on a list to be able to speak and a specific time allowed for those scheduled comments.

Hall addressed the issue that sometimes there is no time available for public comments. The Board of Trustees has a very formal process. However, the focus must be on the senators for discussion and is warranted as the decision-making takes place among the senators. Wassenberg suggested that technology could be used effectively to broaden the range of contentious and public issues. By using technology, comments and concerns could be taken from the public. Sullivan-Stewart agreed with Wassenberg's comment and added that greater communication would be helpful and constituencies should be encouraged to communicate.

Ting indicated that senators should go to the stakeholders, not wait for them to contact the senators. Ting reiterated that this specific issue is not one of faculty versus students. It is unfortunate that students left the senate meeting feeling faculty do not care. E-mails were sent to student athletes and coaches to encourage students to “fight” for themselves by an administrator. This type of contentious communication is not helping the situation. This language is not conducive to solving the problems.

McFarland stated that he had not been contacted by administration. He was contacted by the students and asked to attend a student meeting. Langley indicated that Ali Fitzgerald sent an e-mail last week to all athletes urging them to come to the Campus Senate meeting and fight for athletics. Langley forwarded this e-mail to the Provost, Chancellor, and AEO Officer, Deannie Brown, stating that this type of communication was not constructive. Langley indicated some students had felt like they were being shunned.

Wojcicki noted that he would like to know which staff members were shunning students and it would be dealt with.

McFarland indicated that he knows there are students who do not support his own personal view. Other students do hold differing opinions.

Felix noted that the student athletes provided the leadership to complete the petition process.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Gilliam to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 2:29 p.m.