

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010
December 4, 2009
10:03 AM – 12:06 PM
PAC Conference Room “G”**

Senators Present: L. Bogle, S. Borland, K. Burton, J. Casinova, D. Felix, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, J. Gilliam, L. Giordano, J. Hall, N. Headman, W. Kline, E. Kullick, J. Martin, C. Olivier, P. Salela, B. Siddiquee, T. Sullivan-Stewart, M. Van Vossen, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: S. Borland and Holly Thompson

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: H. Bapat, J. Barker, T. Barnett, D. Barrows, T. Bodenhorn, B. Clevenger, L. Dorman, J. Ermatinger, C. Ford, S. LaFollette, W. Miller, N. Niebur, S. Olsta, L. Otterson, S. Sagmoen, E. Staley, K. Rutherford, and W. Weisenburn

The Senate was called to order at 10:03 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Salela to approve the day’s agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of November 6, 2009

A motion to approve the minutes of November 6, 2009 was made by Hall and seconded by Martin. Burton requested a correction to the minutes by deleting a sentence on line 331. The corrected minutes were approved unanimously.

Announcements

Salela announced that the coffee shop in the library is closing today, but will reopen under new management in the spring.

Fisher announced that the UIS Music Fall Showcase is this evening at 7:30pm in the Studio Theatre, with a pre-show lecture about community programming beginning at 7pm.

Reports:

Chair – T. Ting

Ting reminded everyone of the UIS Public Forum on the Presidential Search next Tuesday, December 8th from 3-5pm at the Brookens Auditorium. Ting encouraged everyone to attend, as the chair of the search committee will be there to moderate the forum. It is a listening session, as they want our ideas regarding the kind of leader we are looking for. Open forums have already been held at UIUC and UIC this week. This is a university-approved event, so everyone can get release time to attend.

HB-4688 is a House Bill introduced by Representative Naomi Jakobsson, of the Champaign-Urbana area, that would modify composition of the Board of Trustees. It proposes to add three faculty members to the Board. One faculty member would be selected from each campus. The bill would also create a Trustee Selection Task Force. It is currently the governor's task to appoint trustees, but this Task Force would receive and review applications for trustee positions. The bill would call for the Senate Chair of each campus to serve as faculty representatives on the Task Force to assist with the vetting process. It remains unclear if this bill will become law, but if it does we would have the opportunity to provide input on the selection of Board members. The terms for faculty members on the Board would be for two years each. They would need to be of at least Associate Professor rank and would need to reside on campus for two full years for the term. The details of the bill are available on the General Assembly website.

Provost – H. Berman

Berman stated that the budget situation remains unchanged from our last meeting. In terms of FY10 the state continues to lag significantly in its payments. We have taken steps to brace ourselves for the possibility of not receiving a portion of our FY10 allocation by holding money in reserve. As a system we are holding back 8.5%. For the next FY we are making plans for significant reductions in state appropriations. He will be meeting with the deans on the Academic Affairs side, and similar processes are underway in Student Affairs and the Chancellor's Division.

Under the general theme of optimizing use of instructional resources, Berman will be sending an email to students today to encourage them to register before the winter break. The deans will be looking closely at low-enrolled courses and making early decisions on canceling courses so that they can reassign faculty to higher enrollment courses. Berman also wishes to remind the faculty that if we replace a section of an adjunct with a faculty member now we can free up money for use in the summer session.

Bill Spellman, Executive Director of COPLAC recently visited UIS. He is the first full-time Executive Director and it has become a much more ambitious organization. They had good discussions about faculty collaborations and an undergraduate research journal that our students can contribute to. It was Berman's feeling that UIS and COPLAC have many shared values and that "we belong here." Spellman also had a very good discussion

with Ray Schroeder about the use of technology, especially Google Wave, as a way to encourage collaboration across COPLAC faculty and campuses.

Fisher wanted to ensure that whatever language was used to encourage students to register early made clear that student can still continue to register up until the normal registration deadline. New Transfer Student Orientation sessions are scheduled for December 8th and January 14th, and an early cancellation could be particularly problematic for new international students who can only register after that second date. Berman suggested that they speak after the meeting about the wording.

Ting clarified that the ongoing planning for a 5% reduction is simply a planning exercise. She asked Berman if it is the case that we still do not currently know how much we need to give back, and Berman indicated that this was the case and was glad she underscored the planning nature of this exercise. He added that we will have a better understanding of several factors that will determine the final dollar value in the spring semester, such as the enrollment numbers and tuition increases, and it remains unclear when the legislature will finish their work on the budget. Ting noted that these figures will not be finalized until close to the end of the fiscal year and asked if the details of the planning exercise the deans are undertaking could be shared? Berman stated that he thought she was going to ask about near-term effects of that planning, and the answer to that question is that we do not yet know about near-term effects but we need to remain flexible in our budgeting. However, Berman stated that he did not want to give the impression that planning is simply hypothetical, rather, this is a way to maximize our flexibility with next budget year. Ting stated that because this is not hypothetical, people need to know what they need to be planning for. Maximizing transparency can prevent people from generating an inaccurate understanding of the situation. Berman stated that Ting made a good point, and praised the transparency of his deans. Information transmittal will occur at the college level, and his understanding was that the same will happen in Student Affairs. Wassenberg stated that she has a meeting with her executive committee next Monday, shortly after the Dean's meeting on Wednesday.

Kline asked what the current status is of the state's contribution to our budget? Berman stated that he heard that we had received a small amount this week. Ting stated that the university has billed the state for \$390 million, but we have received just \$20 million. Kline asked if the tuition dollars that student pay in goes to the university directly, or if it goes to the state and then back to us. Berman stated that it is the former, and it is that money we are currently using to make payroll.

Martin stated that the Board of Trustee numbers as of November 1st were that the state had paid 0.4% of their allocation this year, compared to 24% last year. For tuition receipts, 91% of fall tuition dollars had been collected.

Student Government – M. Van Vossen

This Sunday's SGA meeting they will be reviewing site locations for the Public Safety Building.

Board of Trustees Report

Eisenhart stated that she forgot to bring her report, but will bring it next time. Ting stated that the Board of Trustees met and approved the Presidential Search committee composition and approved the charge of the search committee. Martin stated that much of the meeting featured VP Rao and Ghosh educating the Board about the university. The board also approved the restructuring of their committees to reduce them from 12 to 4, but there was no public discussion about why or how. Ting stated that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee will now be chaired by Trustee Karen Hasara.

Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Calendars/Grading Deadlines

Ting thanked the committee, especially Clevenger, Gilliam and Siddiquee, for their work. The SEC had many discussions with Clevenger regarding the calendars, and we will now include the specific grading deadlines in the Academic Calendar. Clevenger also provided some documents that give rationales for why the deadlines are set the way they are. This information allows us to review what COPLAC and other Illinois institutions are doing with grading deadlines. She noted that an important goal for Records and Registration is to get grade information to students as soon as possible, because grades impact student eligibility for registration in the following semester and students appreciate having their grade information early, and the SEC agreed entirely. There was also a desire to ensure that faculty have an adequate amount of time to process final grades without having to curtail the allocated semester time for them to cover the course materials. Based on these considerations the grading deadline will be set a minimum of three days after the end of finals. Clevenger discussed this with his staff and they have provided us with the current set of grading deadlines to be incorporated into the Academic Calendar.

Kline asked why there were some spikes in the table of grades that were not submitted by the deadline. Clevenger stated that this sometimes happens because individual faculty members leave campus, and sometimes leave the country, and can be difficult to contact. Generally faculty are very responsive once they know there is a problem, but sometimes it is difficult to get in touch with them. Ting added that there do not appear to be “repeat offenders,” those who do fail to submit grades appear to be somewhat random. Berman added that, in trying to maintain the three day floor and allowing for a couple of years in which the due date for days that are after Christmas, we need to recognize that the R&R staff is coming in between Christmas and New Year’s specifically to allow faculty enough time to grade. Ting indicated that was indeed very much appreciated by the SEC.

Hall noted that we often have our spring break a week or so different than UIUC and UIC, and was wondering why. Clevenger stated we set our spring break date according to the schedules for first- and second-half classes.

Martin added that having our spring break staggered away from UIUC and UIC is appreciated, as it allows him to get some time to see colleagues at Urbana.

Olivier asked if there are consequences for faculty for failing to get grades turned in on time. Berman acknowledged that was a very legitimate point. Eisenhart stated that if late

grade submissions were a chronic problem for a faculty member it would be pointed out at Merit Reviews. But for the most part these are isolated incidents that are rarely repeated.

Clevenger added that his office contacts the faculty member first if they have not submitted grades by the deadline. After that they contact the department, then the dean's office. The hierarchy is informed.

The Senate endorsed the academic calendars by voice vote.

Progress Report: Review of Current Best Practices for Campus and Workplace Violence Prevention per Resolution 39-13 – Vice Chancellor T. Barnett

Resolution 39-13 required a review of current best practices for campus and workplace violence, however Ting stated that she has received clarification that Student Affairs is not responsible for Workplace Violence. Rather, Human Resources is responsible for that area. Student Affairs has however provided a review of the other areas requested in Resolution 39-13. Vice Chancellor Barnett and Director of Human Resources Weisenburn are in attendance to answer any questions we might have regarding the reviews.

Barnett stated that he appreciated Weisenburn's participation in this discussion because Student Affairs does not oversee issues related to workplace violence. He also appreciated the attendance of Director of the Women's Center Otterson, who has for years led the charge with regard to sexual assault prevention. The current report documents what all of his departments are doing, but there are some additional programs that he has just recently gotten in the last few days from Residential Life. What this process has revealed is that there is not a single, strategic effort to address violence, but rather has been handled by separate departments. It has become apparent that we need to all be on the same page. Also, stated that he has learned there are some faculty on campus who have expertise in these areas, and he wishes to take advantage of that expertise. There is also an article published by the Higher Education Center document that describes principles and provides recommendations for putting together a campus wide strategy for addressing these issues. He would like to put together a Task Force in the spring to develop a more cohesive strategy.

Fisher asked for a clarification on the plans to assemble a Task Force, which she did not note in the report. Barnett stated that it was not in fact stated in the report, but it is now something he wishes to do. Ting asked if this Task Force would be charged with assembling a cohesive strategic plan for addressing violence amongst students, and Barnett said that is the purpose. Fisher added that she was very glad to see the current report, as she has been aware of some individual programs but had never seen them all put together in such a comprehensive list. She expressed her appreciation for the speed with which he provided all of this information to the Senate. There was also a brochure distributed earlier this year informing faculty about what offices to call for specific problems, but it did not include the Women's Center. This information might also be

shared on the website. Barnett agreed that those were good points and he would like to set up such websites.

Casinova also expressed his appreciation for this document. He has been working with the Diversity Committee (note: Senate Committee on Diversity, Equal Rights, Opportunity and Access) on this same topic, and is glad to see this list. He asked to whom suggestions should be directed. Barnett said that for now suggestions should be directed to him, and he would then determine how to forward them based on their content.

Casinova also asked if it is possible to implement a way to automatically refer someone who has been accused of violence on campus for threat or risk assessment. Barnett stated that the discipline code and grievance procedures are in the process of being rewritten and those are to be submitted to the Senate in early February. Those revisions would address that kind of referral.

Kline also acknowledged that this is a wonderful list. He asked what kind of activity would trigger involvement of the Campus Behavioral Intervention team. Barnett stated that the team meets on an every-other-week basis to discuss many student situations that have been brought to their attention. Kline asked what would be necessary to bring someone before that team, and Barnett stated that there is no minimum threshold. The team takes their task very seriously, so any concerns that are expressed will be discussed no matter how small they might seem to be.

Kline followed up by asking about campus alcohol and other drug abuse and violence policies. Violation of this policy could result from mere possession of these substances on campus. Is the Student Center sensitive to the implications of reporting such violations? Is it the case that if a student is found with a joint they will be reported and will go to jail? Barnett stated that sometimes resident assistants have called about things such as marijuana joints and that then requires police intervention. In discussions with the police chief the chief has stated that he believed some of these less serious instances do not need to be addressed via police. His office is addressing this with police.

Bodenhorn stated that if faculty expressed any concerns about students to him, then he has to take that information to the appropriate Dean and Intervention team. Berman underscored Bodenhorn's point. From a faculty standpoint, the trigger for a Campus Behavioral Intervention team has to be a disturbing potential threat either to the student or to other people. Those are the criteria that the team needs to apply, and was the gist of the email he had sent to the faculty a few weeks ago.

Ting expressed her excitement about the "future areas of focus" portion of the report, in particular she was pleased to see plans to work with athletics to develop a peer-to-peer mentoring program to prevent violence and sexual assault. She noted that Barnett serves on IAC, and felt that it would be good if he could keep the IAC informed of these issues as they pertain to athletics. She also asked what the time frame would be for

incorporating rape and violence prevention programming into UNI 101 courses. Barnett stated he hoped to have that done for Fall 2010.

Ting asked if Weisenburn wanted to comment on workplace violence prevention. He stated that there was nothing to add beyond the policy described in the handout he provided. Fortunately on this campus we have had very few reported instances of such violence. He is aware of only one instance that has been reported to the police over the last six years. His office certainly stands ready to assist employees in any way necessary if there is an episode of violence. This policy was developed several years ago, and he stated that he would welcome any input regarding the need for revisions. Ting stated that the second sentence of the Policy Statement makes mention regarding “threats and threats of violence” – does that necessarily have to directly imply physical harm, or do other kinds of threats count? Would it cover verbal threats that might make the workplace more difficult? What about threats to career progression? Weisenburn stated that is an excellent question, and stated that whenever you feel threatened you should refer them to the appropriate party, namely their immediate supervisor and the police. If it does not rise to the level of a police incident report then it would need to be worked out with supervisor, which could perhaps involve a referral to a social service agency.

Eisenhart noted that the policy does not address stalking, which occur more often than direct threats. We might want to expand the language to include that kind of activity.

Proposed Change of University Statutes by Board of Trustees (USC ST-74)

Ting had provided our Senate’s advice to the Board regarding their proposed changes, and the Board has modified their proposal. They will instead be adding simply one word to the Presidential description – “Executive” will be added to “Chief Officer.” Martin noted that the other campus senates were very pleased by the input our Senate provided. Eisenhart, who is the chair of the USC, described the feedback process to the Interim President Designate Ikenberry and he was very responsive. Eisenhart appreciated the clarity and succinctness of our senate’s feedback, which is not always present in the feedback she receives from other campuses. The Senate endorsed this change.

DPA program review

LaFollette reported that this is a review of the “old” doctoral program, but the Graduate Council (GC) asked primarily about the changes to the program and how they are moving forward. GC was very pleased that they have moved toward a practitioner model, and they have spent a great deal of time collecting data to help make students feel like a cohesive group. They are using a cohort model. The first cohort is finishing up their five core courses right now and will be coming up for their comprehensive exams in the spring. The problems identified with the curriculum have primarily to do with the fact that it is a new curriculum. Issues are being identified as they go along. The assessments are new and they do not yet have data for the assessment. GC encouraged them to continue with their current direction and to strengthen their mentorship/advisee format they have implemented, and their efforts to improve degree completion and time to degree. One of the difficulties they will need to address in the coming years has to do with the dissertation and determining when a dissertation is complete. The program has

also had a fair amount of turnover amongst the faculty, and they are working to maintain faculty involvement. The GC appreciates that the program is flexible and learning, everything seems to be on the right track.

Ting stated that Miller was here for the first hour of the meeting and was prepared to answer questions, but he need to leave to attend a faculty candidate presentation at 11am. Wassenberg and LaFollette are instead available to answer questions. Siddiquee asked how many doctorates have been awarded and how long it takes to complete degrees. LaFollette did not know, but Wassenberg stated that there were probably 8 or 9 degrees granted by the old curriculum. The time to degree is impacted by the nature of the students, who are often mid-to-upper level professionals in state and local government and industry whose lives are not driven by academics, so many of them stop out. Some will return, while others will not. We will be better able to answer that question with the new cohort model.

Fisher stated that she appreciated the report and loved the cohort approach. She inquired about the faculty commitment. She noticed that there are faculty drawn from across the college and asked if they all teach core courses? Wassenberg stated that they do. Fisher asked if those arrangements are set for the long term. LaFollette stated that each department provides two faculty to the program committee, some of which teach, some provide advising. It is a shared endeavor.

Philosophy program review

Bapat from undergraduate council was to present the undergraduate Philosophy program review, but he is not in attendance. Dean Ermatinger commented that things are generally going in the direction we wish to see. There are some issues to be addressed, such as by renumbering some courses and increasing involvement of the program in lower division offerings so as to improve the number of students exposed to the discipline and increase the number of majors. They will also be looking at course rotation to make better use of faculty resources. The marketing plan for their online program will also be reviewed.

Martin noted that one of the recommendations was to get ECCE approval for some courses to improve enrollment. But faculty resources are at a premium; is there the capacity to implement this recommendation with current faculty? Barker stated that there is some ability to overlap major courses with ECCE, but beyond that point additional faculty would be needed. He added that there are some ways they would like to expand, in particular on ground, but there is only so much expansion that can be done with three people. Overall, we can do the major and do a certain amount of on-campus presence and overlap with ECCE with current faculty and adjuncts, but beyond that, additional resources would be needed.

Ting noted that Ermatinger noted the renumbering of courses but that was not addressed by the memo from the undergraduate council, and asked Barker to respond. Barker noted that most of their courses are 300- and 400-level because that is just the way things have always been. The department is open to renumbering courses by doing a systematic review of the entire curriculum. Ting asked if the renumbering request has to do with

expanding lower division general education participation, and Barker stated that would be a large part of it.

Kline added that the renumbering issue does not apply just to Philosophy, but this is a broader issue that results from the legacy of Sangamon State. Many departments need to consider this kind of renumbering.

Fisher noted that one of the things that strikes her is that the online program is essentially still a 2-year completion degree. But for that to work those courses will need to stay at the 300-level, putting online programs in a bind if they want to keep their courses contributing to the “top 60” hours their students need.

Bodenhorn stated that Kline hit the nail on the head regarding the legacy of the curriculum. Courses like Ethics and Critical Thinking would often be at the 200-level at other institutions and would fit well in the general education curriculum, but here are 300-or 400-level. However, the dean’s office recognizes the bind that such a renumbering creates for online programs. Finding the balance that allows service for both online degree and on campus general education needs is the issue.

Martin stated that these balancing problems are faced by many small departments. His advice to Philosophy would be to not try to do everything, but rather to try to find their niche. Unless more faculty lines are available, it will not be possible to do all of these recommendations.

Barker stated that he is mindful of the needs to prioritize. When the online major was very new it was vital to focus entirely on that. But now that the major is in place we can begin exploring other things, such as on ground and general education courses. We can do parts of those things, but we cannot do all of them with our current full time faculty. Perhaps we can do other things with adjunct faculty.

Ting asked about the use of the term Adjunct Assistant Professors, as she had not seen that term before. Are there also Adjunct Associate Professors? Are they paid more? Berman indicated there were, and those appointments are made consistent with the criteria for tenure and tenure track faculty. However, they are not necessarily paid more.

Ting asked if the tenure track faculty delivered core courses of the major. Barker stated that the answer is “yes and no” – some of those courses we do not have full time faculty with expertise in some areas. The majority of core courses are taught by full time faculty and the capstone course is always taught by full time faculty. Ting followed up by asking about the retirement of the adjunct who had been teaching the core History of Philosophy course. Does that mean that the core faculty cannot teach this course? Barker stated that tenure track faculty could do it in a pinch, but then the question becomes what other course do we drop?

Undergraduate Council (UC) Chair Bapat arrived and apologized for being late, as he was occupied with a teaching demonstration. Fisher asked about recommendation #3, the

creation of an advisory committee. She asked if that would be distinct from a regular department committee, and Bapat indicated it would. The idea is to seek out departments with shared interests that could provide input. Fisher asked if this model is used by other departments, and Bapat stated that Modern Languages does, and Hall added that MIS used to have one. Eisenhart stated that it is allowed under the statutes, and Legal Studies has always had one.

Eisenhart USC Acknowledgement

Eisenhart expressed her appreciation for Fisher's previous contributions to the USC. Fisher had stepped down in 2009. On behalf of the USC she presented Fisher with a Certificate of Appreciation for her contributions.

Old Business

None.

New Business

Resolution 39-16 Change Minimum Course Load for Full-time Graduate Student Status from Twelve Semester Hours to Nine Semester Hours [1st reading]

A motion to open discussion was offered by Casinova and was seconded by Martin. LaFollette provided the rationale for the resolution. The GC did research on this topic, including examination of the Integrated Postsecondary Data System and recommendations from accreditation groups, and found that graduate programs are increasingly allowing nine credit hours to be the definition of full time enrollment. Because this would create complications for some students, they ask that if this is approved that it be implemented as soon as possible, in Fall 2010.

Siddiquee asked about the financial implications of this reduction. LaFollette stated that it should be cost neutral, because the tenure of the students on campus would not be different. Siddiquee asked if those campuses that had moved to 9 hrs saw a loss of revenues from the change. LaFollette stated that she did not have that evidence, and they were in fact not looking at this from a financial perspective but from an administrative and quality of education perspective. Berman stated that if we shorten a graduate program from, say 44 to 36, then in terms of tuition payments the university would be collecting less tuition. There are many issues involved in this consideration, including academic issues, marketing issues and competitiveness in recruitment. Because, as the GC stated, it is becoming increasingly common practice to define full-time as nine hours, that might make our programs more competitive. However, if this is approved the fees assessed for nine hour students would be assessed at the full-time level, rather than at the part-time level.

Eisenhart asked about the implications for financial aid. LaFollette stated that this was a primary consideration. Those who are part-time are not eligible for some forms of financial assistance, and by making them full time at 9 hrs those students qualify for financial aid resources only available to full time students.

Hall stated that in his college all graduate programs use 3-credit hour courses. Our college now has a situation in which students need to take 4 graduate level courses just to be full time, which can be problematic.

Berman stated that this is in no way a proscription for graduate programs across the campus to be doing what the College of Business is doing. When they first proposed a 3-credit hour arrangement it was based on a competitiveness argument. Ting stated that there still are implications for departments with 4 credit hour classes. Their departments might then look at shifting those hours down to 3. That would then allow the faculty to have just 9 hours of classroom time instead of 12. What would that mean if we see more of the graduate programs switching from 4 to 3 hr courses? Will we eventually have to teach 4 courses per semester to get to that 12 hr figure?

Berman stated that this policy will prompt discussions about credit hour requirements in additional programs. Human Development Counseling, for example, has had some discussions about this kind of change to accommodate the number of courses they need to offer for accreditation purposes. Berman stated that he has not had any discussions about changing teaching loads at this point.

Eisenhart stated that the original discussion of allowing 3 hour courses instead of 4 hour courses started here in the Senate. That is codified in the personnel policy. We did not change the number of hours required for degrees. Moving from 4 hours to 3 hours simply means students need to take more courses.

LaFollette stated that GC discussed this. The curricular package discussed at the department level must be approved, and should be a competitive number of hours offered for your type of degree. The hours cannot be arbitrarily changed just for the sake of changing hours. She thus does not envision a mass movement out of 4 credit hour courses.

Ting asked if the 12 hrs of contact time is a state requirement, and Berman stated that the requirement is from our personnel policy. He noted that fellow COPLAC member UNC-Asheville has a 4/4 load with all courses at 3 credit hours. The personnel policy does state that we require 12 hours for full-time teaching load. When we had this original discussion we decided that for UIS a 3 credit hour course would be the equivalent of a 4 credit hour course for faculty teaching load purposes. However, we probably do need to have a discussion about this. One intriguing idea that came out in our discussion of Resolution 39-15 was the possibility of making arrangements for modifying teaching loads for those who cannot complete some other facet of their faculty responsibilities for whatever reason. The present discussion does not change anything regarding current personnel policy.

Wassenberg stated that her college has had a long standing discussion about what is considered a reasonable full-time teaching load for graduate instructors. In her office's ongoing Instructional Resource Management analyses they have looked at the number of

seats used in courses and also at the number of tuition dollars generated by faculty members. In departments that are primarily graduate or graduate only there is a great deal of tuition generating teaching activity that is not captured, even when 3 hrs = 4 hrs. Closure activities that sometimes account for close to two additional courses-worth of tuition dollars are often taken out of faculty hides. This is a discussion that needs to be had, and she was pleased to hear that the Provost is willing to have a dialogue on this matter.

Van Vossen noted that housing requires full time status for students to live on campus, and this change would be particularly fair for those graduate students wanting to live on campus.

Siddiquee was glad to hear Berman reconfirm that 3=4. It is important to remember that was the agreement with departments and colleges. It is also important to remember at the time of that agreement that we were provided information from the other two campuses that their teaching loads were significantly lower than what we have, something less than 2 courses per semester. Of course UIUC is a different campus and that is understood. He wanted to remind everyone that this was an implicit understanding campus-wide.

Martin wanted to emphasize that some degree of customization is necessary within colleges and departments. Perhaps one rule does not fit all.

Kline noted that this resolution will not trigger a discussion about faculty workload. That is an independent issue. However, this discussion can certainly be had in other settings.

Headman noted that while 3=4 sounds good, but 9=12 is a big difference. That could work out to a savings of about 120 hours per semester per faculty member. I then have to wonder why all faculty are not doing that.

Eisenhart stated that her program has mixed hr courses, 3 hrs for undergraduate courses and 4 hrs for graduate courses. She felt that her 3 hr courses often required more prep time to squash the 4 hr material into a 3 hr course.

LaFollette highlighted the need to focus on time for degree completion. While the hours might be reduced on a per semester basis, the overall number of hours to complete the degree is not changed.

Wang wanted to remind everyone that this is an initiative to help our students, it is not about faculty workload. He also noted that faculty often do not change syllabi when transitioning from 4 to 3 credit hour courses, which could create more work for those who take additional 3 credit hour courses.

Ermatinger asked about the federal requirements for full-time student status, and LaFollette stated that it is dependent on the University's definition of full-time students.

Ting asked about graduate programs that only offer 4 credit hour courses. If for example they have international students who need 9 credit hours for full time status will the program then need to come up with a way to get the student to exactly 9 hours?

LaFollette replied that the GC discussed this very issue and concluded that this is simply a minimum for campus policy. If the curriculum is based on 4 credit hour courses, the student will need to take 12 hours to be full time. The program does not need to create a 1 credit hour course.

Kline asked how quickly this would need to be passed to be effective for the fall. If it is passed in the early spring would that still be implementable? Clevenger stated that it would be close but still doable.

Hall raised the possibility of voting on this resolution at the first reading. If we pass this now it could help our international students, even if we cannot implement it immediately. He offered a motion to suspend the rules and approve on first reading, seconded by Eisenhart. Motion approved by voice vote with one objection.

Dorman stated that the federal government's definition of full time status is 9 hours. Ting asked how we can require students to take more than the minimum? Why would those programs not be required to then offer a 1 credit hr course to get that minimum of 9? Clevenger stated that this was discussed by the GC, and the argument against that kind of compulsory curriculum change is that the students know that they are agreeing to this arrangement ahead of time. Ting stated that would need to be clarified to departments very rapidly and clearly. LaFollette stated that the GC is aware that there would likely be pressure for students to request Independent Study courses to get the extra 1 credit hour, but ultimately decided that was an advising issue.

The resolution as approved by voice vote.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Casinova to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 12:06 pm.