

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011
November 19, 2010
10:00 AM – 11:15 AM
PAC Conference Room “H”**

Senators Present: D. Ballard, P. Boltuc, S. Borland, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, R. Garmil, K. Jamison, W. Kline, J. Martin, R. Melchin, S. Owusu-Ansah, P. Salela, L. Schoo, D. Schuldt, K. Sheridan, A. Sisneros, C. Switzer, H. Thompson, M. Van Vossen, J. Villegas, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, Y. Zhang and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: L. Bogle, T. Helton, and C. Olivier.

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: T. Barnett, L. Pardie and K. Rutherford.

The Senate was called to order at 10:00 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

Salela moved to approve the agenda and Casinova seconded the motion.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting of November 5, 2010

Chair Ting called for approval of the minutes from November 5, 2010. Ballard motioned to approve the minutes and Fisher seconded the motion. Ting asked for corrections or modifications to the minutes. Owusu-Ansah asked that the word “is” be deleted from line 393. Eisenhart asked for a clarification on the announcement that she had made at the last meeting. She had announced at the November 5th meeting that the food drive is being sponsored by our staff union, UPI, who purchased the turkeys that will go to the families benefiting from the drive. Eisenhart asked that UPI be acknowledged in the minutes. Ting stated that the inclusion would be made. Schoo asked that the word “college” be stricken from line 119, as the statement referred to high school juniors.

Sisneros directed attention to lines 178-179 and asked that either the sentence be deleted or changed to reflect the opinion of the Senate Chair. Additionally, Sisneros asked that the phrase, “which it is not” on line 186 be clarified as opinion of the Senate Chair or deleted. Lines 188-189 also represented opinion which should be clearly identified and labeled as such in the minutes, according to Sisneros. Furthermore, Sisneros asked that Chair Ting, “refrain from playing for time so not to hinder deliberation and risk being

perceived as transforming this senate into [her] propaganda machine.” Ting thanked Sisneros for his comments. Referring to lines 188-189, Ting stated that the information came from the BOT and suggested adding “according to the BOT” to line 189. Ting apologized if she came across as a “mouth piece” for the BOT or central administration. She stated that she will work to clearly differentiate her personal opinion from what is communicated by the BOT and central administration.

Martin asked that line 152 be clarified. In discussing lines 338-339, Borland asked that the word “requested” be modified. Fisher made 2 suggestions: (1) line 181 the word “trusty” should be spelled trustee; and (2) “the motion was supported by 1 vote” on line 240 be modified. She suggested changing the language to “passed” or “passed by a 1 vote margin.”

Sisneros stated that he was unsure of the review process for the minutes, and asked if something is not in the minutes whether or not it could be addressed. Kline asked if it had been said at the last meeting. Sisneros said yes. Kline asserted that this was fine. Pointing to line 179, Sisneros stated that during the November 5th meeting Ting had shared about Trustee Kennedy’s attitudes about open meetings. He asked whether Chair Ting was implying that Kennedy viewed the meeting as an administrative burden. Ting said no and asked whether Sisneros was referring to her mentioning that there were only 2 Trustees at the USC meeting. Sisneros stated yes. Ting asserted that any time 3 Trustees come together the meeting has to be published and open to anyone. According to Ting, the meeting being discussed was a USC executive session. Salela asked that the word “not” be inserted to line 223. Referring to questions raised by Sisneros, Ting stated that the minutes are recorded, final corrections and modifications are made at the senate meetings, and the minutes are then published on the Senate website. Sinseros asked whether someone reviews the minutes before they are posted. Ting said the minutes come from the Senate Secretary to the entire SEC for review first. Kline said that the SEC reviews for editorial changes, but would not remove information from the minutes. Martin clarified an item on line 368 and asked that USC be changed to UIC. Ting called for acceptance of the minutes with the suggested modifications. All Senators were in favor.

Announcement

Borland reported that the UIS Downstate Innocence Project is the recipient of a large grant, which is very exciting. As part of the celebration, UIS will be hosting Kirk Bloodsworth, on Tuesday November 30, 2010. A private donor’s reception will be held before the event, and Bloodsworth will speak in BRK from 6:30-8:00 and a reception will follow.

Reports

Chair – T. Ting

Ting, along with faculty observers, attended the BOT meeting in Chicago on November 18, 2010. In discussing protocol, Ting stated that each Senate Chair or Chair of the SEC gives an annual report to the BOT on the accomplishments of the Campus Senate during the previous year. Ting reported to the BOT at the meeting, and the report was well received. The BOT was impressed by the Senate’s accomplishments last year, according

to Ting. Also at the meeting, the BOT discussed the administrative restructuring proposal and took a vote on the entire proposal. The entire proposal was approved unanimously by the BOT. According to Ting, at the meeting Trustee Strobel stated she had read through all responses transmitted including those from the USC and each Campus Senate. In her comments, Strobel referred to our epilogue and quoted “It is time we step out of our comfort zones and see the University vis-à-vis Campus relationship in a new and hopeful light.” Chair Ting notified Senators of the UIUC Student Senate resolution which passed. Of particular concern to the UIUC Student Senate was that the proposed change might reduce the value of their degrees at the Urbana Campus. Ting asserted that there are more Trustees who have earned their degrees from the UIUC and UIC campuses, than from UIS. For example, Trustee Strobel has 2 degrees from UIUC. Hence, Ting thought the fact that the Board chose to support the proposal is particularly meaningful. Ting stated that Martin will provide report for the December 3, 2010 meeting.

Provost – H. Berman

Berman made a presentation at the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board on Wednesday. The topic was recruitment of perspective students with an emphasis on diversity. Although the presentation had been planned for quite a while, the timing coincided with a drop in diversity enrollment at UIUC this fall. This is an item of concern that was mentioned at the last Board Meeting. Berman stated that over the past 10 years (immediately before the addition of lower division program through today), we have had substantial increase in minority representation in the undergraduate population. We have grown from 10% to 20% of students who come from diverse backgrounds. This reflects recruitment initiatives to reach across the state. For the class entering Fall 2011, we have an identical number of students entering from Cook County as from Sangamon County. Berman commended the good work of admissions people. At the Board meeting, Pardie was approved as Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In discussing the approved changes of the Statutes, Berman noted that this is significant for U of I and that we will have to see how this plays out. Berman commended Ting for getting the search notice out. Included in the notice is the position description for the U of I VP and UIS Chancellor.

Berman commented on Ting’s report to the BOT as a presentation one would like to see by the faculty from the Springfield campus. He applauded Ting for judiciously using power-points and a well-organized presentation. He was very proud of the presentation. Another presentation was made by IHBE Chair Hightman. She reported on the Higher Education Finance Commission Report. Currently there is talk about performance funding for universities in the State of Illinois. The idea is that Universities receive differential funds, according to the degree that they meet state-wide goals. Berman was unsure what this might mean for UIS or U of I, but wanted to let Senators know that this discussion is happening.

Berman noted the significant efforts David Racine and Larry Golden, which resulted in the grant aforementioned by Borland. Senator Durbin was a tremendous support in this initiative, but the Center for State Policy and Leadership did a lot of work to secure the grant. Also exciting is the International flag display in PAC on level 2. Berman encouraged everyone to see the flags which represent the countries from which our

students come. At the alumni awards event last Friday, Berman spoke about objectives including international programming. A check was received that night from donor to endow scholarships for study abroad experiences. Berman expressed his thanks to the Humphrey family for their contribution to the global experience fund. Berman announced the student radio station, STAR 96 which is now broadcasting. Bill Abler (marriage, couples, and family counseling) and Jim Klein (school counseling) from HDC were both given awards last week at the Illinois Counseling Association. Berman also acknowledged Chigozie Umeadi, who was named the GLVC player of the week. Finally, Berman noted the article in the Journal Register *Making the Grade Online* which talked about the awards received from the Sloan Consortium. Scott Day, Ray Schroeder, and Will Miller were quoted. Berman also pointed to the morning article in the Journal Register about planting the idea of becoming a teacher in high schools. The article has an extended discussion about the long-term work of Meeks, Emeritus Faculty member of TEP.

Ting called for questions. Switzer stated that she was the unofficial observer to the BOT meeting and wanted to share her beliefs that UIS was very well represented at the meeting. Both Berman and Ting gave impressive reports and Olivier, the Student Trustee, asked numerous questions throughout the meeting. Martin took notes. As the unofficial observer, Switzer believed that the delegation of UIS members is well liked and respected by Trustees, the USC, and administrators. Switzer said she was very proud to be from UIS.

Garmil asked Berman about the IBHE report. He wanted to know if they take into account graduation rates for full time vs. part-time students. Berman stated that they are interested in doing performance funding while recognizing the differences between institutions. Berman asserted that Garmil's question needs to be considered. Martin stated that Berman has been very diplomatic in talking about how the Board received the report. Martin noted that this was the first time that he has seen the Board stand-up to the IBHE. Chair Kennedy asserted that it is not good to use purely economic metrics to determine programmatic decisions. According to Martin, the BOT was very clear that they will not make programmatic decisions based solely on economic metrics. Fisher said she is delighted to see increase in minority students and noticed that UIS is way ahead of UIUC at this point. Fisher asked Berman if he has information about how minority student retention compares to overall student retention at UIS. Berman asserted that we have the information will follow-up.

Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen

Van Vossen announced that the UIS SGA will be participating in the Lobby Day on December 1, 2010 at the Capitol. The SGAs from UIUC and UIC will also be present. Students are going to lobby for university funding, MAP grant funding, and a proposal to amend a U of I Trustees Act, to give a legally binding vote for all 3 student Trustees who serve on the BOT. Van Vossen asked Casinova to share information about what SGA is doing to prepare for the lobby day. Casinova said he spent the previous day at the Capitol introducing UIS students, and handing out business cards. Students were very well received and scheduled several meetings. Casinova had 40 members on his list from both

the house and the senate, almost all of whom agreed to schedule appointments. SGA is targeting all Higher Education Committee members, Higher Education Appropriations Committee members and all identifiable alumni of U of I. Additionally, students have been invited to attend as well. The SGA will be providing lunch.

Ting shared that the UIS search has been formally announced. She informed students who did not receive the information via email that they can find the information at www.uillinois.edu/uischancellorsearch/.

Ad Hoc Committee on the Academy of Capitalism and Limited Government

Ting stated that the Ad Hoc Committee has spent the past month working on the report. Martin said he would be giving the report to the Senate. Boltuc and Kline also served on the committee, but Kline recused himself from writing the report. Martin stated that the final report was before everyone. To sum up, the controversy stems from the fact that the Academy has money in 2 pots: (1) money with the foundation and (2) a private bank account. Martin referred to the Ikenberry Guidelines which were put in to place during Ikenberry's second term as U of I President. The guidelines assert that the Academy, as a supporting organization to the Foundation, should only expend funds in response to the normal grant application process for faculty. The controversy arose because the Academy used money from the private bank account to hire a CEO. The UIS Ad Hoc Committee did not think this was unreasonable. They are recommending that the administration work on this. According to the Ad Hoc Committee, the Ikenberry Guidelines are a good place to start. While a difference of interpretation may be present, the differences can be resolved.

Boltuc asserted that the CEO was willing to work within the Ikenberry Guidelines which was accepted by all sides; however, the Academy has two funds. This is not a problem as long as all of the Foundation grants are used only for programmatic purposes and follow the Ikenberry Guidelines. The major and only problem exists if the private account allows the Academy to circumvent the Ikenberry Guidelines. A more philosophical issue rests in the construct of institutional neutrality. As UIS has a tradition of engaging in social advocacy, we have more than just a minimal stake in the philosophical debate. However, we cannot close our eyes if the ACLG wants to have elbow room to fund grants, from the private account, which is inappropriate.

Kline stated that he is in agreement with report and comments made. He wished to add that the Ikenberry Guidelines went into effect June 10, 2010. No aberrant behavior or violations of the Guidelines have been found since they have gone into effect. The Ad Hoc committee agrees that although the second account is for administrative purposes, a legal loop-hole seems to exist whereby the account may allow for extra programmatic funding. Therefore, the committee is suggesting the loop-hole be closed so that no question remains.

Chair Ting called for questions. Garmil expressed confusion because the report says that UIS grants are the only ones that follow the Ikenberry Guidelines. Martin clarified by stating that the Ikenberry Guidelines were published in the beginning of June. There are some substantiated allegations that programmatic grants were made outside of the

established guidelines prior to the implementation. Martin asked whether we can hold the ACLG to the guidelines before they went into effect. Kline asserted that he followed the rules. Martin further stated that all interactions between UIS and the ACLG have been in accord with the Ikenberry Guidelines. Garmil asked if anything has been funded since the Guidelines have taken effect. No one knew the answer to this question.

Eisenhart asked about the criteria for the academy. Specifically, she asked if they are funding research grants, or classroom materials. Kline stated that he could only speak of his personal experience. He was unsure what rubrics the committee uses for any grant that he has applied for with funding agency. In this instance, he applied for course development funds, which seemed compatible with the mission of the ACLG. Kline asked and submitted for funding for a course on Liberty Studies to investigate the concept of liberty. Also included in the proposal, was a class called Liberty and Resolutions with Hadley-Ives. Money from the ACLG was awarded to Hadley-Ives for his work on international inspection of revolutions across the globe. Reading were not specified, specific authors were not specified. Paperwork was completed and signatures were attained. ACLG executives met, their deciding body met and the grant was approved.

Fisher, referring back to Boltuc's comments on advocacy asked how the gift rules apply to political advocacy. She talked about the concerns raised relative to individual political advocacy of faculty and wondered what the guidelines might be for the ACLG. Boltuc acknowledged the importance of the question raised by Fisher. According to Boltuc, some confusion exists. This is a reason that the Ad Hoc committee welcomed the hiring of a CEO. Previously, different Board members said different things and were may have been unaware of how U of I works. Some earlier statements may have been justifiably understood. It was made clear that they do not intend to act or want to engage in political advocacy. However, social engagement may be different and appropriate.

In describing his work with the Foundation Center in New York City, Kline asserted that topic areas like peace and sustainability seem to be acceptable across the board for granting agencies. UIS has a speaker fund, not currently being used. Problems arise when professors to actually asked to say something specific in the classroom. This, according to Kline would be beyond the pale. Martin asserted that it is worth noting that this plays into concerns that the Urbana Senate had regarding neutrality. The UIS Ad Hoc committee separated advocacy from engagement.

Sheridan asked if page 2, the 1st bullet point should say purview instead of purvey. Martin said yes, and that the report could be amended at this time. Ting reminded Senators that UIUC senate executive committee passed a resolution calling for the dissolution of the academy from the U of I Foundation. At the same time, they asked that the Foundation return money raised for the academy to them so they could become an independent entity. That resolution was eventually was approved by entire UIUC senate. Before the entire UIUC Senate had an opportunity to vote, the UIUC SEC requested the item be placed on the USC meeting agenda in September. As a result, the USC had a discussion about the resolution. The next day the USC was scheduled to have a meeting with President Hogan. USC drafted its own resolution also calling for the dissolution of

the ACLG from the U of I Foundation, which was passed. Hogan received the resolution and was asked to follow-up. At USC's October meeting, Hogan gave an update. He stated that they are working on it. At this point, we do not know what will happen. Ting asserted that this is a delicate issue. She said that with the endorsement of the UIS senate, she would transmit our report to President Hogan. Ting asserted that our Ad Hoc committee conducted its own independent fact checking. It is unclear if the report will hold relevance at this time. As Senate Chair, Ting believed personally that it is important for us to honor and forward the report to President Hogan. Kline said he put a lot of time into the report. He recused himself from the writing of the report because he has received money from the committee. Kline further stated that it is important that Senators speak their minds regarding their report and if the decision is made not to forward the report that is all part of the process. Martin made a quick correction regarding Kline's statement. Kline received money from the ACLG, not the Ad Hoc committee. Ting affirmed Kline's comments and asserted her intention to seek feedback and Senate endorsement.

Van Vossen informed Senators that the Ad Hoc committee acted very quickly. He highlighted Ting's comments about the relevancy of the document because the USC did not wait for our opinion. He believed it is important to submit. Eisenhart asked whether the Ad Hoc committee investigated the relationship between the ACLG and the U of I Foundation. Martin asserted that most of those concerns were raised a few years ago. According to Martin, the relationship between the two was changed to a tax code, supporting organization. Although the water is somewhat muddled, most of the comments made were before changes were made. Consequently, the Ad Hoc committee focused on the Ikenberry Guidelines and forward in their investigation. Eisenhart asked if the Foundation provided a list of any other supporting organizations that are 509s. Martin stated that ACLG is not the only one, but the Foundation will not give the information.

Boltuc said the Foundation refused to do this when asked by other Senates. The committee knows there are 2 more organizations, but nothing more. According to Martin, Tolliver has done her own PI work, but it is hearsay. Garmil referred to the 5th bullet point pertaining to neutrality verses engagement. He wondered if the point is necessary or prudent, as the charge was to consider the single issue about matters of impropriety. He wondered if we have been taking on enough disagreements with the Urbana campus without raising this issue. Kline acknowledged Garmil's point. Kline went on to talk about the inclusion of point because we were not given a prior opportunity to respond. The statement was an artifact of what was initially sent down. Kline addressed Eisenhart's question regarding the 509a3 status. One of the early concerns was an add mixture of board members. As Kline investigated, he learned there are 3 types of 509a3, with different oversight expectations. The ACLG is a type 1, requiring stringent oversight. One way they have done this historically, was to have U of I Foundation members on the board. This was one way of legally satisfying that requirement.

Boltuc described the history of SSU and the UIS campus as being advocates and engaged citizenship. UIS is special in this way and this is big for us. Boltuc did not support the complete removal because we have a responsibility to support philosophically our institution legacy. Boltuc agreed that it is important to state in a civil and understated

way. Martin highlighted that the tone will is about the importance of raising unintentional consequence. Garmil stated that his concern is with the sentence reading, “UIS's mission of engaged citizenship contrasts the model of neutrality the UIUC senate advocates.” He asserted that we have developed a model to be engaged while also maintaining university neutrality. Garmil requested a friendly amendment to remove the sentence. Boltuc agreed with the friendly amendment.

Fisher commended the Ad Hoc committee for their work. She asked for clarification on the committees report and comments that several problems existed, but have been resolved. Boltuc referred to the preamble of the UIUC resolution which spoke largely to the history. He suggested this was a backwards talking resolution. Although not free of problems, the present situation is different. Martin added that what is and is not resolved is a moving target which is why the Ad Hoc committee chose to look forward not backward. Boltuc asserted that the Ad Hoc committee perceived the Ikenberry report as the compromise reached in June. UIUC Senate also seems be acknowledge this. Additionally, very little time has transpired between the implementation of the Guidelines and now, but no violations have occurred.

Fisher directed attention to the 2nd to last bullet point on page 3 and was unsure what UIS experiences have been with the ACLG before the Senate discussion. After hearing discussion, Fisher wondered if the sentence was a little broad. Kline stated that much discussion and interaction happened between UIS and the UCLG. Interactions included Megginson, Koua, and Willenborg, and administrators. Kline asserted that the process was not binary although he understood what Fisher was stating. Ting suggested striking “whatever the case UIS has had good experiences in working with ACLG so far .” Boltuc suggested striking the entire sentence, based on Fisher’s concerns. The Ad Hoc committee agreed with the friendly amendment.

Ting asked for senate endorsement to transmit the report to President Hogan, with all the amendments and corrections. Switzer seconded the motion. A vote was called. The motion passed with 2 abstentions.

Old business

Resolution 40-13 Amendment to the UIS Campus Senate Bylaws – Creation of Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure as a Standing Committee [2nd reading]

Ballard motioned to discuss resolution 40-13. Owusu-Ansah seconded the motion. Ting stated that the PPC had changed the resolution based on feedback from the previous meeting. At the end of line 37, “any faculty” was added. Hearing no questions, a vote was called. All were in favor of the proposed resolution.

New Business

None

Adjournment

Ting asked for a motion to adjourn. Borland made the motion. Melchin seconded and the meeting adjourned at 11:15.