

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD  
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011  
September 24, 2010  
10:00 AM – 11:55 AM  
PAC Conference Room “G”**

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

**Senators Absent:** L. Bogle, L. Fisher, K. Jamison, R. Melchin, C. Olivier, S. Owusu-Ansah, P. Salela, and P. Wassenberg

**Ex-Officio:** H. Berman

**Guests:** D. Anthony, H. Dell, J. Ermatinger, W. Johnson, J. Kirkham, S. LaFollette, J. Lyon, K. Moranski, K. Murray, L. Pardie and K. Rutherford.

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

**Approval of the day’s agenda**

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Switzer and seconded by Borland.

**Approval of Minutes from Meeting of September 10, 2010**

Van Vossen moved to approve the minutes from September 10, 2010. Schuldt seconded the motion to approve. The minutes were unanimously accepted without any corrections, deletions, or modifications.

**Announcements**

Martin reminded senators of the Star Parties being held every Friday evening at the campus observatory, until October 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Borland announced that she is coordinating a road trip of pre-law students to Drake University on Thursday September 30, 2009. Justice Alito will be speaking.

**Reports**

Chair Ting stated that the Provost needed to leave at 10:30 and would be giving his report first.

**Provost – H. Berman**

Provost Berman stated that he is honored to be selected as Interim Chancellor and plans to continue building on the energy and momentum that has been generated. Berman highlighted the record enrollments, which substantially surpassed the 5,000 student goal. He described the funneling process that occurs within the admissions process and how admissions staff make projections. First, an inquiry is made by a prospective student and then application is made to UIS. Of all of the applicants, not everyone is admitted. Additionally, not everyone who is admitted enrolls in courses. A realistic, conservative projection for Fall 2014 is 5,500 students. The goal is to increase student enrollments by 75 to 100 new students each fall until 2014. In responding to the questions, what do we need to do to support an enrollment of 5,500 students, Berman stated that additional faculty, instructional staff, housing and support staff will increase proportionally to student increase. Currently, UIS housing is full; however, we are still accommodating approximately 45 Lincoln Land students. Going back to presentation the Provost made in the spring regarding the financial status of the campus, a realization exists that more faculty are needed. Looking at the last slide of the presentation, a line graph represents the relationship between increasing the number of students and the need for increasing faculty. Both need to increase, but the slope of the lines are different. We have some capacity if we utilize faculty resources effectively because our student to faculty ratio is considerably lower than other institutions. Provost will continue to share information as movement occurs.

Berman reported that U of I did receive substantial payments from the State of Illinois for FY '10. The university is still owed approximately \$40 million. In August 2009, the state owed U of I \$120 million on its appropriation, which was clear the end of September. All money is being collected in FY '11 to pay what is now owed for FY '10. Provost Berman commented on the September 23, 2010, BOT meeting where two very sobering presentations were made regarding the structural deficit. In the weeks to come, Provost will be talking in more detail with the Budget and Planning Committee and the Senate conversations about the way the next fiscal year is shaping up. The Provost and Chancellor will be meeting with President Hogan during the next week to talk about University level thinking and implications for UIS.

Provost Berman reported that the 6-year graduation rate for the class entering fall 2004 was 67.8%, which is the highest graduation rate to date. The number speaks to progress made relative to student retention. Graduation rate calculations are the same across country. Students who are counted are those who enter as first time freshmen and graduate from the same institution. In comparison to other COPLAC institutions, a large range exists. For example, some institutions are very rural, and offer mostly undergraduate-level curricula. Evergreen State has a 6-year graduation rate of 59%, Southern Oregon in Ashland has a 36% graduation rate, and Truman State's graduation retention rate is 69%. While Truman State has a higher graduation rate, the Provost believes UIS can achieve this goal. The Fall-to-Fall retention rate is 76.15%, which is the highest it has ever been and is a very respectable number.

Provost Berman congratulated the Capital Scholars Honors Program on a successful visit from Thomas King. King is the author of a book used in the Capital Scholars Honors Program.

A reminder was given about the Faculty Scholarly Recognition luncheon on October 13, 2010.

Chair Ting called for questions for the Provost.

Van Vossen asked the Provost if the state has paid UIS for FY '11. Berman said, no, payments for FY '11 have not yet been received.

Kline asked if evidence exists that supports the notion that retention breeds retention. Berman asserted that UIS identified a retention problem a couple of years ago and placed focused attention to the issue in a cross divisional way. As a result of systematic problem solving strategies, progress has been made in the area of student retention.

Martin added a figure from the BOT meeting for the Provost. For FY '11, the State of Illinois owes the U of I \$205 million. The total amount owed for FY '10 and FY '11 is \$245 million.

Chair Ting asked about the class size in terms of faculty-student ratio, based on rankings from *U.S. News and World Report*. She wondered if the calculations are focused on only undergraduate students or both undergraduate and graduate students. Berman repeated the question and stated that he did not know. Moranski stated that the calculations include all students. Ting pointed out that graduate-level courses have lower numbers of students.

Commenting about the accommodations needed to support an increasing number of students over next four years, Ting asked about the preliminary discussions regarding housing. Berman stated that eventually we will need to add both town houses and a residence hall. The master plan includes location for the next residence hall. Apartment style housing can be built relatively quickly. Martin noted that the list of top 10 capital projects presented at the BOT meeting didn't include residence halls and wondered if we would include residence halls in the list for next year. Berman said the residence halls are not considered state capital projects. Residence halls are funded through bonds. Kline stated that the master plan has space for private business and asked if a plan exists for using the space for both housing and business. Berman stated that the land is set aside for business, but there has been some talk about apartments as well. Ting noted that we do not own that property, but the foundation owns the property. Berman reported that previously there have not been enough students to support business; however, this is changing. Referring to the master plan, Berman talked about discussions regarding senior citizen housing by the soccer fields, on the northeast side of campus.

**Chair – T. Ting**

Ting stated that at the last senate meeting she had reported on the suspension of the CARR committee, in order to re-examine structure and charges. This semester, an undergraduate advising task force will be created to address growing complexity and issues involved in the undergraduate advising processes. The recommendation for the task force came from the report submitted by CARR last spring. Committee membership and committee charges were finalized at the last SEC meeting, in consultation with Vice Chancellor Barnett.

The task force membership will include: Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Moranski, who will chair the task force; four faculty or chair representatives so each college will be represented; an undergraduate student; a representative from Undergraduate Advising Center; an online coordinator representative; a representative from the Office of Admissions; and a representative from Records and Registration. A total of 10 members will be on the task force. They are being charged to submit their report, along with recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee by March 30, 2011, and to report to the full Senate on April 8, 2011.

Ting stated that Martin will be submitting his report as faculty observer for the September BOT meeting that was held in Champaign. Ting also said the BOT submitted a proposal regarding title realignment for U of I Chancellors. The proposal is to add the title of Vice President to the title of Chancellor. The proposal will be submitted to the Senates Conference and then to each campus senate for review. November 18<sup>th</sup> is the next BOT meeting and each campus needs to respond to the proposal by then.

No questions were presented to Chair Ting.

#### **Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen**

Van Vossen stated that the next SGA meeting is scheduled for Sunday, September 26, 2010. The Fall election was conducted Wednesday and Thursday, and the election results will be announced later today. All new and continuing members will vote on the student fee moratorium at the next SGA meeting.

#### **Proposed Graduate Council Charges AY 2010-2011 – S. LaFollette**

Ting introduced LaFollette. LaFollette stated that two amendments had been made to the document. On line 10, the words “graduate curriculum” were added based on recommendations from SEC. Additionally, LaFollette reported that the governance table had been added to the list of charges since the first report had been submitted. Therefore, a charge was added to section 3 about the monitoring of sustainability and functionality of the governance table.

Ting asked for an update on graduate education task force because it had not been formed last year. Chair Ting said that she understood that Associate Vice Chancellor Pardie has been working diligently on the task. LaFollette stated that the Graduate Council has been working on the solidification of membership. Atul Agarwal from MIS, Carolyn Peck from HMS, Elizabeth Ribarsky from Communication, Tosha Cantrell-Bruce from PAD,

Christine Ross from the Library, and a graduate student from MIS. Pardie stated that the approved members are scheduled to meet every couple of weeks throughout the semester. Ting asked Pardie to remind senators what is expected to be completed by the graduate education task force this year. Pardie stated that a major focus is on the graduate handbook. The task force will solicit information and feedback from departments. A recommended draft will be submitted by the end of the academic year. Ting clarified that if everything goes well we should expect to have an approved graduate student handbook starting Fall 2012. Pardie said this is possible. Lafollette said that they are anticipating policy revisions and additions. For example, currently there aren't any policies regarding graduate certificates.

Ting asked if any feedback has been given relative to the proposed governance level chart for curricular changes. Lafollette affirmed that they have received feedback and are working on the issues.

### **General Education Council Annual Report AY 2009-2010 – H. Dell**

Ting introduced Heather Dell, chair of General Education Council (GEC). Dell stated that it had been a very busy year for GEC. She stated that 34 courses were approved in AY 2009-2010. Two proposals had been withdrawn by folks who were retiring. No courses were denied. She reported the committee has great deal of work and are learning more and more about other disciplines. Another item submitted was a preliminary proposal that has not yet been circulated on campus. The proposal is to reduce the number of Comparative Societies requirements from one to two, and to introduce Freshman Seminar and potentially retire the elective. GEC will be holding forums with Undergraduate Council and are wanting feedback by October 15. She has benefited greatly from information shared by those who teach Comparative Societies. GEC will continue working on Math requirements this year.

Ting called for questions. Borland supported the idea of a required freshman seminar and asked if there had been decisions about how it will be handled by different departments. Dell stated that final decisions had not yet been made, which is why the proposed list of courses were proposed. The hope is to meet the individual needs of departments and establish consistency regarding skills built. The seminar is about promoting student success and retention. Moranski added that it will work as any general education category would work. Criteria will be developed by GEC and faculty will propose courses within the category. Boltuc asked that special situations be considered in the development. Dell said that this is the reason the open forums are being held and hopes to work with faculty during the transition. Boltuc stated that sometimes classes fit within general education category but do not fit with remaining categories. Garmil asked if GEC is planning to planning to come to EXS-L to solicit feedback. Dell said yes. Garmil also noted that there are at least three departments that do not get their needs met through EXS-L. Moranski referred to the bottom of page six which does talk about receiving feedback from service learning programs. Ting wanted to clarify that bullet point six, which referred to the removal of 400-level courses, only refers to courses that existed before our current general education curriculum. Moranski agreed that it applies to courses developed prior to 2006. She stated that lower division general education courses are

largely 100- and 200-level courses and emphasized that it is the attribute that will change for the 400-level courses. The courses will still exist, but will not be attached to general education. Historically, a concern arose about how to accommodate students who transfer in with 60 or 90 hours of transfer credit and general education deficiencies. While the number of students in this situation is decreasing, the 300-level courses will continue to meet this need. Ting asked whether the general education attributes include the ECCE category. Moranski said that was totally separate. Ting also asked if there is any information about the proposal to include foreign languages in general education. Moranski said not at this time.

### **Old business**

#### **Resolution 40-3 Modifications in Workload for Non-Tenure Track Faculty [2nd reading]**

A motion was made by Casinova to discuss 40-3. Wang seconded the motion. Anthony reported that the committee discussed the issues raised at last senate meeting and added language to clarify the expectations more specifically for non-tenure track faculty teaching a 4-4 load. Chair Ting asked for questions or discussion. Garmil asked about the implementation process. He wondered how the decision will be made and if it will be made at the time of hire. He asked whether the decision intended to be made by the department and/or in consultation with dean. Ting said the decision will begin at the department level and then with the dean.

Boltuc asked how we will know if the 10% limit is enforceable. Ting stated the dean will keep track. Garmil asked if this is university wide. Ting said it is not a university wide number, rather a college percentage. Martin stated that if each college is at 10%, the university percentage will also be 10%. Ting said it depends on how the number is calculated. Boltuc asked why we would have limitations for non-tenure track faculty when this does not exist for tenured and tenure-track faculty. He asserted that this is an artificial and will tie the hands of deans, administration and also may not be good for departments. Anthony stated that limitations are important for ensuring teaching quality and potential imbalance of bargaining power. Boltuc asked to amend the resolution by removing the sentence on line 31 stating, "Four-course workloads for non-tenure track faculty shall not exceed three course preparations per semester" from the resolution. Boltuc's rationale for excluding the sentence was twofold: (1) there may be situations in which it is in the best interest of the department to have a non-tenure track faculty member to teach more courses, and (2) tenured and tenure-track faculty do not have this restriction. Sheridan seconded the amendment.

Garmil expressed opposition to the amendment and agreed with the committee's decision because of bargaining power. He noted the major difference in ability to refuse teaching additional courses between tenured, tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty. Kline raised a question about the reduced service and scholarship expectation. Garmil stated that he does not agree that service is equivalent to a new course preparation and not all service is equal. Wang asked to discuss the original proposal. Martin called a point of order because the amendment was on the table. Switzer agreed with Garmil and the intention of the committee when thinking about a person continually coming up for

renewal. It is important that they should have bargaining power regarding course preparation expectation.

Kline stated that in the tenure review and appointment renewal that anywhere between 30-40% of time is allotted for service and scholarship. He asked if there is equivalence when removing a service and scholarship expectation and teaching courses that do not require new preparation. Martin suggested there is an unspoken issue relative to equity and fairness of compensation, which has nothing to do with bill being addressed. He acknowledged that there is wisdom in including the last sentence, but it does eliminate some flexibility. Boltuc supported the fact that non-tenure should have bargaining power but believed the sentence removes bargaining power as it deprives faculty from being able to teach. Garmil stated that service and scholarship are not denied of non-tenure track people; however, those are not generally judged on renewal. Ting confirmed that non-tenure track faculty with a 4-4 load are not being evaluated on service and scholarship at the same level. Eisenhart emphasized that non-tenure track faculty make less money than tenure track faculty. Kline commented on the intention of the PPC to address the issue of quality of teaching. He emphasized that if this were true, tenured and tenure-track faculty cannot provide the same quality either. Sheridan reiterated that if the language remains as it is, we are saying you have to be a faculty member in order to teach 4 courses with quality. Villegas asked if there a way to appeal the decision if the proposed policy passes. Ting said that we need to follow the policies that are in place; however, if the policy is not working, it can be revised through governance process. Zhang noted the difference between four course preparations and a four course load.

Ting asked if the senators were ready to vote on the amendment to eliminate the proposed sentence from the resolution. In a show of hands, seven senators were in favor of the amendment, 8 senators voted nay, and 2 abstained from the vote. The amendment was defeated.

Switzer asked whether or not most non-tenure track faculty are expected to produce scholarship. Berman stated that historically the expectation has been ambiguous. Currently, the norm is not to have scholarship expectation. Switzer then asked if non-tenure track faculty were asked to teach a fourth course if they would receive overload pay for their work. Berman said they would not be compensated monetarily, but would receive a reduction in workload. Switzer suggested that this could be creating two classes of faculty. Tenure track faculty who are compensated and non-tenure track faculty who do not. Secondly, she shared a concern about the possibility of tenure track faculty abusing non-tenure track faculty by refusing to teach difficult or undesirable classes, which will then become the responsibility of the non-tenure track instructor. She then suggested that if a dean was only looking at bottom line it may be tempting to hire clinical instructors to teach 4-4 loads, instead of tenure stream faculty until the 10% cap was reached. Martin agreed with Switzer's concern if finance was the only consideration. However, he stated that this would be a very short sided position that does not consider student retention, university rankings and the types of students electing to attend the university.

Wang asked a question regarding amendment. Ting called on Ermatinger. He acknowledged concerns raised by Switzer but noted that if a dean was only concerned with the fiscal aspect, he/she would not hire instructors and would only hire adjuncts. Strategically, it is better to reduce the number of adjuncts who are teaching the courses and create a community to help students. He agreed that fairness is an issue that needs some flexibility. Optimally, a system will be created whereby instructors can become a part of community. Switzer agreed with the difference between adjuncts and instructors. Her biggest concern is that if we can have non-tenure track faculty teaching 4 courses, they should be compensated for the extra course they teach. Anthony stated that as of last fall every college already has reached the 10% of instructors teaching a 4-4 load. Garmil asked whether there are any plans to convert people who are currently teaching a three course load to a 4-4 load. Berman stated that the resolution creates flexibility to deans when appropriate and will assist tenure track and tenured faculty. Ting said that she does not know whether an instructor salary is vastly different from a tenure track faculty. Salary is contingent upon experience and the field within which instructors are hired. Ting seconded the Provost's point that this resolution actually helps tenured and tenure track faculty because it may release tenure track faculty from teaching overloads. She acknowledged that there are different sides of policy.

Ting asked if Wang wanted to put his amendment on the floor. He said that he would like to make the amendment to provide compensation for non-tenure track faculty teaching more than three course preparations. Senators discussed the appropriate wording of the amendment. Ting suggested the insertion of, "additional course work or course preparation will require additional compensation" to end of the sentence on line 32. Eisenhart seconded the amendment. Sheridan and Borland asked why the language would be included if the policy will not allow for this situation to occur. Martin stated that the amendment would be unenforceable. Kline disagreed with what Martin stated because the original intent is to compensate through reduction of service. Borland called to question on the amendment and Martin seconded the call. The vote yielded 2 favorable votes, 12 nays, and 4 abstentions.

Switzer asked if she could raise an amendment, but withdrew.

Ting called for discussion of main motion. Harry reminded the senators of the work done by the PPC. They deliberated both the pros and cons of the policy and investigated the expectations, the issue of exploitation, and needs of institution. He asked that senators give consideration to colleagues who have created the policy. Cisneros asked for clarification. Berman stated that the intention is to give flexibility to the deans, in certain circumstances, for certain kinds of course.

Helton stated that the resolution restrains deans but allows the potential for hiring a certain number of instructors to teach 4-4 loads. The policy provides a balance. If we have nothing there are no restraints and more exploitation is going to occur as the budget gets tighter. Helton supports the resolution and acknowledged the great work of the PPC. Ermatinger highlighted that without the policy, instructors who teach 3-3 load will also be reviewed based on teaching, scholarship, and service. This policy removes part of that

expectation. Eisenhart asked a hypothetical question about the hiring of an instructor who may also have an appointment outside. For example, she asked how the review process will occur if director of x center and is also an instructor in a department. Ting stated that as long as they are not 4 course loads they are expected to do whatever service or other areas required. Martin seconded Helton's thoughts. A vote was called on the resolution. Seventeen senators favored the resolution, 1 opposed, and no one abstained from the vote and the resolution passed.

**Resolution 40-4 Designation of Scholar in Residence [2nd reading]**

Sheridan motioned to discuss resolution 40-4. Villegas seconded the motion. Ting called for discussion. Anthony reported that the PPC included language for online faculty as well as on-ground faculty to address issues that had been raised during the last meeting. Additionally, language was added to include non tenure track faculty as well as adjunct faculty. Boltuc thanked Anthony for the inclusion of "online" in the resolution. Eisenhart moved the resolution; Martin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion carried.

**New business**

**Resolution 40-9 Clarification of Review Cycle for Non-Tenure Track Faculty [1st reading]**

Sheridan motioned to begin the discussion of 40-9. Wang seconded the motion. Anthony stated that there is a minor change to article 5, section 1 of the personnel policies to clarify that the review cycle is for all tenure track faculty. "Non" was removed from the title and "tenure track" was inserted in line 1 as a replacement for "non-tenured." Chair Ting called for questions or discussion. Senators did not have any questions or discussion points regarding the proposed changes.

**Resolution 40-10 Revision of Procedures for Reappointment Review [1st reading]**

Ballard made a motion to discuss resolution 40-10. Borland seconded the motion. Ting asked if Anthony would like to provide information. Anthony stated that concern had been identified regarding a gap in the review process. Faculty members on probationary status were receiving comments during the two-and four-year review letters that department chairs were not made aware of in a timely fashion. This information is important as department chairs in a position to support and mentor non-tenured faculty. The resolution closes the gap by ensuring that letters are sent to the faculty member, personnel file, and department chair at each level of review.

Ting asked for questions or discussion. Eisenhart asked to make a friendly amendment to remove "said" as adjective in lines 5 and 10 of first page. Anthony accepted the friendly amendment.

Sisneros raised concern regarding inconsistencies that occur in the language. He also expressed reservations about the implications of including a mentoring role for department chairs, without an explicit understanding of what the third "whereas" represents. Sisneros also stated that he is uncomfortable with the idea of letters resting in hands of the chair, which he says creates a secondary personnel file. Kline asserted that it is important during the tenure and review process, for the department chair to know if a

candidate has weaknesses that emerge from dean and provost levels. Sisneros stated that the chair does see the recommendations during the spring merit review process. Switzer stated that the process does not happen that way in CLAS. She said that a chair would not see the review letters until next review process. Ting emphasized that each college has different process. Berman also stated that review process of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is not completed until end of April. Timing is critical at second and fourth year reviews and very important for chairs to know, at that time, what feedback has been given so he/she may provide guidance regarding what needs to be done. Ting said that Sisneros raised a good point about implications that chairs provide mentorship which needs clarification. Sisneros stated that it will be critical to explicitly clarify the mentoring expectations of the chair. Boltuc asked whether the chair would be expected or allowed to share the file. Berman suggested that the role of the department chair also be examined for the second reading. Ting clarified that because someone is department chair, it does not mean he or she will be the chair of the department level personnel committee.

**Resolution 40-11 Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment (USC OT-259) [1st reading]**

Martin made a motion to discuss 40-11. Switzer seconded the motion. Ting stated that this policy is for the entire U of I, from the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Each campus had faculty and administrators who participated in the most recent revisions of the policy. Professor Keith Miller, Grants Contract Officer Deb Koua, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education Pardie represented UIS on the committee. Pardie stated that she came to process rather late and the campus committees did a nice job. The current conflict of interest policy was adopted in 1996. Work on updating the policy and making clarifications began in 2007. The most recent proposal was reorganized and expanded for clarity. Ting stated that this resolution will come back next meeting for approval. She will email entire faculty to raise attention to this policy. Senators are encouraged to talk with faculty and compile feedback from constituents. At the next senate meeting we will compile comments and vote on the resolution. Ting also discussed the addendum forwarded from the Vice President of Academic Affairs for consideration with the next meeting.

**Adjournment**

Van Vossen motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ballard seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 11:56.