

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD  
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011  
October 22, 2010  
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM  
PAC Conference Room “G”**

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

**Senators Absent:** K. Sheridan

**Ex-Officio:** H. Berman

**Guests:** D. Anthony, D. Bertaina, D. Brown, S. Cordell, B. Hayler, D Larson, K. Moranski, L. Pardie, K. Rutherford and E. Wojcicki.

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

**Approval of the day’s agenda**

Fisher moved to approve the agenda and Cassinova seconded the motion.

**Approval of Minutes from Meeting of October 8, 2010**

Salela moved and Zhang seconded the motion to approve the minutes from October 8, 2010. Boltuc reported that his name had been misspelled. He asked that the word “not” be removed from line 374 and that lines 436 and 437 be corrected. Senators unanimously voted to approve the minutes with the suggested corrections and modifications.

**Announcements**

None

**Reports**

**Chair – T. Ting**

Ting had 2 items to report. (1) The Undergraduate Advising Task Force met for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time on October 21. Associate Vice Chancellor Moranski has been copying Ting on the agenda and the task force is doing very well. Ting expressed her gratitude for Moranski’s leadership. (2) The Ad Hoc Committee on the Academy on Capitalism and Limited

Government Foundation has concluded its inquiry and is working on a report for the Campus Senate. The report will be discussed at the SEC meeting before proceeding to the Senate.

**Provost – H. Berman**

Berman announced that the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs position will be filled by Dr. Lynn Pardie. This decision was made after extensive consultation with the SEC, Deans, and other administrators. Berman noted that the official title is consistent with the proposed changes to be discussed later in the senate meeting. Pardie was acknowledged and congratulated by senators. Pardie has served with excellence as Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Education and Research. Dr. Cecilia Cornell, from the Department of History will be assuming many responsibilities of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Education. She currently directs the Whitney M. Young Graduate Fellowship Program, which is within the Provost's office. Taking the responsibilities for the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects will be Dr. John Barker, from the Philosophy Department. Barker will assume the administrative tasks that Pardie and Koua had been responsible for previously. Additionally, Leslie Defrates, Assistant to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Education will also take on additional responsibilities. An official notice will be going out to the UIS campus during the Senate meeting.

The budgetary situation remains consistent. The U of I is still owed \$30 million of the \$743 million on the FY10 appropriations. No payments have been received for FY '11 to date. By the end of October, the University will be owed approximately \$350 million against this year's appropriation. Berman stated that the desktop refresh program has promoted administrative streamlining, cost reduction, and efficiency. The program provides a set replacement schedule for computers every four years. This year, 110 computers have been replaced with 95 percent of users opting for the standard configuration. IT has been working with faculty and staff who require more individualized technology. The program has created a savings of \$150 per work station, which amounts to a total savings of \$15,000. Unintended positive consequences of this initiative include much more one-to-one interaction between IT staff and faculty and staff. Additionally, the IT staff has been able to be much more efficient in the work it does because of standardized installation processes.

Berman asked Rutherford to distribute the report from the International Dialogue that occurred on October 1, 2010. Thirty-three faculty and staff discussed International Programming in its various manifestations. UIS wants to provide opportunities for our native students to learn more about the world through study abroad and other international experiences and to bring more international students to UIS. Goals and strategies are provided in the report. Berman highlighted two primary areas of emphasis: (1) coordination, and (2) communication. Other important initiatives include: faculty development, curricular development, international student recruitment and retention efforts, and student life issues. Barnett and Pardie will co-chair a group to move this forward over the next months.

Next week UIS is hosting a very distinguished delegation of people from Harbin University of Science and Technology. The President of the University, along with five other administrators and faculty, will be at UIS. Berman stated he is pleased about emerging relationship with this institution.

Last weekend was the UIS 40 year celebration. Berman stated that the event was very successful. Olivier was acknowledged for his outstanding job as MC of the event. The Theater Department will be presenting in the Studio Theater beginning this weekend the Heidi Chronicles..

Provost Berman reminded senators that as State of Illinois employees, we all must complete the ethics training.

WUIS is concluding its biannual fundraising campaign. Tonight, David Sedaris will be performing in the Sangamon Auditorium.

Ting called for questions. Fisher asked for an update on Deb Koua's replacement. Pardie stated that the search is moving along very well. Candidates will be coming to campus soon. A schedule, which will include an open forum, will be provided as plans progress.

Boltuc commented on the UIS international initiatives, and believes this is a very good initiative. He noted that no one of international status is represented within the administrative structure.

Casinova asked if it is possible for students to go through ethics training. Berman referred Cassinova to the UIS Ethics Officer, Donna McNeely.

Ting congratulated Pardie and confirmed that her interim appointment will begin in January. For the next two months, Berman will fill his current position as VCAA/Provost, as well as the interim Chancellor position.

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

Van Vossen reported that SGA decided not to support the \$2 student fee cut because it would strain SGA budget too much. Other ideas are being generated. Van Vossen met UIUC SGA President, David Olsen, to discuss the proposed revisions to the University Statutes and General Rules. Olsen is still undecided about the proposed changes. Ting called for questions. Garmil asked what concerns were raised by Olsen.

Van Vossen stated that Olsen believed his role is to remain neutral; however, Olsen is planning a campus-wide student forum which may inform his thinking.

#### **Committee on Assessment of Student Learning – S. Cordell**

Ting welcomed Cordell, Chair of CASL. Cordell was invited to introduce senators to the new CASL website and provide a report. Cordell acknowledged Bertaina, who assisted in the presentation. Bertaina stated that the website was activated approximately two weeks ago and follows the UIS format. Cordell expressed her pleasure with the website. Last year, the committee worked to create the content, and formulate workshops. Cordell and Bertaina went through the content of the website with senators. Of particular interest was

the “schedule” tab which provides information regarding the assessment status report schedule and its use. Each program is represented. The third year assessment report is now part of the review schedule. CASL is trying to be proactive with each program and will assist programs in the assessment process. The website will be updated continuously. Cordell highlighted the bibliography and links to other UIS pages. A series of audio workshops have been produced by CASL members and are available on the website. Making the assessment process less onerous is a primary goal of CASL. Any questions about assessment can be directed to Cordell.

Berman thanked and congratulated Cordell and the committee. He underscored the importance of accountability. Ting asked Cordell to go back to assessment schedule. She referred to the resolution passed by the Campus Senate last year and asked for clarification regarding the third year assessment process. Moranski stated that the assessment report schedule will be reorganized to reduce confusion. Ting asked whether CASL has checked with all Department Chairs about the review process. Cordell reported that she has contacted the first three departments coming up for review immediately. Garmil asked for direction if a program is missing from the list. Cordell asked Garmil to send her an email and said the omission will be corrected. Ting stated the reconfiguration of the assessment schedule would be very helpful. Eisenhart asked if CASL is the appropriate place to receive guidance during the self-study year. Cordell encouraged Eisenhart to talk with her. Moranski stated that a training session will be held for folks writing the self-study.

### **Old Business**

#### **Resolution 40-10 Revision of Procedures for Reappointment Review [2nd reading]**

Van Vossen moved to discuss resolution 40-10. . Bogle seconded the motion. Ting called for discussion and said that Anthony was present to answer questions. Sisneros stated that he is in support of the resolution and expressed appreciation for the responsiveness to his concerns during the first review. Referring to Article 5, Section 3, Sisneros asked if “each level” includes the department. If the department is included in “each level,” line 17 should also include the department. Another point of clarification regarding lines 53 and 56 was requested, in light of the change made to lines 23 and 24 regarding the role of the Department Chair. Sisneros asked if the Chair should also receive a copy of the faculty member’s comments (line 53) and whether room exists for the Chair to provide comments if s/he disagrees with the recommendations (line 56). Ting said that would mean that the Chair, by himself or herself, would have a letter about the candidate, in addition to the Department Personnel Committee. Sisneros asked if the Chair should take a more active role and to provide the letter.

Ting asked Anthony to provide information relative to the intent. Anthony stated that the intent of the resolution is to provide the Department Chair with information s/he may not otherwise have when feedback is given. It was not anticipated that whatever faculty response is generated would also go to the Chair. Sisneros stated that he holds a different concept of what it means to keep a Chair “in the loop.” Anthony asserted that the faculty member is free to share whatever response with the Department Chair if s/he chooses. Kline said he understood the purpose of this resolution was assurance that the

Department Chair receives the letter from the Dean. He suggested that a different resolution may be in order to clarify the role of the Department Chair in the process. Sisneros asked why we would do a partial fix. Switzer acknowledged Sisneros' point, but suggested that the Chair could incorporate his/her comments in the Departmental letter. Sisneros asserted that new information should be allowable after the Dean's feedback. Switzer stated that her understanding of the resolution was to inform the Department Chair of concerns, so s/he can assist the faculty member to address the concerns through the following year and a half review process. Fisher noted that incorporating Sisneros' recommendations would create a formal role for the Chair that does not currently exist. Fisher went on to discuss the variability of leadership within Departments and suggested that ideally, faculty will reach out for mentorship if they receive concerning feedback. Ting then called for the vote. The resolution passed unanimously.

**Resolution 40-12 Policy on Definition and Criteria for Graduate Level Certificates at UIS [2nd reading]**

Garmil moved to discuss and Olivier seconded the motion. Given the dearth of questions or comments, Eisenhart proposed a call to question. The resolution passed unanimously.

**Proposed Amendments to the *Statutes* and *The General Rules* from the Board of Trustees to Effect Streamlining of University Administration & Operations (USC ST-75/GR-44) [to be discussed]**

Olivier moved to discuss the proposed amendments to the Statutes and The General Rules. Martin seconded. Ting reminded senators that the proposed revisions initiated by the BOT do not require a vote for approval by the Senate. It is only when amendments are initiated by the Senate that two readings and a vote are required. Last year the BOT asked for input regarding changes to the Presidential and Chancellor executive titles in the *Statutes*. After discussion, UIS Campus Senate provided input to the University Senates Conference, and from there to the President and the BOT, which assisted the decision making process. As a result, the only change made was to the President.

Ting reminded senators that the proposed changes did not come from President Hogan as the new president. Changes were initiated by the Board in an effort to create a strong and coherent University of Illinois. Initial discussions promoted the adoption of the Michigan Model, which would have resulted in the merging of President and UIUC Chancellor positions and then the thinking evolved to the merging of the Chancellor and Provost/VCAA positions at the campus level. Along the way, the BOT and then President Ikenberry were seeking input from faculty leadership and administrators. At that time, Ting reached out to Ikenberry and provided 12 points addressing the idea of merging the Chancellor and Provost/VCAA positions and the long-term un-sustainability of such a merged position. Discussions at University Senates Conference and BOT meetings have revolved around the idea of creating synergy between campuses this past year. Referring to the University General Rules, Ting read the following to senators:

“ARTICLE I. UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION  
SECTION 1. THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CAMPUS

The role of the University of Illinois in the state as a leader in public graduate and professional education rests upon its organic wholeness. It is not a loose federation of universities, nor is it a system of totally independent units. The mission to which the University is committed, and upon which its development thus far has been based, starts with an emphasis on the fundamental responsibility of the University as a whole. The specific contributions that each campus makes to the University's mission are diverse, since they reflect the needs and methodologies appropriate to different settings; but the campuses are alike in the broad nature of their public responsibilities, in their basic educational policies, and in their institutional quality; and they are integrated by a University-wide organization designed to maximize their educational effectiveness and the efficient use of their academic resources.

The campuses of the University of Illinois share common goals, even though each makes a highly differentiated contribution to the University's mission. The campuses are assisted and strengthened by intercampus cooperation and by University-wide services, while carrying out their academic functions with a high degree of delegated authority. The campuses are expected to achieve intercampus cooperation, to avoid unnecessary duplication, and to develop missions responsible to their particular orientation and setting, and to build upon and to foster faculty and staff strengths and initiatives. The campuses are encouraged to operate at qualitatively equivalent levels, even though each of them provides different services for varied clientele.”

Ting stated that the senate’s goal in reviewing the proposal is to decide whether or not the proposed amendments have merits in meeting the aforementioned mission to create a strong, coherent university. This sentiment does not appear to be shared by UIUC. In the media coverage of the discussion on the Urbana campus, UIUC SGA President raised the question regarding how the “one university three campuses” model will reduce the value of their degrees earned from the Urbana campus. President Hogan’s FAQ responds to many of the questions raised. Ting expressed her concerns about such attitudes. In a meeting between the UIUC Senate and President Hogan, UIUC faculty leadership expressed that the U of I is UIUC and that Chicago and Springfield are “supporting” campuses. In sharing this information, Ting wanted to inform senators of the differences that exist in the starting points. While Ting does not know what other campuses will do, she suggested that UIS Senate examine the proposal for its merits and provide rationales for support or concerns regarding the proposal. She suggested the discussion proceed section by section.

Wassenberg stated that she was going to support the proposed changes and wanted the record to indicate that the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings for UIS have remained strong. Ting thanked Wassenberg and reiterated that she is not trying to create hostility toward the other campuses. It is important not to denigrate what other campuses are doing. If any one campus is doing well, this is good for the university as a whole. Sisneros asked for the timeline for the discussion and process. Ting hoped the senate would be able to formulate the response to the BOT after today’s discussion. If such is

the case, she will first draft the response based on input received and seek feedback and approval from SEC next week. On November 5, Senate will formally endorse the document which will be forwarded to the University Senates Conference, and then to the BOT. Sisneros suggested using the FAQ as the basis of discussion. Ting stated that the FAQ covered a number of different topics and wanted to focus according to the three proposed changes. Fisher noted that former Chancellor Ringeisen was recorded as stating that the changes may affect our search for a new Chancellor and she was curious about the search committee's response. Ting said that she did not know where he got that idea. The concern was with the proposed merging of the Chancellor and Provost/VCAA positions. The search firm says that adding the Vice President title will actually help to increase the pool. Sisneros stated that it was unfortunate that the outgoing Chancellor was on the radio the day he left town saying that the proposed change was "confusing."

Kline wished to emphasize that clarifying a chain of command is important for aligning interests. Martin agreed with Kline and noted that several examples exist where a Chancellor has overstepped bounds. Van Vossen supported the change and wished to highlight that within the realignment, that the powers and responsibilities of the Chancellor are not being substantively enhanced or diminished. Van Vossen stated that the change is symbolic. Ting added that the change does go beyond the symbolic. Although adding the VP title does not fundamentally change the duties and responsibilities of the Chancellor, it will re-affirm the Chancellor's role as a University Officer. Within the role, the Chancellor will be working for promoting the development of the entire University. Eisenhart said that she raised her concerns at the meeting with President Hogan, but supports the BOT in their efforts to try to resolve some major problems. If this does not help to remedy the problem, something else can be tried. The proposed change in title will not hurt the UIS campus.

Helton stated that she believes the changes will clarify roles and responsibilities, but there are also deeper structural implications. Additionally, she would like for UIS to not be perceived as the "ornery step-child." Ting pointed out that UIC joined the U of I system in 1982 and is still being treated poorly. Garmil stated that he has received a general sense of support here at UIS. Ting stated that adding the VP ensures that equality occurs between Chancellors and other VPs of the U of I.

Sisneros referred to the FAQ and how each Senate is being asked to provide an inventory of benefits and risks. He said that we are being told this does not constitute more top-down approach, nor is centralization the goal. He pointed out that the concentration of power in the President's office will hold implications for governance. Ting asked Sisneros to clarify how centralization will occur. Sisneros stated that concentration of power assumes centralization and requested that senators think about the implications of this.

Owasu-Ansah referred to the organizational chart on page 9 of the report. According to the given structure, the Chief Internal Auditor reports directly to the President. As it is, the office of the Chief Internal Auditor has no authority to provide oversight. Owasu-Ansah suggested that this officer should report to someone higher. Ting asserted that the

only senior administrator being added is the Vice President of Health Affairs, which is not a sweeping change to the existing UA structure, and that the Chief Internal Auditor is not discussed in the proposed changes. Martin suggested that the complaint is about something that already exists. Owusu-Ansah wanted to address this issue in the discussion. Ting said that even though the chart does not reflect it, the Chief Internal Auditor already reports to the president and BOT. Ting appreciated the comments, but wished to focus the comments on the proposed revisions. Eisenhart suggested that if a senate concern exists, it has to emerge in a resolution to the University Senates Conference.

In response to the comments regarding the centralization of power, Van Vossen stated that no new powers are going to the Chancellor nor the President. No additional checks are being placed on the Chancellor. Sisneros stated that this is difficult to interpret based on document, given the direct line from the Chancellor to the President. Ting asserted that this has always been the case as stated in the *Statutes* that the chancellors report directly to the president. Garmil suggested that the problem in past regarding run-around will be remedied by the change. Ting emphasized that the only new position is the VP for Health Affairs. The reporting line remains the same. Kline posited that a distinction is not being made between formal and informal power. Formally, this is trying to re-establish an equilibrium that should exist. Ting suggested that accountability is an important aspect of clarifying the chain of command.

Schuldt stated that the concerns exist relative to doing away with duplication and triplication and the possibilities of increased bureaucratic procedures. As the BOT has demanded that we reduce costs, it is important to provide consistent feedback on the results of the proposal. Ting reminded senators about Hall's question to President Hogan regarding the Vice President for Research, Technology, and Economic Development. Hall had asked if an effect of having VPRTEED might be increased bureaucracy, and Hogan said it is not to add another layer of bureaucracy. The point is to provide better coordination and identify opportunities. Schuldt stated that sometimes processes and procedures that work well at large institutions do not work as well at smaller institutions. Looking at the details as they come will be important. Ting referred to the report given by Provost Berman on the desktop refresh program, which came from the efforts of administrative review. Fisher supported Schuldt's emphasis on the importance of feedback from campuses when it comes to implementation. She asked that in our report to the BOT, we express the importance of seeking feedback and would like a robust feedback mechanism. Using the example of the global campus as an example of inefficiency, she stated that central administration has not always taken feedback seriously. Mechanisms described for how feedback will be solicited and utilized would be wonderful. Martin talked about the spirit of changes. He asserted that the spirit of the change is to try to remove people from situations where they are trying to defend their turf. Decisions will be made in a better way if we are thinking more holistically. Fisher stated that feedback will be an important part of that process.

Boltuc supported the comments and concerns raised by Van Vossen, Sisneros, and Schuldt. He also supported the addition of the points made by Owusu-Ansah. Deanie

Brown made a clarification about the history of the UIC campus, stating that it existed in 1963 and joined with the medical center in 1983.

After seeking consensus from the senators, Ting confirmed that UIS Senate will support the title re-alignment proposal with an understanding that the intention is to create a clearer chain of command. However, this does not amount to top-down structure nor does it add more bureaucracy. Fisher suggested we add a statement about welcoming the idea that Chancellors will be perceived more as a university-wide leadership team.

Ting called for discussion regarding the proposed extension of the Portfolio for the Vice President for Technology and Economic Development and re-titling of the position to VP for Research, Technology, and Economic Development (VPRTED). Eisenhart raised a concern regarding the historical connection between academic affairs and scholarship. Moving research out from under Academic Affairs may not serve those within the humanities or social sciences. Ting asked someone to locate the *General Rules* on the description for VPAA. Ting asserted that the primary motivation for the proposed changes is to increase coordination for research as well as research funds. Martin referred to the Administrative Review and Restructuring Report (ARR) and asserted that currently, the VPTED has a very light portfolio. The ARR suggested something totally different. Garmil shared the current VPAA description in the *General Rules* which does not have references to research or scholarship.

Eisenhart reinforced her belief that scholarship should be housed within the academy. Martin suggested that the point is to provide facilitation and coordination between campuses. Ting stated that adding Research to the VP title is tied to securing federal grants, NSF funding, NIH funding, etc. Those are the kinds of research funding sources we need to increase. The idea is the VP at a central level will facilitate and target federal grants and create a general pot of money from the overheads for which any faculty can apply.

Kline talked about the possibility that setting the research agenda could shift focus of the position. He suggested that we address the concern by suggesting a connection between the office of the VPTED and VPAA. Additionally, Kline raised a question about the possibility that one's status as a Research I institution is affected by how many grants are obtained. While proposals of equal validity may be submitted, they may not have equal validity on each of the campuses. A Research I institution may then receive priority. Understanding this dynamic is important to understand the impact on rankings and status. Ting referred to the FAQ page 7 which states,

***“With respect to the addition of “Research” to the title of Vice-President for Research, Technology and Economic Development, how would that position impact research in those disciplinary areas that are unrelated to technology and economic development?”***

Most universities like ours have a Vice President for Research whose portfolio also includes economic development and technology transfer. The Board is proposing that the University of Illinois Vice President overseeing this domain

have all three functions articulated in the position title. In addition, at universities like ours, the Vice President for Research or Vice President for Research, Technology, & Economic Development is responsible for promoting and facilitating research in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, as well as in disciplines that compete for large sponsored research grants and contracts. This is what the Board envisions in its proposed change.”

Kline stated that the answer heightens the importance of asking the questions. Garmil acknowledged Kline’s concerns, and agreed that a coordinator may be important. However, “setting an agenda” can be perceived as sounding nefarious in nature. Kline asked that the agenda represents university-wide concerns, and we may want to suggest that further description be provided. Martin asserted that part of the reasoning behind the initiative is to eliminate the power vacuum that exists. Ting discussed the vacuum in the senior administrative team. This is a really important time for the BOT to move forward, receive faculty feedback and create a structure to move forward.

Fisher also shared concerns about the VPAA, but recognizes this is a big job and has been carved out because VPAA’s job is too big. She wondered if there is another way to address the concerns. Fisher does not like the language “agenda setting” coming from the central administration level. She wondered if we might say that we welcome support and coordination across the campuses and underline that the distinctiveness of campuses needs be taken into account. For example, sometimes grants from UIS would emphasize undergraduate research in a way that may not be played up, but is still a high priority--so we would also have strength. An emphasis needs to be taken away from who is better. One thing that works well is to get faculty and staff from all three campuses together to talk, which increases coordination. The Summit that happened last week was mentioned as an example. Fisher suggested that part of the portfolio might include such coordination. Ting said the point is that agenda setting is not one sided. Agenda setting will have to have feedback from all campuses. Kline asked where the VP offices are located. Ting said they are in Urbana and Chicago. Berman shared some examples of great research collaborations currently happening between UIS and Urbana.

Ting then opened the discussion regarding the creation of the VP for Health Affairs. Helton stated that at first, her reaction was, “More administrators?” After hearing President Hogan speak, she changed her mind. If it generates revenue, it’s worthwhile. Ting noted that the position will pay for itself and much more supposedly. Sisneros asked how UIC feels about this. Martin stated that he has heard many very vocal proponents from UIC. Ting affirmed that, for the most part, UIC faculty members support the effort. Sisneros wondered if there are significant issues and believes it is in our interest to proceed with caution. Berman thought that in terms of response it is appropriate to reiterate the President’s arguments and demonstrate a “posture of humility.” Ting said that if the rationale makes sense, we can simply say this. Fisher agreed that we should proceed with caution as she does not understand what this is trying to do. If the intention is to increase revenue, why doesn’t it affect Urbana? Ting discussed the medical district in Chicago and reported that the hospital is being outcompeted. They don’t have a person to help coordinate and bridge academic enterprises with clinical practices. Wassenberg

supported the idea of proceeding with caution. Kline posited that we could ask the President and BOT to consider what those who are most directly affected think about this. Boltuc also agreed with aforementioned comments. Ting said we will say that the rationale makes sense, but that we strongly encourage the BOT to listen carefully to any feedback given from the other two campuses. Ting stated that SEC will work on this and, after approval, the report will come back to the Senate.

**New Business**

None

**Adjournment**

A motion was made by Van Vossen to adjourn. Eisenhart seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 12:03.