

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011
November 5, 2010
10:00AM – 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, K. Jamison, W. Kline, J. Martin, R. Melchin, C. Olivier, S. Owusu-Ansah, P. Salela, L. School, 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: T. Helton

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: L. Pardie and K. Rutherford.

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

Approval of the day’s agenda

Ting reminded senators of the request made by Graduate Council to remove Resolution 40-14 Graduate Certificate in Human Resource Management from the agenda. She requested approval of the agenda as amended. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Cassinova and seconded by Bogle.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting of October 22, 2010

Ballard moved to approve the minutes from October 22, 2010. Martin seconded the motion. Ting asked for corrections, deletions, or modifications. Garmil asked that “can be perceived” be added to line 399. The minutes were unanimously accepted with the suggested correction.

Announcements

Eisenhart asked senators to encourage participation in the food drive for Thanksgiving that is being sponsored by UPI. They have identified ten families, have purchased the turkeys, and are collecting non-perishable items. Bins can be found in every building around campus. Fisher announced the November 12, 2010, UIS Music Showcase which will feature the band and chorus. This will be a special event in light of the 40th anniversary. A new piece of music by Dr. Davis will be premiered at the event. Additionally, there will be a contest to write the lyrics for a new UIS spirit song. Bogle

announced that Scott Day and Dean Larry Stonecipher were currently in Florida accepting an award for the best online EDL program in the U.S. Additionally, Karen Swann, also in EDL, has been named a fellow of the Sloan Corporation. Garmil stated that on November 9 2010, the World Affairs Council is sponsoring Aaron David Miller, Middle East analyst, author, and negotiator, who will be speaking about the Mideast peace process.

Reports

Chair – T. Ting

Ting stated that she would save her report until the discussion of the Proposed Amendments to the *Statutes* and *The General Rules* from the Board of Trustees to Effect Streamlining of University Administration & Operations.

Provost – H. Berman

Berman reported that the budget information is currently unclear and it is still too early to know about spring 2011 enrollments. Berman offered congratulations to the students who collected more than 4 tons of food as part of a Halloween drive. Monday, Berman emailed the campus regarding his thoughts and priorities. Within the international programming arena, Berman highlighted that Goldberg-Belle has been visiting 3 universities that currently or plan to partner with UIS in the UK and Ireland. Dana Atwell, Associate Director of International Programs has been testing potential students in Dalian and Beijing. UIS recently hosted a visit from a delegation of Harbin University of Science and Technology faculty, including the President. Dean Ermatinger is in Japan on the Sister City visit where he will send greetings to the Ashikaga Institute of Technology. Dean McNeal and Vice Chancellor Barnett are recruiting in Mongolia.

Berman offered congratulations to the Theatre Program and Visual Arts Department. *The Heidi Chronicles*, directed by Missy Thibodeaux-Thompson was extremely well done. Mike Miller's Object Code exhibit is in the Visual Arts Gallery. This is the essence of interdisciplinary collaboration between the visual arts and computer science in areas of common interest. Keith Miller is the computer science faculty member in this collaborative effort. Additionally, Dean McNeal is on the national feed of NPR's Marketplace. McNeal met Jeremy Hobson, lead reporter on Marketplace, at a WUIS event here at UIS and formed a collaboration which has led to consultation on Marketplace. Finally, Berman suggested that everyone take advantage of the beautiful Ring Road, while the leaves are still radiant.

Ting called for questions. She asked Berman if the Associate Director of International Programs is a new position. Berman said that it is not. Ting then asked if the title was new. Unsure, Berman said he would check. Fisher noted that she is glad to see all of the emphasis on international recruitment and asked that UIS also form priorities that focus on recruitment in areas that are not wealthy. According to Berman, Josiah Alamu in Public Health is working with the University of Gambia. Wassenberg explained that the collaboration with University of the Gambia includes Public Health, Teacher Education, and Political Studies. UIS students are going to Gambia for internship experiences and work is being done to coordinate working with their students online. This initiative

includes the creation of an online or blended Master's of Public Health. Alamu is working with Schroeder to secure grant sources to get computers the Gambian students can have internet access. Boltuc asked if there are organized efforts to recruit international students for online programs. Berman stated that the efforts are more toward building collaborations with universities which can create opportunities. He asked Boltuc to share any ideas and thoughts about effective recruitment strategies.

Ting asked if anything worthy of note happened at the open forum held by Berman, as Interim Chancellor, on the previous day. Berman said it was an opportunity to expand on where UIS currently is compared to personal experiences he has had here over the past 15 years. Additionally, he elaborated on current initiatives. He said that a thoughtful question was raised about the presence of UIS in downtown Springfield.

Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen SGA

Van Vossen reported that the SGA working to confirm hearing panel members for the AIC at the meeting. On December 1, 2010, UIS and UIUC students will be attending the lobby day at the state capital to advocate for higher education funding and the vote for all three student trustees on the U of I Board. An invitation has also been extended to the UIC SGA, but it has not yet responded. SGA will also vote on the resolution in support of the title re-alignment proposal and stated the SGA document is consistent with UIS Campus Senate recommendations. Noting that the resolution will be up for a 2nd reading, Ting asked if the document will be forwarded to the Campus Senate, President Hogan, and the BOT. Van Vossen said the resolution will also be forwarded to the SGA presidents at UIUC and UIC. Ting requested information about the status of the statement for AIC service. Van Vossen said SGA is working on the statement and has provided the draft for the AIC Chair for feedback. Once finished, Van Vossen will send Ting a copy.

IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee – L. Bogle

Bogle reported that at the October IBHE/FAC meeting they continued to address questions regarding how to articulate the goals of the group. Goals include: (1) advocating for all of higher education to representatives; (2) how should goals be represented; (3) how should the message regarding what resources are needed and rational for funding be delivered. During the morning, there was a conversation with two State elected officials Maloney, Chair of Senate Higher Education Committee and Pritchard, House Higher Education Committee (Republican Spokesperson).

Bogle highlighted that access in the state is good; however, affordability is miserable. The previous Governor did not like higher education and did not fund it. We are paying the price along with students and high school students. Bogle reiterated the importance of reaching out to high schools and preparing kids for college. Currently, tuition and fees account for 35% of a family's income. MAP grants are given based on a first come, first serve basis which only assist approximately half of the students who could benefit. Minority students and low socio-economic status students are disadvantaged. Andrew Davis, Executive Director of the Illinois Student Assistance Commission talked about finding ways to fund an additional 140,000 students through the use of bond sales.

Currently, this is happening in Indiana. The idea is to target graduated recipients of the MAP grants. Income, which is much greater with a college degree, will generate more tax revenue that can be used specifically for this initiative. Adding more students is better for everyone.

The Career and College Readiness Act is being piloted currently. So far, the program has been very successful at assisting juniors to become ready for college. Bogle reported that income is the largest predictor of college success. Seventy-seven percent of those who graduate come from the top quartile, while only 7% come from the bottom quartile. At present, 50% of students in schools are at the poverty level. We need to work with schools to help them get students ready. Bogle highlighted that poverty makes students less prepared, not less smart. The Indiana 21st century scholars program is addressing this issue and seems like a good model for Illinois. It is imperative that legislators and citizens understand the importance of higher education.

Cassinova asked why minorities and students coming from low incomes are last to discuss college. Bogle stated that the bureaucracy can get in the way. Berman expressed an appreciation to Bogle for his work and passion. He asserted that college success is also a predictor of future income. On the matter of the delay in applying for college among 1st generation and lower income students, Berman said that students can just not have the idea about going to college. The Illinois Student Assistance Commission has been able to hire two counselors in Springfield to assist with this issue. The initiative can be attributed to the Sangamon County Community Foundation, which is doing something at the local level to address this problem.

Kline asked whether Illinois is considering adopting the 21st Century Scholars Program and Bogle stated yes. Kline expressed concern with point 3, *I will not use illegal drugs or alcohol, or commit a crime*, which may inadvertently punish and exclude based on early life mistakes. He suggested that scholarly commitment, not moral commitment, should be emphasized. Furthermore, Kline believed that the pledge to submit an error-free FAFSA could be problematic. Bogle said he had copied from the Indiana rules. He will share the concerns.

Garmil requested clarification about the graduation rate for income (item 5, page 1), and asked if the 7% was based on 4-year graduation. Bogle affirmed that it is 4 year. Boltuc asked if the group is talking about high schools accepting college credits as AP credits. Bogle said they have discussed the need to look at senior year in high school, which is typically a blow-off year. Dual credit may be very effective in addressing this issue. Boltuc asked about upward bound grants and suggested this would be a good idea. Success cannot happen without resources. Martin stated that we all agree that the ideas of IBHE initiatives are important but we need the resources to be effective

Old Business

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)

A motion was made by Kline to discuss the proposed amendments. Fisher seconded the motion. Ting reported that the USC met with Trustees Kennedy and Oliver for 2 hours. The 2hour discussion was all about the proposal from the BOT. Ting reminded everyone that the legal authority in any university originates from the governing board. The BOT is our governing agency. The Preamble of the U of I Statutes states:

The University of Illinois, as a state university, is subject to the control of the Illinois General Assembly. The General Assembly, subject to the limitations of the state constitution and to such self-imposed restraints as are essential to the maintenance of a free and distinguished University, exercises control by virtue of its authority to change the laws pertaining to the University and its power to appropriate funds for the maintenance and improvement of the University. Under existing state law the University of Illinois is a public corporation, the formal corporate name of which is "The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois." Within the limits fixed by the Illinois constitution and laws, the Board of Trustees exercises final authority over the University.

Given that the BOT can be very powerful, it is incredibly important to have a good board in place to work with the university. It is the chair's opinion that the current board is the best ever for U of I and the BOT is probably the best in the country. Trustee Kennedy talked about wanting feedback from each Campus Senate and the USC before the November board meeting. Trustee Kennedy said the November deadline is very important because the current board may not stay intact. Three positions will expire in January. Additionally, a new governor could change the appointments. Since the current board was appointed in 2009, a major charge was to build strong, coherent university.

Many at UIUC see the proposal as centralization. The only new addition is the VP of Health Affairs. According to the BOT, they want to build a strong university leadership which will weaken the power of the board. Clarifying the chain of command will reduce ambiguity and create a stronger university according to the BOT. Ting discussed an example given by Trustee Kennedy about how Senator Durbin's ability to act has been compromised because he did not know who to contact at the U of I regarding a project to clean up the Great Lakes. From this perspective, adding a VP for Research will resolve some of these issues. Someone is needed to orchestrate, coordinate, and promote research activities within the entire university. This person will play an important role in DC. In regard to the V.P. for Health Affairs, Ting stated that the UIC campus unanimously supports the addition of this position.

Ting presented the drafted response for discussion. She asked for feedback about any blatant grammatical errors, suggested improvements, etc. The UIUC Senate approved and forwarded their response to the USC which says no to everything. The response is posted on their website. Sisneros asked what UIC's position is currently. Ting said that UIC does not think this is controversial. On Oct. 26 at the USC meeting, UIC Senate Executive

Committee Chair said that UIC needs more time to discuss the creation of V.P. for Health Affairs. The next day, an open forum was held where unanimous support was given for the VPHA position. Sisneros asked for further clarification about UIUC's stance. UIUC believes that the title re-alignment will be a diminishment of the Chancellor position. Martin stated that the USC is often able to reach consensus on issues. However, there was no consensus on the title re-alignment proposal. The USC resolution passed by a very small margin of 8 to 7 to oppose the title re-alignment. Worthy of note is that 10 of the 20 members are from UIUC. Martin further suggested that the disagreements are ideological and that people are entrenched and not willing to move from where they are standing. Ting asserted that a primary concern for UIUC is the loss of their identity as being the U of I. Sisneros requested discussion about the relationship between the President and Board and the history of Chancellors going to the Board. He wondered what the BOT thinks about that behavior. Ting asserted that the current board says no to the practice of circumventing the president by chancellors or anyone in the university going to the board directly. Sisneros asked if the problem was with the presidency, as the current proposal does not create any changes in the chain of command. Ting said that the problem is that the past Board was able to infiltrate the chain of command because there was not a clear chain of command. Currently, it is not explicitly stated that the Chancellor is working for the President. Olivier stated that a major problem has been the BOT reaching out to Chancellors, instead of the President. The current title confusion allowed members to claim that they did not know they were not reaching out to the most senior official in the university. Sisneros asked if this would be a new experience for the U of I. Ting affirmed that it will be. She stated that the titles of President and Chancellor are used differently nationwide, which makes it difficult to determine who the CEO for the university actually is. Martin thought it worthy of mention that personalities within those positions have contributed to issues. With this resolution, the BOT is trying to plug the hole so this cannot happen again. Ting said ultimately we do not know what will be decided by the Board, and it is their decision to make.

Fisher asked Martin if the vote in the USC was on this matter. Martin said that many people voted against it and many objected to the language as much as the motion. The official motion was "the USC takes the position that all the powers that are defined currently in the *Statutes* are sufficient to establish a proper relationship between a strong President and a strong Chancellor, and that we see adding the title of VP as at best redundant and at worst diminution of the Chancellor's authority within the statutory definition." Ting stated that the vote was very close and was approved by 1 vote. Martin emphasized how rare it is that something is so closely contested on the USC. Berman clarified that the motion was passed by a 1 vote margin. Martin stated that the USC report being drafted will emphasize the deep division in the USC and present both sides of the issues raised. Kline asked whether the vote took place by roll call or voice and wondered if names were attached to the vote. Ting said it was a hand vote.

Garmil asked if the recommendations UIS Senate is making regarding VPRTEDE will slow down the BOT's acceptance process. Ting stated that it would not. If we suggest changing the proposed title from Vice President for Research, Technology, and Economic Development to the Vice President for Research that will just be an input for the Board. Owusu-Ansah asked for a rationale regarding this suggestion. Ting said that Senate had

discussed that faculty interests in research are broad and diverse and may have no immediate connection with technology or economic development. Yet these are still fundamental in higher learning. Many at UIUC, especially those in the humanities, do not like the proposed title. Everyone supports the idea of having a VP for Research. Commercialization of technology and economic development will still be in the portfolio, but not in the title. Ting stated that the Board is open to the idea. Boltuc believed this is much simpler.

Sisneros asked if he could make suggestions regarding the draft language. Ting affirmed his question and stated that the Senate needs to decide whether or not there will be endorsement and submit the response to the USC by November 9, 2010. Sisneros asserted that his understanding of the task was to submit an inventory of risks and benefits, but not to support or oppose. He suggested deleting the first sentence, as it is not important whether the UIS Senate supports the proposed changes. Ting asked if Sisneros was referring to the first sentence under the *Chancellor Title Re-Alignment* section. He said yes, and also raised a question about whether the last sentence of first paragraph would draw negative reaction from the other Chancellors if they feel differently. He suggested the sentence be deleted. Martin raised a point of order questioning whether we were going to go through an amendment process or another way. Ting said we would use an amendment process and called for a second. Martin seconded the motion.

Fisher requested a review of the mission. Sisneros, reading from the FAQ stated, "The Board is not asking the various senates to reach a consensus, and no formal votes are required by the Board, the Statutes, or The General Rules. What the Board would like to have is an inventory of what the campuses see as the benefits and risks of the amendments for the Board's consideration at their meeting on November 18." Ting stated that we can support or not support the proposed changes, just as UIUC made their lack of support very clear. Borland reiterated the importance of expressing support because UIUC is so diametrically opposed to the proposed changes. Van Vossen asked if the UIC response has been posted on their website. Ting said UIC will not have their response until next week. Van Vossen reminded everyone that SGA has a resolution to support. Garmil also endorsed the idea of verbalizing support and asked Sisneros if he would rather include a statement that UIS believes it will be beneficial for all campuses to make this change. Sisneros believed that adding support is contrary to the charge. Ting disagreed.

Martin assured Senators who may be concerned about political fallout that the USC Executive Committee recognizes that we are all married to each other and have to live with each other. That said, they are working to ensure that this is not a lasting fight. Ting said the political fallout is over-exaggerated. If this is an opportunity for us to voice what we think, we should do so. Last year, the USC weathered a lot of things and came together. When the issue changed, the solidarity and consensus was not there. Again she emphasized the importance of demonstrating support. Fisher agreed that supporting is fine if that is the way the Senate decides. Additionally, Fisher suggested reflecting some discussion of possible risks and changes with title re-alignment. For example, concerns that this would seem to diminish the role of the chancellor may be important to note.

Martin raised a point of order as an amendment was on the floor. Ting reminded Senators of the motion to remove the first and last sentence of the paragraph. The motion to remove the sentences failed, with 2 abstentions. Fisher said the section emphasizes accountability of the Campus Chancellors to the University system, but does not underline the high degree of delegated authority, which is also stated in the General Rules currently quoted in the response. Fisher suggested that instead of saying, "University Officers should promote harmonies within the entire University" we should state that "Chancellors have executive authority for their campuses, but should also promote synergies within the entire university system." Kline suggested as a friendly amendment that the last line of the section should be changed from "academic leader" to "executive officer" for consistency. Ting clarified the requests. Borland raised a point of order regarding the amendment on the table. Martin confirmed it would need a second. Garmil seconded Fisher's motion. Reading the paragraph under discussion, Ting said, "Adding Vice President to the Campus Chancellor title makes explicit the roles that the chancellor should play and clarifies the chancellor's authority vis-à-vis the president, leaving no room for ambiguity or contestation. Chancellors have executive authority for their campuses, but should also promote synergies within the entire university as University Officers. Ambiguity and contestation blur a clear line of authority and accountability in the views of both internal and external stakeholders, which ultimately undermines the effectiveness and standing of the University as a whole." She asked for further questions. Jamison questioned the redundancy because the very first paragraph already affirms that the Chancellor is the chief executive officers of the campus. Ting stated that we want to emphasize that Chancellors have not functioned as officers of the University. University officers should promote synergies within the entire university. Jamison asked to remove some of the redundancy. Kline reiterated the importance of the friendly amendment to the amendment that he suggested. Ting confirmed that she had made the change. Sheridan suggested we vote on the amendment and wondered if the other issue regarding redundancy is a separate amendment. Garmil stated that the change would create redundancy. Ting said the amendment would create repetition and reminded Senators that there is a motion on the table. Jamison is speaking against the amendment because it will create repetition.

Fisher raised a concern that not enough is being said regarding the campus authority of the Chancellor. She emphasized the importance of the delegated authority Chancellor, and the necessary restraint of the BOT. Ting asked for convincing arguments that this is about centralization, as the title re-alignment is not negating the degree of delegated authority. Fisher reported her concern that we could accidentally achieve centralization as an unintended consequence if we continue to emphasize only the central authority without mention of the delegated authority.

Sisneros suggested a solution can be found with a change within the last paragraph. Ting stated that would be a separate amendment. We have to vote first on whether we want to change the second paragraph. Borland suggested that instead of changing, a new sentence be created to focus on the delegated authority. Ting, reading the first paragraph stated, "The chancellor also serves as the chief executive officer for the campus under the direction of the president. Therefore, it behooves the chancellor to contextualize the unique strength and distinct mission of her/his own campus within a University-wide vision." Ting asked whether the amendments are redundant with points already made. Sisneros suggested that if

we are concerned with centralization, or concentration of power, that redundancy is good. Ting called for a vote on Fisher's amendment to the second paragraph that "Chancellors have executive authority for their campuses, but should promote synergies within the entire university as University Officers" and Kline's friendly amendment to change the last sentence of the last paragraph in the section from "academic leader" to "executive officer." The motion passed with 3 abstentions.

Sisneros made a motion to delete the words, "it does not" and insert "we expect the proposed re-alignment will not" in the last paragraph, second sentence of the section. Clarifying, Ting read: "we expect the title re-alignment will not diminish the roles of the Chancellor or reduce her/his authority to lead." Martin said the preposition "it" can replace title re-alignment. Sheridan seconded. Borland called a point of order and asked if this was a friendly amendment. Ting agreed that this is a friendly amendment. She read, "In short, we do not think that the proposed title re-alignment for the campus chancellors creates conflicts for the chancellors in carrying out their duties and responsibilities as defined in the University *Statutes*. We expect it will not diminish the roles of the Chancellor or reduce her/his authority to lead." Garmil proposed another friendly amendment to the last sentence. Instead of, "On the contrary, it re-affirms the equally important roles that the Chancellor plays as both University Officer and the academic leader of the campus," Garmil suggested adding "already defined in the statutes."

No comments or suggestions were raised regarding the *Vice President for Research, Technology, and Economic Development* section. Ting called for discussion of the *Vice President for Health Affairs* section. Fisher asked whether UIC voted on this. Ting asserted that UIC held a campus forum. According to Martin, Chambers reported at UIC that everyone seemed in agreement with the proposal. When asked if anyone had objections at the end of the meeting, no one spoke up. Olivier noted that the position arose from UIC. Ting reiterated that this part of the report did not come from the BOT, rather it emerged from administrators at UIC. Martin suggested that the VPHA is equivalent to what the VPR is for research. Schuldt inquired about the inclusion of the parenthetical statement at the end. He suggested that we remove the note. Ting agreed.

Referring to the epilogue sentence reading, "Nonetheless, at the same time, we would like to urge the Board to pay attention to any unintended consequences when it comes to implementation," Sisneros suggested deleting "we would like to" and inserting "urge." Additionally, Sisneros asked to strike "pay attention to" and insert "adequately respond to" in the same sentence. Ting clarified the suggestions.

Chair Ting asked if the Senators were ready to vote to endorse with the modifications. Kline asked if it needed to come as a resolution for endorsement to occur. Martin said that procedurally, we take a vote to endorse to be democratic. Because it is not a resolution item, Ting stated that we do not need the resolution. A vote was called. All were in favor, except for 2 people who abstained from the vote.

New business

Resolution 40-13 Amendment to the UIS Campus Senate Bylaws – Creation of Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure as a Standing Committee [1st reading]

Van Vossen made a motion to discuss Resolution 40-13. Fisher seconded the motion. Sisneros asked where the committee is housed currently. Ting reported that it is currently under the Provost. According to Berman, this resolution is coming to the Senate because events at the Urbana campus led to the activation of their AFTC committee. He began to think about this committee and brought the concern to the attention of the SEC. After some research, the AFTC is a governance committee at both of the other campuses. The fact that it isn't a governance committee at UIS predates our affiliation with U of I. Even though the committee is rarely convened, it is better to have the committee firmly grounded in governance side. Ting mentioned the memo from PPC in support of this resolution. Additionally, the PPC suggested that only tenured faculty should be appointed. Berman said this is correcting a hole. Additionally, the movement of thought presented is that the members of committee would be tenured, senior faculty, which would be helpful for issues that would come before this committee. Sisneros asked why the committee was not under the senate. Berman said he didn't really know, but it was a different time and approach. Ting asserted that we are currently out of compliance with the *Statutes*. Martin pointed out the legal ramifications that may happen if a problem were to arise, and we are not following our own rules. Garmil agreed that only tenured members should serve on the committee. However, he suggested the inclusion of *any* faculty members in the investigation. Ting asked if there was a friendly amendment on the table. Martin suggested that SEC could rework the document for the next reading. Ting agreed. Salela underscored the importance of coming into compliance with the *Statutes*. Fisher agreed with Garmil's point and stated that cases don't only involve the dismissal of tenured faculty. She referred to the AAUP language which explicitly uses the word teacher, instead of tenured faculty. The rationale is based on the instructor being a citizen outside classroom and teacher inside. One does not need to be tenured to have protection of academic freedom. Ting said that adding "any" faculty clarifies. Boltuc spoke of the case at UIUC, which was based on an adjunct faculty member. Ting said this committee will look at dismissal of any tenured faculty and also investigate allegations of infringement for any faculty member.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Cassinova. Sheridan seconded the motion.