

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011
April 22, 2011
10:00 AM –11:10 AM
PAC Conference Room “G”

Senators Present: D. Ballard, L. Bogle, P. Boltuc, S. Borland, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, R. Garmil, T. Helton, K. Jamison, W. Kline, X. Li, J. Martin, R. Melchin, L. Schoo, D. Schuldt, K. Sheridan, B. Siddiquee, A. Sisneros, C. Switzer, H. Thompson, M. Van Vossen, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, Y. Zhang and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: J. Casinova, C. Olivier, P. Salela

Ex-Officio: L. Pardie

Guests: D. Anthony, H. Bapat, R. Bouray, D. Bussell, J. Case Pease, S. Cordell, H. Dell, L. Giordano, B. Hayler, C. Hoelscher, N. Karuppaswamy, S. LaFollette, S. Longo, A. Mulvey, J. Pierceson, D. Ruez, G. Simo, E. Stanley, J. Tienken, J. Villegas, S. White, E. Wilson.

Approval of the Agenda

Chair Ting called the senate to order at 10:00 am. Ballard motioned to approve the agenda. Martin seconded the motion. Ting announced that she would like to save at least half an hour for old and new business items.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting of April 8, 2011

Martin motioned to approve the minutes from April 8, 2011. Bogle seconded the motion. Borland asked that “prerequisite” be made singular on line 425 and asked that the word “to” be changed to “the” on line 543. With the change, the phrase should read, “call the question.” Schoo noted a discrepancy in the spelling of Ghosh and asked that lines 61 and 62 be altered to reflect the accurate spelling. Sisneros stated that line 492 made reference to 40-18, but the discussion was about 40-19. Ting asserted that the minutes accurately reflected the tabling of one item to discuss another. All were in favor of accepting the minutes with the suggested corrections.

Announcements

Helton announced that the UIS English club will sponsor the Verbal Arts Festival on April 23, 2011. She strongly encouraged UIS faculty, staff, and students to attend some or all of the festival events as the verbal arts are a vital component of a Liberal Arts Institution. The event is free of charge. Hot Dogs will be provided. Martin announced that Star Parties will continue through the month of April, weather permitting.

Reports

49 **Chair – T. Ting**

50 Ting acknowledged senators who have completed their service to the campus senate. She
51 thanked Bogle, Borland, Eisenhart, Siddiquee, Thompson, Wang, Van Vossen, Casinova,
52 Melchin, and Olivier for the work they have done.

53

54 **Provost – L. Pardie**

55 Pardie recognized the current events on campus. Theater's production of *Spinning into Butter*
56 was wonderful, according to Pardie. Also, Pardie mentioned the success of the Earth Day event.
57 Pardie updated senators about the Department of Education's Regulations on Program Integrity
58 Issues. Specifically, Pardie discussed the aspect involving state authorization which would
59 impact online education. As a result of lobbying efforts by many, including Ray Schroeder,
60 University Administration, and folks at UIUC, the Department of Education deadline has been
61 pushed back from July 1, 2012 to July 1, 2014. Concerted efforts by a number of entities will
62 ensure that state requirements are gathered and publicly posted on the web. Additionally, we
63 have been assured that no efforts will be made to stop students from using Title IV funding.
64 Pardie asserted that this is a very good thing for UIS.

65

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

67 Van Vossen introduced the new student senators who have been elected and will begin service at
68 the transition meeting. He acknowledged the new officers: President Erin Wilson, Vice President
69 Shonda White, Treasurer Ryan Bouray, and Secretary Aaron Mulvey. Van Vossen reported that
70 during the summer 2012, some students were going to be displaced due to campus housing
71 remodeling of Sunflower Court. Van Vossen and the SGA met with Housing Director, Ringle, to
72 resolve the issues and find housing for them during the renovations.

73

74 **Campus Planning and Budget Committee Annual Report – B. Siddiquee**

75 Ting stated that she expected that senators had all read the report and called for questions. Fisher
76 said that she liked the process giving budget priorities from different units. She asked Siddiquee
77 to talk about how the committee translates priorities into reality as budget planning and
78 implementation moves forward. Siddiquee asserted that the task of the CPBC is to make broad
79 recommendations to the campus senate and administration. Furthermore, the CPBC is not
80 charged to translate this into policy. Pardie asserted that the Provost and Associate Provost sit as
81 ex-officio on the CPBC where there is opportunity for dialogue. She does not believe that the
82 recommendations of the CPBC are inconsistent with established university priorities.

83 Furthermore, Pardie stated that the process is a testament to how the committee process works.

84

85 Ting asked Fisher if she has seen any other priorities that have emerged but have not been
86 included. Fisher noted the repeated recommendations that salary equity issues be addressed. She
87 also mentioned long-standing recommendation to recruit and retain faculty which is also
88 included in the salary equity concerns. Fisher acknowledged the difficult milieu within which
89 budget planning has occurred in recent years. She did not believe that we have had a discussion
90 about how priorities are set. Other questions that emerged for Fisher are relative to the different
91 units setting priorities. For example, Fisher noted that colleges seem to focus on faculty, but have
92 not provided dollar amounts associated, and the Chancellor's division is making large
93 investments in advertising and athletics. She believes the priorities appear to be mismatched. She
94 asked for clarification about the communication with those different agendas.

95 Pardie emphasized the complex challenges that we face given the budgetary recessions across
96 the last decade. She provided the example of the importance of engaging in the business planning
97 retreat. Furthermore, Pardie asserted that it is critically important to ask questions pertaining to
98 the core institutional mission and what is most important to protect. Pardie offered that provision
99 of services to students and faculty are essential to the core mission. In order to preserve and
100 protect the academic core, cutting has occurred in other ways. Discussing the money allocated
101 out of Chancellor's office for advertising, Pardie suggested that the recruitment of students is
102 important to increase the amount of revenue to the institution. This becomes increasingly
103 important as state appropriations continue to decline. Pardie asserted that we have seen
104 approximately a 37% reduction in state appropriations, which is at the heart of the challenge. She
105 reemphasized that the only way to increase revenue is through enrollment. Pardie noted that
106 President Hogan is keenly aware of the urgency of our situation. He has set a salary program as
107 priority for all campuses. UIS has a committee meeting to investigate compression issues for
108 faculty who have been here longer. Pardie stated that UIS is facing a constantly shifting
109 appropriations situation as the budget for the next fiscal year has not yet been set. Pardie
110 acknowledged the importance of appreciating and hearing faculty and staff concerns. Faculty
111 have been hired to address noted gaps. Administration will continue to work on this issue.

112
113 Siddiquee noted three areas where the CPBC has made recommendations and seen some
114 implementation: (1) equity adjustment; (2) recruitment and retention; and (3) more funding in
115 marketing. Talking about the recommendation regarding salary enhancement, Siddiquee noted
116 that this has now been ranked the number 1 concern. Our campus is now ranked 12th for salary
117 and 10th for total compensation among our 14 peer institutions. He went on to assert that this is
118 not just faculty, but that staff salaries are less as well. This is strongly felt by the campus
119 community, which impacts morale and productivity.

120
121 Clarifying Fisher's questions, Ting stated that Fisher was not suggesting that money should not
122 be spent on marketing or branding. Rather, is the amount being spent justified and is there data to
123 support? For example, have the investments in athletics really enhanced student life? Ting said,
124 in terms of salary, this is a systemic problem. Pointing to the data to which Siddiquee was
125 referring, Ting noted that UIUC is ranked 21st out of 22 for salary when compared to other
126 similar institutions. Chicago is ranked 11th out of 22 for its peer institutions. She reiterated that
127 President Hogan is committed to implementing a general salary program and that the
128 Chancellors are aware of this priority. She noted that at this point the U of I is facing a cut of
129 \$100 million. She was not sure that we will be able to offer a general salary program if the cuts
130 are greater than the \$100 million.

131
132 Wassenberg asserted that within Academic Affairs, very little flexibility exists. Less than 10% of
133 the budget is flexible within the colleges; most of it is tied up in salaries. She suggested that we
134 have to wrap our heads around a new model at the campus level. Learning how to deal with
135 budget inflexibility while recognizing that if we don't increase tuition dollars no one is getting
136 anything that is critical. Unfortunately, we exist within a mental habit of legacy budgeting.

137
138 Borland suggested that providing colleges with incentives to increase enrollments may be very
139 beneficial. For example, summer courses may offer opportunities to assist. Pardie stated that
140 there is not anything to use for the incentives. She strongly cautioned against moving to an every

141 college for itself model. Bultoc suggested that the campus senate needs to be more assertive in
142 insisting that we are brought to the average of similar colleges. UIS should have a goal of 50% to
143 instruction. Ting thanked Siddiquee for his work and likes the format of the report. She strongly
144 encouraged the CPBC to conduct the study of allocations of instruction spending versus other
145 spending.

146

147 **Committee on Assessment of Student Learning Annual Report – S. Cordell**

148 Ting thanked Cordell for her report and called for questions. Referring to the report, Ting noted
149 the plan to review three programs over the summer for AY 2011-2012. Ting asked if this would
150 be the same CASL to review, and not the incoming committee members. Cordell asserted that it
151 will not be the incoming members. Martin asked about the due dates that have been listed on the
152 website. Cordell asserted that revisions have been made and she believes the most current
153 information on the site is accurate. She encouraged everyone to look at the site and provide
154 feedback if any information is incorrect.

155

156 **Undergraduate Council Annual Report – H. Bapat**

157 Ting called for questions to the Chair of the UGC. She asked Bapat about the survey of the
158 undergraduate certificate. Bapat stated that he is hoping to complete the analysis over the
159 summer and will report back to senate at the beginning of the Fall 2011 term. Ting thanked
160 Bapat for his work.

161

162 **General Education Council Annual Report – H. Dell**

163 Ting announced that Dell was present to answer questions about the GECO report. Ting thanked
164 Dell for the submitted report. Ting asked about the petitions to transfer credits into ECCE
165 reviewed by GECO. She asked if they were coming from community colleges. Dell stated that
166 most come from community colleges, but noted some variation. Ting asked if any were from
167 UIUC or UIC. Dell said that she was not aware of any from the other two institutions. Next, Ting
168 asked about the applied math course category. Dell asserted that this was never fully
169 implemented and was prioritized by GECO. While GECO hadn't expected that agreement across
170 the board could be reached; however, after meeting with interested departments consensus was
171 met. Lastly, Ting inquired about the implementation status of the rubrics for the Freshman
172 Seminar. Dell reported that it was approved at the last meeting and will be up as soon as
173 possible, within the next week or so. Dell encouraged everyone to spread the word that there will
174 be money for those who get approval and want to do training. Bapat made a point of
175 clarification. He is also sitting in on GECO as chair of UGC.

176

177 **Old Business**

178 **Resolution 40-19 Modifications in Personnel Review Procedures [2nd reading]**

179 Ballard moved to discuss Resolution 40-19. Garmil seconded the motion. Ting asked Anthony to
180 recapture the intent and rationale of the PPC in forwarding this resolution. Anthony stated that
181 the PPC wanted to emphasize that the current policy does not prohibit the inclusion of outside
182 knowledge and can be legitimately read to allow outside information into deliberations.

183 However, how much and what type of information is very unclear and varies widely. According
184 to Anthony, some college deans have told committees that this is acceptable. This resolution
185 intends to clarify and limit the type and amount of information that can be included.

186 Furthermore, the information can only enter at the department level. Currently, information will

187 be included in the discussions, but will not appear on the evaluation letters which is very
188 confusing for the faculty member, and for committees also making recommendations. For
189 example, the letter may be very positive, but the votes do not reflect positively on the faculty
190 member. According to Anthony, this makes the review process very difficult and leaves the
191 faculty member unprotected. Currently, if information is not included in the narrative of the letter
192 the faculty has no opportunity to rebut, address or correct the problem. The resolution aims to
193 solve this problem. Anthony stated that the status quo, as represented by the current policy is
194 inadequate. Allowable first-hand knowledge of individual committee members, as proposed by
195 the resolution, must have substantial implications for the faculty member's meeting of the
196 criteria in order to be considered. Anthony explained the resolution clarifies that information
197 cannot be introduced for minor or petty issues, and that the information must come from direct
198 observation. Student complaints, therefore, would not be considered first-hand knowledge. The
199 primary goals of the policy are to increase transparency and increase legitimacy of information.
200 Furthermore, the PPC discussed the importance of a holistic review process, including
201 contributions to departmental functions. Anthony continued by stating that while it is true that
202 individuals can write a letter to the file beforehand, they may not choose to without department
203 consensus. Requiring departments to meet prior to the meeting to write a letter does not seem to
204 make a lot of sense, from Anthony's perspective. Talking about the risk of abuse, Anthony did
205 not believe that the policy would enhance the risk if followed properly.

206

207 Bogle thanked Anthony for the explanation and rationale that she provided. He asserted that if
208 this is already happening that departments are already in violation of the policy. Referring to the
209 current policy Anthony read, "All committee deliberations relating to a faculty member's
210 performance shall be based solely upon applicable criteria set forth in this Policy and
211 documentation contained in the Personnel File and/or Portfolio." Anthony suggested that the
212 current language can be read both ways because the emphasis may be on "applicable criteria."
213 Bogle again thanked Anthony for her explanation. However, Bogle argued that if he had done
214 something so egregious that it would be brought into the meeting, it should be placed in the
215 personnel file. He perceives the current policy to promote a subversive process. He argued that a
216 paper trail is critically important.

217

218 Martin agreed with Bogle. He asserted that we should not be making policy to cover or
219 legitimize a process. Furthermore, Martin stated that he works in a department where the policy
220 works as currently written and he did not support the resolution. Li also raised concerns about
221 potential abuse. Eisenhart argued that one of the problems currently is that if the person who has
222 the first hand knowledge is a junior faculty member, they will be unlikely to jeopardize their
223 career by documenting. Secondly, Eisenhart also raised concerns that the policy does not include
224 all personnel processes, like yearly reviews. Garmil also expressed concerns and believed that
225 this is the wrong solution to the problem.

226

227 Boltuc agreed with the intention of the proposal; however, he was not sure that the current
228 resolution addresses the problems. He stated that he hoped the resolution would be voted down.
229 Boltuc also encouraged the PPC chair to withdraw the resolution from consideration and rework
230 the language. Sisneros requested clarification to the 4th whereas statement. Anthony asserted that
231 the whereas sought to clarify whether the department would need to meet prior to the
232 deliberation meeting. Sisneros expressed concern relative to context. He argued that any relevant

233 information should be included during the annual review process and documented. Anthony
234 stated that different colleges conduct the process differently. Not every college does the annual
235 review at the department level. Referring to the faculty handbook, Sisneros stated that the
236 candidate always has an ability to rebut. He believed that the proposed policy provides too much
237 potential for abuse.

238
239 Hypothetically, Helton argued that it may happen that three faculty in a department might
240 individually hold direct knowledge that would be missed in aggregate until the meeting occurs. If
241 each individual has information that personally is significant to them, they may not know that
242 others share concerns. She asserted that the proposed resolution would explain split votes, but
243 was uncertain about whether or not she would vote in favor of the resolution.

244
245 Sheridan raised the issue of allowing any one individual to serve on multiple levels of the review
246 process (i.e., the department and the campus levels). Sheridan asserted that this allows for that
247 member to introduce direct knowledge to multiple levels of the process. Anthony stated that the
248 information could only be introduced at the departmental level, and would be documented for the
249 next levels of review. Sheridan argued that the individual would be able to speak directly to the
250 information and advocate for their personal positions, which she believed is unfair. Fisher
251 suggested that one problem is related to departmental letters which don't always explain the
252 rationale for decisions. After listening to the discussion, Fisher wondered if the issues might be
253 better served through the implementation of mentoring processes. Additionally, departments
254 need training that explains the expectation.

255
256 Zhang agreed that there is value in the first-hand direct knowledge as part of the evaluative
257 process. He suggested that the committee should meet beforehand to document. Borland agreed
258 with Zhang, but questioned the logistics of meeting. She wondered if meeting an hour
259 beforehand and sending a memo to the file prior to the official meeting would suffice. Borland
260 agreed with Martin and does not know if this policy resolves current issues. She asked what
261 happens if a department considers improper information and does not include the information in
262 the letter. She argued that due to the confidentiality of the process, there are no ramifications.

263
264 Ting announced the time considerations and asked for a motion to extend the meeting for 15
265 minutes. Kline motioned to extend, Borland seconded the motion. Kline said that this raises two
266 crucial issues. First, if a faculty member is too afraid to write a letter, then they would probably
267 also be too afraid to speak up in a meeting. Second, he asked about the role of the chair in the
268 process. He believed these are critical discussions for the senate to engage.

269
270 Eisenhart asked that the policy be sent back for reworking if it did not pass. Sisneros referred to
271 the U of I statutes, he did not want chair descriptions to change from chair to head. Ting noted
272 that accountability and power go hand in hand. Kline called the question. Eisenhart seconded. A
273 vote yielded 18 nay votes and 5 abstentions.

274
275 Ting thanked Anthony for her work on PPC. She stated that she is confident that the PPC will
276 know what to do.

277
278

279 **New Business**

280 **USC GR-45 Proposed Amendments to the General Rules, Article II, Sections 4, 5, and 6 [to**
281 **be approved]**

282 Ting informed senators that amendments to the General Rules do not have to come to the campus
283 senates for approval. She stated that a subcommittee was formed at University Senates
284 Conference and Martin had been serving. He reiterated that this does not need faculty review or
285 approval. Martin noted that Interim Chancellor Berman had been chairing the subcommittee on
286 regulatory relief for the ARR report. The subcommittee was approached by the University
287 Attorney's office with suggestions related to streamlining contract approval. Martin stated that
288 the proposed changes would dramatically reduce the number of contracts to be reviewed by
289 university attorneys. Currently, all contracts require attorney's approval. Additionally, this would
290 also permit the use of electronic signatures and remove the need for the secretary of the BOT to
291 attest to signatures. The idea is to speed up contract approval without increasing liability.
292 Martin's suggestion is to tell the USC members to vote their conscience when it appears. Ting
293 encouraged senators to raise any concerns if they exist. Wassenberg believed this holds
294 significant benefits for UIS and for departments with online programs requiring internships.
295 Expediting that process would be very beneficial for students. Ting said that currently even these
296 need to go through the university counsel and require the signature of the secretary of the BOT
297 and it is a slow process.

298
299 Helton stated that individually these factors may not increase liability but questioned whether in
300 aggregate liability would be significantly increased. Martin stated that the opinion of counsel is
301 no. Schuldt applauded this initiative because it is imperative that UIS be able to act quickly to
302 bring in research money. Eisenhart noted that this is truly a nightmare for our campus. Given our
303 relative size, getting things through quickly should be a strength and it is not currently. Kline
304 stated that this is within the Ikenberry Guidelines and should not be of concern.

305
306 Ting asked if senators were ready to vote. All were in favor to support the proposed changes.
307

308 **Adjournment**

309 The meeting adjourned at 11: 10 AM