

Approved
UIS Campus Senate Meeting
March 12, 2010

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010
February 26, 2010
10:03 AM – 11:11 PM
PAC Conference Room “G”

Senators Present: L. Bogle, S. Borland, K. Burton, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, J. Gilliam L. Giordano, J. Hall, N. Headman, W. Kline, J. Martin, P. Salela, B. Siddiquee, E. Smith, T. Sullivan-Stewart, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, H. Thompson and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: D. Felix, C. Olivier, and M. Van Vossen

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: H. Bapat, T. Barnett, B. Bunch, S. Cordell, C. Cornell, L. DeFrates, J. Ermatinger, R. Garmil, K. Moranski, M. Payne, L. Pardie, D. Ruez, Jr., and K. Rutherford.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Thompson to approve the agenda and was seconded by Martin. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of February 12, 2010

A motion to approve the minutes of February 12, 2010 was offered by Salela and seconded by Martin.

Martin requested clarification regarding the minutes’ attendance record, which noted Cass as being present as a senator instead of being a guest in place of Giordano. Giordano asked the same question, noting that she intended Cass to serve as a proxy. Martin stated that proxies are not permitted, as CLAS would not be entitled to send a representative in his place if he needed to miss a Senate meeting. Ting stated that the attendance issue would be clarified for the final version of the minutes. K. Rutherford provided some historical context regarding alternates to senate meetings, and Ting stated that would be addressed outside of the present meeting.

Provost Berman thanked Burton for translating his presentation comments into text for the minutes.

Hall asked for a correction to line 231 to clarify that he is in fact a member of the Graduate Council. The corrected minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Announcements

Casinova reported that the statewide coalition that was assembled last fall to restore Map Grant funding has unofficially become a “Save Our College” coalition, and they held a conference call with representatives from administration, ISAC and IBHE about organizing a grassroots effort on behalf of higher education. The strategy is to create groups based on geographic proximity, which for us would include Lincoln Land Community College. The coalition had asked if UIS’s group could take something of a lead on this issue, given our proximity to the state capitol, and that is something that will be discussed with his student colleagues. The IBHE has scheduled a breakfast with legislators on March 11th at the Stratton Building, and on April 21st there will be a Rally Day for Higher Education at the State Capitol.

Student Government is working on a resolution that would request faculty perspectives on how they view and use their furlough days. While this resolution is not yet complete, he urges faculty to consider taking a furlough day on April 21st and to use that day to participate in the Rally Day events. Salela asked what day of the week that would be on, and Ting said it was on Wednesday.

Martin offered a correction to an email sent out on Wednesday by the AAUP which stated that the development of the furlough policy took place outside of the usual governance structure. Martin believes that to be a factual error, as faculty and governance bodies did have a participative and significant contributive role in the development of this policy. He added that he felt that, as having been part of that process, faculty need to take responsibility for that policy as well.

Reports:

Chair – Ting

President Ikenberry is coming to UIS on March 5th, and he will meet with Civil Service employees and Academic Professionals from 2:30-3:15pm, and with faculty from 4-5pm. She sent out a reminder via email, and encouraged all who can to attend these meetings.

Ting added that these are difficult times, and she encouraged everyone to remain calm and to resist the temptation to jump to conclusions without having all necessary information. She reminded everyone that the institution is engaging in ongoing negotiations with unions, and that faculty are not a part of those discussions. She added that administration, especially HR, is not permitted to speak outside the confines of the negotiation table about specifics. Niebur had sent an email, copying all senators, recently asking for Ting’s help in union negotiations with HR as well as in arranging for a meeting between unionized CS employees and Ikenberry. However, Ting is not part of their negotiations and such things really fall outside of Ting’s role as Chair of

the Campus Senate. She spoke with Nieber and she understood Ting's role. Ting expressed her great appreciation for Nieber's understanding.

Ting also commented on the correction issued by the USC Executive Committee to the statement issued by the UIS Chapter of the AAUP concerning the University's response to the financial crisis. She noted that many people have their own views on the faculty role in shared governance and noted that it is important for everyone to review the Statutes to gain a better understanding of the faculty role in governance. The USC Executive Committee is comprised of faculty from UIS, UIUC and UIC. The USC Executive Committee statement that was issued is the collective statement regarding their perspective on the furlough policy process to date and the role faculty have played. She also reminded everyone that the Senate Officers cannot 'do it all' and she asked that Senators be sure to do their part to communicate Senate information to their colleagues.

Provost – H. Berman

Provost Berman congratulated the Career Services Office for the wonderful Career Fair they put on recently. Over 100 employers were present and it was well attended by students. It really seemed as though we had turned a sort of a corner, as it seems unlikely that so many employers would have been present if they did not believe they would find some good prospects. He offered congratulations to Tammy Craig and all who work in that office.

Berman stated that in his opinion the major difference between UIS now and what UIS will look like in five years will be the degree of international students and international collaborations. Recently, a group of high school students from China visited our campus. They were visiting universities on the West Coast, in the Midwest and on the East Coast. They visited Stanford, UC-Berkeley, Harvard, and UIS. It is difficult to imagine that they received as warm a welcome from those other institutions as we provided for them. A number of offices collaborated for this visit; Atwell helped with language testing and Giordano was there from Admissions. Atwell will be going back to visit that high school to solidify our relationship with them.

We have also developed a wonderful relationship with the University of Colima in Mexico. This academic year we had a number of students taking online courses in Political Science here, with some of our students taking courses in Political Science in Spanish at the University of Colima. Of particular note, one of our freshman students submitted a final paper, written in Spanish, that was so highly regarded that the university decided to publish his paper. Berman offered congratulations to the Department of Political Science, Crocker, and Goldberg-Bell for their participation in this successful exercise.

Bapat asked if the University of Colima students were offered e-Tuition rates. Berman stated that this was a student exchange situation, with Colima students paying their rates to take our courses, and UIS students paid their rate to take courses at Colima. The financial model then calls for reviewing the differences in tuition rates in a few years and squaring away any differences. He believed that they received e-Tuition rates. Kline asked who did the organizing,

and Berman stated that GoldbergBelle did much of the organizing, along with many others, and they all did a wonderful job. Ting noted that the University of Colima is one of our sister schools for student exchange programs. Wassenberg added that GoldbergBelle did a terrific job, as his college had no previous experience doing this kind of thing.

Student Government – M. Van Vossen (absent)

Casinova stated that Van Vossen did not ask him to present a report on behalf of the Student Government Association.

Committee on Committees – L. Fisher

There are two vacancies on CARR, and Mouw from PAA and Villegas from CBM have generously volunteered to serve. Siddiquee moved to approve the nominations, and Martin seconded the motion. The nominations were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Instructional Resources Management Summary Report

Berman noted that everyone should have received the transmittal letter and guiding principles documents. He stated that he is presenting this as a representative of this group and he thanked them. Bapat, Barnett, Bogle, Moranski, Pardie, Ruez, and Siddiquee served on the committee, and Berman also thanked the Deans for presenting their colleges' current activities on instructional resource management. This document is in large part a distillation of best practices from across the colleges.

This document represents an important component of the financial sustainability for the institution as we discussed two weeks ago. We have little control over the state portion of our budget, but what we can control is the use of our time. We can control which courses we teach and when we teach them. The way we use our collective time is the product of a multitude of decisions made by the individual faculty member, the department and the college. One size of "rules" will not fit all, and so central administration will not move forward in such a fashion. However, when curriculum decisions are made it is important to keep the financial impact of those decisions in mind, much like the environmental slogan of 'think global, act local.' Each of those small individual decisions can have a profound effect on the broader effectiveness of the institution.

Berman stated that to really understand how best to optimize the management of these resources it is important to know what we are doing and measure it. Consequently this committee arrived at several metrics that are thought likely to be very useful. Such activity examinations (including curriculum, course scheduling and course caps) will take place across colleges and faculty need to know that their colleagues will all be doing the same examinations.

Hall applauded this committee's report and the metrics, and asked about the reporting of these data. He asked if it might not be valuable to have subsets of data, especially with regard to on-ground, online, and Peoria campus examinations. Berman stated that he is aware of the CBMs wonderful breakdown along the lines Hall described. Berman noted that the analysis would probably then involve some common metrics across those settings. For example, using the utilization metric it might be helpful to examine the utilization at the department level and then to determine whether there is room for improvement and see if there is some way to close that gap. However, this global metric can serve most helpfully as a starting point, and then you would want to apply that to a finer

level of analysis, such as with Peoria students. Hall asked how that information would be supplied, and Berman stated the finer grained analyses he is talking about would be provided by the college. Wassenberg stated that her college already does precisely this. There is an application that attaches to Banner that allows for the accumulation of such data.

Kline asked for a clarification on the use of means versus medians in these computations. He asked if the use of the median might make the number more prone to skewing, and Berman indicated that the median is actually less susceptible to skewing from outliers. Kline commended the committee on their use of the less skew-prone measure. Berman offered an aside regarding his gerontological experiences. You can actually use both the mean and median to help determine the skewness.

Fisher also applauded the process behind this work and the thoughtfulness of committee's work. She asked if this group would continue to meet and provide continued guidance across the colleges in the analysis and application of these measures. Specifically thinking of course caps, she asked if this can be 'hooked' to retention measurements in particular with regard to general education. The concern is that we have raised course caps with many general education courses, and it might be useful to ask not only if we are using our faculty time effectively for financial purposes, but also if we are using our faculty time wisely with regard to success of students. Berman stated that the work of this committee is essentially done, and the implementation of generating these metrics will primarily be an administrative issue between college offices and institutional research. He added that while the application of similar metrics toward studying general education success is worthwhile and he can imagine using it in that way, but the focus right now is getting this system up and running.

Ting noted that if we are to measure the effect of course cap increases and IRM techniques on retention in general education courses, we need to begin measuring that now so that we can have an adequate baseline. Moranski indicated that we do already have that data, and indicated that course caps are essentially one small factor among many factors that might impact retention issues.

Ting stated that this metric would be applied to entire departments, but that does not prohibit deans from examining individual faculty. Fisher clarified that she was more concerned with the effect of course cap increases on general education retention, and Martin stated that he agreed this data would be useful as general education spans across departments. He suggested that we may want to consider charging some of our committees with using and analyzing some of this data.

Kline asked about the language that indicates consideration of elimination of concentrations that are consistently poorly enrolled. He asked if that would apply to concentrations that have some low enrolled courses, or would all of the courses need to be low enrolled? He further commented that the Provost had previously commented on the continued funding of Athletics because of its attraction value, and asked if similar reasoning might apply to programs or concentrations. He also asked if it might be possible to do some tweaking of those low enrolled concentrations or programs prior to using the 'nuclear' option. Berman stated that this language is primarily targeted at graduate programs, and the idea is to examine closely whether there is sufficient student demand to keep their enrollments at feasible levels. Elimination of programs/concentrations is simply one option, but modifying or examining ways to otherwise improve enrollment would certainly be options. Berman further clarified that Athletics is not an academic unit, which is why it is not being considered in the current discussion. Kline indicated his understanding of that fact, but was curious as to the use of similar reasoning to academic programs. Kline reiterated his concern that the language in the guidelines says "evaluate and eliminate" but it does not indicate any other options, which could read like a mandate to the deans to get out the hatchet.

Old Business

Resolution 39-17 Suspension of MPA Concentration in Criminal Justice [2nd reading]

Motion to open discussion was offered by Fisher and seconded by Thompson. There was no discussion. The resolution was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Resolution 39-18 Integration of an Assessment Reporting Process with Program Review [2nd reading]

Motion to open discussion was offered by Bogle and seconded by Siddiquee. Ting reiterated that this resolution is a policy resolution, and is not an implementation document. CASL would provide the training to faculty and program administrators for doing assessment next year, and the implementation of this would begin in AY 2012. Cordell has provided a schedule for program assessment reports as well.

Eisenhart asked to whom we should direct corrections to errors in the schedule. Ting stated that this is a draft schedule, and such comments and corrections should go to Cordell or CASL. CASL should first send the draft schedule out to programs for review and feedback.

Martin asked for clarification regarding the timeframe for when a 3rd year report would occur – would it occur after a self study? Cordell indicated that was the case. Ting asked if CASL had a website for their documents, and Cordell stated that they have a BlackBoard site but not an updated website at present. She stated they were planning to develop a website, which Ting indicated would be very useful for posting documents, schedules, and procedures. Hall added that he noted some errors in the draft schedule as well.

Salela asked if this applies only to degree granting programs, or if this would apply also to general education. Cordell stated that some process for general education would also apply but would likely be more limited.

Kline asked if these 3rd year reports would have to be simultaneously reviewed by CASL and by the Undergraduate Council (in the case of undergraduate programs). He asked if there is a written agreement that CASL would accept the UGC's recommendations? Moranski stated that there is a synergy between CASL and the Councils. She stated that CASL is doing a mid-career review, and Section 2 of the Program Review guidelines pertains to assessment. There is a committee looking at the assessment section of the guidelines, and they would need to be modified to reflect this change in assessment process. However, these reflect essentially two separate cycles of assessment – CASL does a mid-cycle review which the UGC would have access to. Kline asked what would happen when UGC or GC disagreed with CASL's assessment of what programs need to do. Moranski indicated that agreement or disagreement is less likely to be an issue than assuring that the program has acted on the feedback that was provided by the mid-cycle assessment. CASL's feedback is intended to be more formative, while UGC and GC are intended to be more summative. The Councils essentially "trump" anything CASL might say, as they have the ultimate authority for program reviews. Ting asked if the submission of a

3rd year report feedback provided by CASL would be shared with UGC and GC at the time, and Moranski indicated that it would.

Headman stated that, based on his experience with this, CASL's feedback really is supposed to be formative. They do not have any real authority, as it is the review of the UGC and GC that ultimately matters. Kline asked why a formative feedback body would not also ultimately be the final summative body. Moranski indicated that the guidelines for program assessment are campus-wide and all bodies should be using those guidelines in formative and summative feedback. Kline indicated that he wanted to see some guarantee that by doing what CASL says that UGC would also be satisfied. Ting stated that the assessment rubrics would be the same across those bodies.

Fisher asked what would happen to the annual assessment report if we approve this resolution now? Does that disappear? Moranski stated that it would. Ting asked if we need to include language abolishing the annual reports, and Moranski stated that there is no formal Senate language compelling annual assessment reports, so abolishment is not needed. Fisher also asked if those program review guidelines can be made easily visible via a website so that everyone is in clear agreement with regard to the assessment rubrics. Ting agreed and stated that next year will be crucial in getting departments comfortable with this process.

Martin described this process as analogous to a personnel process. One can think of CASL as a department personnel committee and UGC is more of a college personnel committee, and Moranski stated that was not quite accurate. Pardie stated that she would change some of the analogies being described here. The history of CASL is that it has been a supportive body, rather than an exclusively evaluative body. They have a history of working closely with departments and have offered many assessment workshops specifically tailored for departments. It is formative, and their assistance is individually tailored to departments so that departments retain control and remain responsible for the presentation of their own assessment data. The goal was also to reduce the reporting requirements and decrease the burden while still obtaining the necessary assessment information. She also acknowledged that CASL is taking on a huge burden in providing this formative advice and assistance. Cordell added that she recognizes the anxiety departments experience regarding assessment, much of which might be attributed to a failure to fully understand both why and how assessment is done. CASL comes in at the 'how' part, but ultimately assessment is up to the department. That information can also prove very helpful to the program for curricular planning and retention strategies. We also wish to make sure that we are serving our students the best we can.

Hall noted that there are many programs that, for accreditation purposes, need to do assessment and the process we are discussing with regard to this resolution is important in that regard.

Eisenhart stated that she has also been trying to push assessment in her program, but her program is simply not accustomed to doing this kind of assessment. It will make our new Director of Assessment happy to have this resource. Ting added that the schedule of assessment reporting indicates CASL will have a tremendous workload ahead of them. This responsibility will make CASL an even more important Senate committee.

Siddiquee cited some language in the resolution indicating assessment of administrative programs would occur, and asked what those would be. Pardie indicated that entities such as the Center for State Policy and Leadership that have academic elements to them would be subject to this process. Ting asked if they would be going through the status reporting sequence as well, and Pardie and Moranski both indicated they had not discussed that yet. Pardie elaborated on that point, saying that even if CASL did not require such participation, it might still be desirable especially for those units that want assistance with assessment. She added that CASL has administrators serving in an ex-officio role. Moranski added that one of the members of CASL has been tasked with working on an assessment mechanism for administrative units. The process is not fully fleshed out yet, but is ongoing within CASL.

The resolution passed with unanimous voice vote.

New Business

None.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Casinova and seconded by Thompson to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 11:11 pm.

