

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD  
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011  
April 8, 2011  
10:00 AM – 12:46 PM  
PAC Conference Room “G”**

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

**Senators Absent:** L. Bogle, T. Helton, W. Kline, C. Olivier, K. Sheridan, T. Sisneros

**Ex-Officio:** L. Pardie

**Guests:** D. Anthony, D. Atwell, H. Bapat, T. Barnett, J. Berry, C. Bradford, A. Carlberg, B. Cass, C. Cornell, T. Craig, H. Dell, A. Egizi, C. Eversgerd, D. Ferk, L. Giordano, R. Grosboll, K. Guthrie-Coleman, B. Hayler, J. Joseph, R. Knuppel, K. Moranski, D. Morris, V. Perkins, K. Pressley, D. Ruez, C. Schloemann, B. Selvaggio, E. Stanley, T. Sweeting-Trotter, D. Williamson, and A. Winters.

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

**Approval of the day’s agenda**

Salela motioned to approve the agenda for April 8, 2011. Melchin seconded the motion.

**Approval of Minutes from Meeting of March 25, 2011**

Chair Ting asked for approval of the minutes from the previous meeting. Ballard motioned to approve, Martin seconded the motion. Schuldt directed senators to line 326 and asked that “so far” be inserted before were found. Referring to line 329, Schuldt wanted the phrase, “troubling to UIC is that” UIUC before had good audit findings. On line 337-338, Schuldt stated that while he had said Civil Service Commission, it is officially the State University Civil Service System. Salela noted that Olivier’s name had been misspelled on line 97. Additionally, Salela pointed to line 239-240 and asked for a clarification. Ting asserted that the minutes were an accurate reflection. Fisher suggested that “and problem” be inserted between communication and solving on line 161. Pointing to line 409, Garmil suggested changing the phrase to “have the ability to make recommendations about academic related programs” and Martin recommended using “creating a task force” as an example. All were in favor of accepting the minutes with the suggested corrections.

## **Announcements**

Martin announced that Friday Night Star Parties will continue until the end of April. Fisher informed senators that the UIS Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences research Symposium was being held that day beginning at 12:30. Lan Dong provided the keynote. She believed the symposium was in the Brookens Auditorium and encouraged senators to attend if possible. Schuldt announced that the WUIS pledge drive began that morning. Contributions to the calendar club will be matched by AT&T.

## **Reports**

### **Chair – T. Ting**

Ting encouraged attendance at the reception for the New Chancellor Koch on Monday April 11 from 2:00-4:00 pm in the PAC lobby. At 4:00 pm, the Pension Reform Panel will be held in PAC conference rooms C and D. She also encouraged senators and all faculty and staff to attend Chairman Kennedy's address on Tuesday, April 12, at 10:00 in the Brookens Auditorium. He will be speaking about the U of I and future.

Ting wanted to share some information that has been discussed in the USC and in the SEC regarding the savings that has occurred from the restructuring. According to the memo by Avijit Ghosh who chairs ARR implementation, the total university savings by the end of last December was \$10.89 million. The breakdown of the savings was: \$2.7 million in I.T., \$5.6 million in procurements, \$1.24 million to shared service center, and approximately \$340 thousand to alumni and development related activities, and \$940 thousand related to off-campus rentals. Additionally, Ting noted this is university wide and, for example, the procurement savings have come mainly from departments and units using the IBUY system, savings from I.T. projects, AITS. She asked if anyone knew what AITS represents. Eisenhart stated that it is academic information technology service. Ting also stated that headway is still being made with the travel and expense management system, electronic contract management system. Furthermore, work is being done to implement grants management software, and to simplify contract processes.

Lastly, Ting stated that President Hogan finalized the entire slate for the university level VPAA search committee. Four UIS people were selected by President Hogan: Dean Wassenberg, student representative Charles Olivier, AP representative Sherry Smith, and faculty representative T. Ting. She highlighted that only one AP will be serving on the committee, and our AP was selected by President Hogan.

Boltuc emphasized the importance of attending Chairman Kennedy's presentation on Tuesday. Eisenhart echoed Boltuc's comments and stated that she cannot remember a time when the BOT Chair has spent time at UIS.

Fisher wanted to clarify that Ghosh had given the savings report. Ting stated that this was a memo from Ghosh to the ARR steering committee. Fisher asked if there was a campus breakdown provided in the report. Ting stated that there is not specific campus information, but thought that Pardie might have more information about our campus savings. Pardie stated that this was an interesting exercise. Each campus was asked to put forward numbers and estimate

their savings. According to Pardie, UIS looked really good because we have been preparing for some time.

Referring to the VPAA search, Ting announced that the first meeting was going to be held later in the afternoon. She again encouraged everyone to attend the pension reform panel and directed everyone's attention to the email sent from President Hogan about the precarious nature of the state budget.

Siddiquee stated that in the budget committee meeting, a question was raised about whether this is a real saving and if so, why did not happen before. He believes that some of the savings is due to interdepartmental issues and duplications. He believes that an explanation is necessary so that outside forces to not assume that we can continue to cut budgets. Ting agreed that the savings have largely occurred through reduction of duplication of back office operations. She noted that there was a one time savings of about \$500 thousand dollars, but did not know where that had come from. USC will continue to receive this type of information and will invite V.P. Gosh to visit some time in the future.

### **Provost – L. Pardie**

Provost Pardie stated that it had been a very active week on campus. She mentioned the Midwest-Great Lakes Society of Ecological Restoration Chapter Annual Meeting, which had been possible due to the work of the Biology Department and partnership with the Emiquon Field Station. The theme of the meeting was *Linkages between Ecological Restoration and Ecosystem Sustainability*. Tim Wise (dealing with diversity and prejudice in the classroom) and Dr. Jamie Washington (creating an LGBTQ and diversity friendly campus culture) were on campus this week providing faculty development workshops and events. Wise delivered a well attended presentation through ECCE which required an overflow room. Rev. Washington created a number of special events including town halls, a round table, and faculty development this morning.

Provost Pardie referred to President Hogan's email regarding the state of the budget. She emphasized the grimness of the current situation. According to the latest news, the State backlog is now approaching \$7 billion. Pardie urged senators to closely follow as very important conversations are happening relative to money saving strategies. She encouraged attendance at the Monday forum on pension reform to get a sense of what might happen. According to Pardie, there are multiple changes that may directly or indirectly affect UIS and faculty, staff, and students. Also related, Pardie discussed the performance based funding initiatives. The house and senate bills focus on performance indicators related to degree completion and student retention. Both the house and senate passed the bills. Lt. Governor Simon strongly supports. Several states have already passed similar bills. Pardie noted that one of the leading proponents is the President of Eastern Illinois University. The intent of the performance based funding should not be punitive in nature, rather the goal is to help institutions improve graduation and retention rates. If everything moves forward, the legislation will be in place by FY 2013. This will require additional monies (approximately \$40 thousand) to the IL Board of Higher Education.

Speaking about our current retention rates, Pardie stated that our retention rates for first time, first year, students from fall to fall is strong. Our numbers are slightly lower than our COPLAC

peers. Our 6 year graduation rate is higher than others. She asserted that we are always looking for ways to improve.

Garmil asked whether part-time students are taken into consideration in the bills. Pardie said that originally one set of indicators were proposed. Through discussion, questions were raised about how one set of indicators could meet the needs and account for institutional differences. She believes that a very broad based group will serve as an advisory group for this initiative. According to Pardie, U of I will have a seat at that table.

Eisenhart noted a problem that students have in receiving scholarships. She posited that only one in three students receives a scholarship which creates financial barriers that impede retention and graduation. Pardie stated that administration is well aware of the issue and that the U of I Foundation is working with offices on campus to think of ways to improve. She noted the paradoxical nature of the initiatives and the state appropriations still missing. Institutionally we can try to strengthen and are also at the mercy of the state.

Ting highlighted that of the \$470 million still owed by the state, that \$40 million of the money is in MAP dollars, which the University will end up absorbing it if the state does not pay.

Siddiquee asked about the incentives and whether we have information about what the benchmark level might be. Pardie stated that we don't have this information yet and that details will matter. In the constituency of the advisory group they are talking about bring in external consultants to talk about this issue. Li asked if there are other indicators than retention and graduation rates. Pardie stated that this is not specific yet; however, information suggests looking at services provided to retain underserved populations.

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

Van Vossen reported that the SGA passed a resolution in support of the IL version of the Dream Act on March 27, 2011. On April 6, 2011, several SGA members and students went to the Capitol for a UI lobby day and passed out relevant information. The focus was on educating legislators about the importance of not cutting funding for higher education. They encouraged legislators to pay what is owed to the university and not cut the budget further. Van Vossen reported having a very productive member with Maloney, who serves as chair of the senate higher education committee. The campaign for SGA Spring 2011 election is underway. Voting will take place on Wednesday and Thursday, April 13 and 14.

Fisher congratulated the SGA on the successful lobby day and asked about the participation. Van Vossen stated that the event was organized through the Alumni Association and had high student participation. Casinova stated that they grew out of the Sangamon Club. Approximately 185 people were present for the lobby day. Wassenberg shared feedback she had heard from alumni who work downtown. According to Wassenberg, they were very impressed by our students and how conversant they are.

#### **Academic Integrity Council Annual Report - K. Pressley**

Pressley wanted to add to the report that she was a bit surprised that no new cases had yet been added, but did not have anything further to add to the report. Garmil thanked Pressley for her work. Martin asked whether the problems with securing student panelists had been resolved.

Pressley stated that there is now a much larger student pool to draw from and the new process is working well. The departments supply the names. Van Vossen stated that SGA had created a contract that students sign.

Eisenhart asked whether there was a backlog of hearings. Pressley stated that there is not a backlog; however she expects more cases to emerge because of the cyclical nature of the semester.

Ting asked Pressley what kind of policies the committee is currently working on. Pressley said that one area relates to the immediacy of student suspension. M. Henss met with the AIC and talked about pros and cons of making the policy concrete. The issue will be revisited at the next meeting. Further, Pressley stated that a major current concern exists relative to the dual role the AIC chair plays in advisement to faculty and students, and being presiding officer of the hearings. Ting asked if the AIC has solidified the workshop materials. Pressley said she has handed over the materials to others who modify, and there are different types of workshops that need to be created and implemented. Pressley also stated that the AIC is still having difficulty getting information to transfer students. Ting mentioned issues with workload distribution within AIC. Pressley stated that people typically seek information from the Chair; however, it's getting better. Once specific people can be targeted on the website, this should help. Ting thanks Pressley for chairing the committee for two years.

#### **Enrollment Management Update - Vice Chancellor Barnett**

Barnett directed senators to the hard copy of his summary. He reported that freshman applications are slightly down. The biggest area of concern is with transfer applications which are down approximately 200. According to Barnett, graduate applications have increased, but this is because of Computer Science (+133) and MIS (+40). Talking about admissions, freshman admissions are down slightly and transfer admissions are down considerably at 76. Graduate student admissions have increased by 99, with the majority in Computer Science and MIS. A number of students are still pending because of missing information.

He stated that everyone has a list of programs that have received fewer applications this year.

Addressing current strategies and alterations, Barnett stated that an enrollment management plan has been created and many phone calls and emails are being sent. Specific action steps for counselors have been implemented, although this needs modification. Barnett asserted that a company has been hired to assist in the contact process. They identify students who have ACT scores that meet criteria and have identified majors similar to our offerings. There is an ongoing campaign to get students to apply and finish the process.

Barnett asserted that they are gathering information regarding why our transfer enrollments have decreased. Only anecdotal information is currently available, but seeking data. Barnett reported that there are a decreasing number of high school graduates in IL. Additionally, Chicago is heavily recruited. UIS has two admissions counselors living full time in Chicago. He stated that with exception to our honors students, other state schools are our major competitors. UIS is not yet competitive out of state. Our tuition and fees place us third most expensive in IL. Western, Eastern, Northern, and SIUE are much more aggressive in recruitment. Furthermore, Southeast Missouri State is very competitive with us. Another issue is the decrease in MAP funding.

Talking about internal challenges, Barnett reported that we were down three admissions counselors this year; however, they have been replaced. Barnett believed that the negative publicity in the press has also negatively impacted the recruitment of athletes.

Siddiquee asked about the cost rankings. He asked if housing is the root of the difference. Barnett explained that the residence halls were bonded. The bonds need to be re-paid and the money cannot come from other sources. Ting thought it was important to remember that we have the newest residence halls in the state. Siddiquee asked how we are explaining our cost to prospective students. Barnett agreed that our facilities are a major attraction. Giordano notes that another draw is faculty/student interaction.

Siddiquee asked how many potential students that we are missing. Barnett said that there is no way to measure this. Martin, referring to President Hogan's emphasis on enrollment management resources for the university, asked Barnett how this might offset some of the issues. Barnett stated that he has not been given any information on this but believes that a common application will help. Currently, we have to request information so we can contact prospective students. Ting asked if Barnett has received the report by the consultants who visited. Barnett said he is awaiting the report.

Eisenhart commented that Southeast Missouri State is actively recruiting in Chatham. According to her, students can attend SEMS much cheaper than they can attend UIS. Boltuc asked about the recruitment of online students. Barnett said that advertising for online programs is onerous because we cannot go directly through google, facebook, or twitter. Boltuc encouraged recruitment of online students. Barnett mentioned the change in federal law which has increased challenges. Pardie reported that the state authorization clause, which is under new federal regulations, includes a number of components. The goal is to protect students as consumers. For-profit institutions where there weren't good retention and graduation rates were targeted. The state authorization component is not because we are accredited by the HLC, but dictates that each institution meets requirements of the state. A database does not exist with this information. According to Pardie, there is a lot of push-back happening nationally. Work is being done to repeal this legislation. Ray Schroeder is monitoring closely. If it is not repealed, it would be tremendously cost prohibitive for us.

Giordano stated that she has been looking at data to better understand what is happening. She reported that the number of transfer applications is coming from traditional age students. A large decrease in the number of students over 25 has been seen, which is traditionally our largest pool.

Fisher asked about the data regarding the difficulty in recruiting athletes. Barnett stated that the information has been supplied by coaches who are trying to recruit. Fisher asked about the document imaging. Barnett hopes we will have this in place next year and believes it will help tremendously. Ting stated that this will speed up our process.

Garmil asked for data on international applicants. Giordano said that she did not have the information with her, but that international applicants are increasing. Li asked if students want to transfer from UIC and UIUC if they consider UIS. Giordano said that we accept all of their credits and make transferring easy, but we do not have other agreements in place. Ting said that part of enrollment management initiative is to have an articulation agreement among campuses.

For example, if a student is pre-med here, it will be easier for them to transfer to UIC. So far, UIUC is not in favor of this initiative. Martin stated that faculty representing UIS have been very involved in promoting this initiative.

Siddiquee asked if cost is a factor for students who have been admitted but decide not to attend. Barnett stated that cost and program offerings both factor in to those decisions. Salvaggio asked if anyone is investigating ways for us to mitigate fees by recruiting from other states or focusing on international students. Pardie asserted that we have looked at states from which a vast majority of students come. It would be challenging for us to advertise in areas (i.e., public universities in California). Currently, it is cost prohibitive for us to advertise in those areas.

Switzer asked what one thing that would really help in his recruitment efforts. Giordano stated that funds are challenging, the imaging equipment, and advertising. Barnett added scholarships would be very helpful. Ting said that President Hogan is directing the Foundation to begin an initiative to specifically raise funds for scholarships.

### **Discussion**

#### **Undergraduate Advising Task Force Report and Recommendations – Associate Vice Chancellor Moranski**

Moranski began her report by emphasizing the significant difference that can be made by increasing advising. She stated that the task force members (Jennifer Berry, Admissions and Records Officer, Office of Admissions; Aleta Carlberg, Associate Director of Records and Registration/Associate Registrar; Keenan Dungey, Faculty, Chemistry; Andrew Egzi, Program Information Coordinator, Liberal and Integrative Studies; Randy Knuppel, Student, Accounting; Karen Moranski, Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education [Chair]; Donald Morris, Faculty, Accounting; Beverly Rivera, Faculty, Criminal Justice; Tarah Sweeting-Trotter, Undergraduate Academic Advisor; Cynthia Wilson, Faculty, Teacher Education) have been meeting for the past six months to tackle this very important issue. The report produced is a well researched document that investigated best practices, and wanted to understand the impediments felt by students, faculty, and staff relative to advising. She stated that the Task Force was charged to make undergraduate advising efficient and effective for students. The Task force was asked to: map different kinds of advising; identify current roles, responsibilities, and interactions between professional advisors, online coordinators, and faculty regarding undergraduate advising; examine the transition issues for undergraduate advising at different stages; and examine the issue or complexity of dealing with multiple advisors.

Moranski went on to talk about the last ten years of proliferation of people doing pieces of advising. The introduction of freshman honors and general education students, university growth online and on campus, and the increased faculty responsibilities all play a role. She directed senators to the 20 units (listed in appendix 1) involved with advising. The Task Force believes this is too many and exacerbates confusion and misinformation. Evidences of substantial student concerns were found. She summarized the issues as follows: accessibility of advisors; lack of communication with advisors; changing of requirements; confusing DARS reports; misadvising, and multiple advisors. Substantial evidence of faculty's and professional advisors' concerns also

was found. Major concerns include: lack of recognition for advising; lack of preparedness of students; lack of time; confusing DARS reports; and resource inequities.

UATF provided a definition of advising and emphasized the importance of advising as teaching. Additionally, the UATF identify the roles and responsibilities of various staff and units on campus. To distinguish between roles, the UATF has adopted the terms direct advising, consulting, and referral. Through the process, the UATF explored advising literature to find best practices. Data suggest that faculty have the greatest impact on student retention and have a direct responsibility in the advisement process. Both the research and survey conducted in this process support this finding. Also critical, is the development of a professional advising staff. Given financial challenges, this has been difficult. In the faculty survey, faculty frequently commented about the need for assistance in the advising process.

Moranski asserted that the model being put forth by the UATF is a model that is already working. Moving advising closer to students (into colleges) is also important; although some centralization is necessary. Having someone to spearhead initiatives, a center director, will be critical to the success. Additionally, advising for undeclared and at-risk students is increasingly important. Realigning the academic advising center toward the needs of at-risk freshman and at-risk transfer students will assist in retention.

Moranski asserted that the Personnel Policies must also change to offer recognition for advising in the review process. The UATF outlined recommendations to be made immediately and across time. Immediately, many things can be implemented. For example, the creation of an advising handbook, offering trainings, discussions with departments about particular needs and challenges, and providing accurate lists of advisees will help tremendously and without a lot of additional cost. Moranski concluded the report by asserting that what we are currently doing isn't working. Adopting the changes suggested by the UATF may be the single most important step that we can take to improve student satisfaction, increase retention and graduation.

Martin asked about the likelihood of finding the suggested resources of \$650 thousand. Pardie said this will have to be an incremental approach; but we do not want to refuse the model because it is too idealistic. Pardie asserted that Moranski has been talking with Shures and thinking about how some positions might be reconfigured. Pardie encouraged faculty to provide feedback about the model. Additionally, she reminded senators of the proposed performance based funding initiatives that will focus on retention and graduation rates. Pardie stated that advising needs to be a top priority for us.

Ting informed senators that \$650 thousand dollars is the total budget, including about half of what's already been spent. Currently, we have six professional advisors and we would like to have thirteen. She stated that we are already invested in this area and hope to expand. Ballard said that advising is critical issue and is glad the senate is focused on this issue.

Eisenhart suggested that colleges conduct mini, follow-up surveys for students to find out how the process is working. Moranski stated that the UATF is very aware of the models that have come into play in different colleges relative to the relationship between online coordinator advising and recruitment. This is an area we will need to continue to investigate. Fisher

highlighted the difficulty and importance of accessing accurate advising lists for secretaries. She also encouraged the idea of taking faculty development to the department level. Moranski stated that Helton actually raised that suggestion earlier and thinks that is a great idea.

Martin encouraged all faculty to read this report, as increasing understanding will help to increase efficiency. Salvaggio asked if anyone has looked at the ERM? Moranski said that is addressed in the report. In the fall, templates will be built for emails and letters to students which will provide salient information about how to fix problems and who they may need to contact.

Hayler stated that she was pleased to see that students who have had problems with the way that they have moved through their degree program unrelated to GPA. Bad DARS reports certainly emerged as one problem. This is especially important with athletics as the NCAA has implemented rules. Fisher noted the importance of knowing who holds expertise in various areas. She suggested two FAQ's: one for students, and one for faculty. Moranski agreed that this is important and also can happen without cost.

Winters asked about streamlining the petition process. Moranski stated that this is also in the report. Policy is one way that this might happen. Borland said she has had good luck with Cunningham who works with DARS. She can often change things in the system and save on lots of student petitions.

Ting reminded senators that the UATF is an ad hoc committee put together by the senate. She believed they did a phenomenal job creating a roadmap for the campus to follow. She asked senators to endorse the report. Martin moved to endorse the report and Eisenhart seconded. All were in favor. Ting thanked all of the UATF members for their work.

### **Old Business**

#### **Resolution 40-18 Resolution Revising the UIS General Education Requirements [2nd reading]**

Ting introduced resolution 40-18. Martin motioned to discuss the resolution, Ballard seconded the motion. Martin directed senators to amendments that he proposed and had sent via email. For the benefit of those in the audience, Martin read his first proposed amendment to be appended to the end of line 232: All Freshman Seminar courses must be based in an academic department or program. Ting stated that there was an amendment on the table. Eisenhart seconded the motion. Martin suggested that while we do not want to preclude highly qualified staff from teaching UNI 101 courses, it is important that each course be housed within an academic department and be subject to the same evaluative process as other courses. All were in favor of the proposed amendment.

Martin introduced his second proposed amendment. He suggested the following changes: (1) to be appended to the end of line 232, "Freshman Seminars cannot be used as a pre-requisite for a major-specific requirement." and (2) replace "Courses fulfilling" on line 265 with, "Any course that is not Freshman Seminar that fulfills." Casinova seconded the motion. Fisher thanked Martin for providing his proposed amendments in advance. She wondered why we would not consider 100 level courses as part of the degree programs. Martin stated that this amendment grew from a request from the UGC. From his perspective, students are encouraged to step outside of their respective interest areas in freshman seminar to broaden perspectives. Having a major or minor

requirement will narrow where freshman go to get the seminar. Moranski suggested that one problem has been that sophomores have heavily populated (i.e., Comparative Societies) those courses. If made a requirement for a major, sophomores would have to populate those courses. She continued by stating that these are 1<sup>st</sup> semester, freshman, skill building courses.

Borland also suggested that this allows faculty to develop courses around interests. Similar course requirements therefore cannot be guaranteed. Garmil asked whether departments might add the course as a major level if desired. Ting stated that double-dipping cannot occur. Li stated that the rationale is clear and very good. He also questioned why the course cannot be used toward a degree. Martin asserted that the purpose of the freshman seminar is to build skills. The emphasis is on skill building first.

Boltuc supported the questions raised.

Borland offered a friendly amendment to change the phrasing that freshman seminar cannot be a required pre-requisite for a major. Martin did not accept the suggestion as a friendly amendment. As chair of the GECO, Dell stated that a major issue of concern is finding balance between emphasis on major and minor requirements, and commitment to a liberal arts education. She stated that students can take a risk in the seminar that they might not otherwise take.

Additionally, Dell suggested this will provide an opportunity for faculty and staff who want to teach subjects that they are passionate about but are not normally able to teach.

Boltuc and Li were both swayed by Dell's comments. Van Vossen asked if it would be easier for students to pursue their major if the seminars could be counted toward majors. Moranski stated that all other courses can count toward a prerequisite for a major. She reiterated the emphasis on skill building and engaging students. We are not taking away students' freedom to focus on the major, we are focusing on an area that we have needed to focus on. Fisher also was convinced by Dell's statements. She emphasized the importance of the general value of the liberal arts education.

Speaking to Van Vossen, Garmil asserted that students would not be disadvantaged because it will be a requirement for every student. Van Vossen if students will be required to take another course. Ting asserted that this is neutral and will not require additional course expectations. Salela suggested that as a skill building course, it is a prerequisite for all degrees.

Siddiquee asked if time was an issue and asked if a motion was needed to extend the meeting. Ting stated that the parliamentarian was absent. Martin asserted that the agenda did not contain time parameters. Borland stated that the agenda stated 10:00-12:00. Ting stated that she wanted to conclude this item because it is a second reading. Siddiquee asked about the new business because he wanted to be present for the new business. Martin suggested finishing the proposed amendment and then tabling until later. Ting asserted that she did not want to table right now. Anthony stated that she could not stay passed 12:30. Ting reminded senators that if new business is tabled, it will go to the new senate for approval. Martin called a point of order. Garmil suggested that we table 40-18 and move to new business 40-19. Ting stated that the order will be switched. Eisenhart seconded. Martin suggested that these were two different motions. Garmil moved to table 40-18 which was seconded by Boltuc. Garmil motioned to discuss 40-19, Eisenhart seconded. All were in favor.

## **New Business**

### **Resolution 40-19 Modifications in Personnel Review Procedures [1st reading]**

Borland called a point of order and asked if Anthony could speak for the resolution before discussion begins. Anthony stated that the policy aims to clarify the type of information that can be included at the departmental level. Currently, a wide variation in application of current policy exists. Occasionally, information is discussed but not included in the letter which is very confusing for the person being evaluated and others involved in the evaluative process. For example, the letter received is very positive but the votes are negative. The purpose of the policy is to increase transparency. PPC didn't think it was feasible for departments to meet beforehand to document.

Boltuc supports the spirit of the resolution. Furthermore, Boltuc suggested that there may be relevant information that is hearsay that could be relevant. He suggested a friendly amendment to line 85 which might allow for broadening. Anthony did not accept the friendly amendment. Pointing to line 22, Siddiquee noted that the word direct is present but not in other places. Anthony stated that the wording can be changed to match. Siddiquee raised questions relative to liability and fairness issues. Ting emphasized the confidential nature of the process. Siddiquee noted that the individual being reviewed would not have an opportunity to respond to the information being provided and that information will be included in the rest of the deliberation process. Anthony asserted that the PPC tried to address the issue by ensuring that the information is included in the letter. The faculty would then have an opportunity to respond once they received the letter. Eisenhart was not clear about where it says the information needs to be included in the letter. Anthony directed Eisenhart to line 51. Eisenhart clarified that the faculty member would then be able to respond prior to the next evaluative level. Anthony agreed.

Salela stated that she was stunned when she arrived at UIS that decisions could be made without faculty input. She believes that it is very serious to document such information without discussion. Switzer was unsure how the person could be notified because it may not be of concern for the majority. Ting thanked Anthony and stated that we would come back to this for a second reading.

Martin made a motion to remove 40-18 from the table for consideration. Fisher seconded the motion. A vote was called and yielded one nay vote. The motion passed.

## **Old Business Continued**

### **Resolution 40-18 Resolution Revising the UIS General Education Requirements [2nd reading]**

Martin introduced his 3<sup>rd</sup> proposed amendment. The following amendment to be appended after point 4 beginning on line 42 read:

“Before Freshman Seminar is first offered as part of the General Education requirements the Undergraduate Council must report they are satisfied that the following criteria have been met:

1. The General Education Council must develop a set of uniform goals and establish clear course approval criterion to be met by all Freshman Seminar courses.
2. The academic Deans must agree on a plan for equitable contribution to Freshman Seminar by all colleges and units.
3. Responsibility for assessment of Freshman Seminar courses must be

assigned and a regular schedule established to conduct assessment of those courses.

4. A plan must be developed to ensure appropriate advising of all first-year non-honors students to enroll in Freshman Seminar during their first semester.”

Eisenhart seconded the motion. Martin stated that these changes are being supported by the UGC to assist in implementation. Boltuc raised specific concerns around the third point. He believed that this amendment would unnecessarily complicate the process. Borland also opposed due to the complicated nature of the amendment. She suggested that it would be problematic if the catalog was incorrect. Martin stated that we have a very large problem if we cannot identify who is going to be conducting the assessment by Fall 2012.

Moranski asserted that the GECO has already drafted the approval criteria. Additionally, point 4 is already in place and can be sent out once approved. Two and Three will need some work but Moranski’s office and the GECO will be responsible for the assessment process. Ting asked if CASL will be involved. Moranski asserted that they would be involved collaboratively. The schedule would need to be decided upon. Decisions about whether assessments would happen every year or every two years will need to be decided upon. Ting stated that the amendment gives room to establish regular assessments. Talking to point number two, Ting thought it would be hard for the senate, GECO or UGC to hold the Deans accountable, unless the Provost makes a stern request of Deans. However, the senate can express the desire for Deans to make equitable contributions. While we do not know specifically what the plan will be, this is just seeking agreement.

Fisher agreed about the logistical point. She noted that this is taking into the senate the implementation of something that is ordinarily delegated to the councils. Fisher asserted that we can ask the council about if and how they are addressing issues, but does not believe it needs to be part of the resolution. Martin highlighted the ambiguity regarding which council will be dealing with what. This clearly gives the UGC some weight and they will be responsible to report back to senate. Pardie clarified that the senate really intends to say that Deans must agree before freshman seminar can be offered.

Borland called the question. A vote yielded 2 affirmative votes, 12 nays, and 4 abstentions. The proposed amendment was defeated.

Ting directed senators back to the main motion. Referring to lines 291 and 292, Garmil asked if the requirement would decrease. Moranski asserted that the requirement is for a total of 10 hours. One hour of speaker series and then students have the choice of how to complete the other requirements. Ting stated that this is confusing as listed because of the four categories. She suggested it read, “two of the three categories below for at least 9 credit hours, plus 1 credit hour of speaker series.” Garmil further suggested striking line 295. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Speaking as a Department Chair, Eisenhart agreed with the resolution in principle but struggled with not having enough resources to support. She sees this as an unfunded mandate because

resources will not be given to replace courses that will be open as a result. Martin echoed Eisenhart's concerns. He stated that supporting the resolution requires making a leap of faith that resources are available. Ting noted that departmental concerns are also important in making decisions about what faculty will be able to teach the seminar. Borland stated that she loved the spirit of the resolution and also shared the expressed concerns.

Pardie conveyed understanding of faculty concerns about the resources, the importance of the equitable distribution, and the need for sternness. She emphasized that she will work on this. Fisher noted that faculty who teach 100 level classes are sometimes put into a position requiring support and recognition for taking on a particularly challenging course. Bapat was hesitant to provide special recognition. Ting cautioned against creating negative expectations regarding first year courses. Boltuc expressed support for Fisher's concerns and for the resolution. Eisenhart called to question. The vote yielded 1 nay vote. All others were in favor.

Garmil suggested a speedy discussion of resolution 40-20.

### **New Business Continued**

#### **Resolution 40-20 Changes to UIS Campus Senate Bylaws – Academic Technology Committee [1st reading]**

Ting provided some rationale for Resolution 40-20. She asserted that this emerged because more flexibility is needed within the library to appoint appropriate person to the ATC. Martin asked if Salela was in support of the resolution. Salela stated that the resolution was actually at her request. Furthermore, Salela asked to suspend the rules. Van Vossen seconded the motion. Martin called to order. Boltuc questioned whether a quorum was present. Seventeen senators were present. A vote was taken to suspend the rules. Sixteen senators were in favor, one senator voted against suspension of the rules. The rules were suspended. Ting called for discussion. Garmil called to question. A vote yielded unanimous favor.

### **Adjournment**

Ting adjourned the meeting at 12:45 p.m.