

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD  
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011  
March 25, 2011  
10:00 AM – 12:05 PM  
UHB 2008**

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

**Senators Absent:** K. Eisenhart, C. Olivier, K. Sheridan, H. Thompson, and T. Wang

**Ex-Officio:** L. Pardie

**Guests:** H. Bapat, B. Hayler, K. Moranski, K. Richardson, P. Shapinsky

The Senate was called to order at 10:04 A.M.

**Approval of the day's agenda**

Casinova moved to approve the agenda. Li seconded.

**Approval of Minutes from Meeting of March 11, 2011**

Melchin moved to approve the minutes and Li seconded the motion. Chair Ting called for any corrections, deletions or modifications. Three specific corrections were suggested: 1) changing the word "matrices" to "metrics" in line 347; 2) adding an apostrophe to Fisher's in line 393; 3) clarifying the five years of the chart on line 380 to 2003-2008. Minutes were approved unanimously with corrections.

**Announcements**

Martin announced that star party season was supposed to start today, but will probably begin in April instead due to weather. Star parties run Friday nights throughout April from 8-10 p.m.

**Reports**

**Chair – T. Ting**

Ting reported that two important reports will be put forward during the next senate meeting. One is the enrollment management update report given by Tim Barnett. At the same time, the senate also will discuss the report and recommendations from the Undergraduate Advising Taskforce (UATF). Thus, the senate will be reviewing issues

associated with recruitment and retention. She stated that she hoped all the senators will be here at the senate meeting.

The Board of Trustees meeting occurred this past Wednesday at UIS. One of the most significant issues addressed at board meeting: approval of tuition increase at the board meeting. More about the meeting will come from the provost and from Kathy Jamison, who wrote the B.O.T report.

### **Provost – L. Pardie**

Provost Pardie reported that the B.O.T was at UIS this week, which involves a great deal of work by our faculty and staff and students to get ready for the meeting and events. UIS delivered three separate presentations at the BOT. She reported that she was part of a three-campus presentation to Academic and Student Affairs Committee about what it means to be excellent in teaching, how we support that endeavor, and how to effectively evaluate teaching. UIS prepared videos for the meeting; one wonderful example features Keith Miller and Karen Kirkendall contrasting teaching online and OG. There was also a presentation for the BOT and guests Tuesday night called Campus Insights. This event allows campus to present something to the BOT so they understand more about the campus' function. Our focus was on UIS as a small public liberal arts institution delivering some of the highest quality education around. She talked about the AACU's high impact practices and demonstrated how to bring those practices to life in the classroom. During these presentations, UIS always makes a concerted effort to integrate technology. This time Ray Schroeder demonstrated twittering, and Missy Thibodeaux-Thompson was able to script the presentation at the last minute. Pinky Wassenberg and Karen Moranski helped as well, and it reflected well on UIS. Alumni came back as well to do faculty-student pairs for the presentation, which also made a positive impression on the guests.

Chancellor Berman presented at the board meeting itself, presenting the full array of things we do here at UIS, giving a sense of our history and a sense of the high quality education we give here. It was a good presentation well received.

The main focus of the meeting itself was the potential tuition increase, which was passed and which will affect new students. The increase was 6.9 percent, about \$22 million each year, about \$18.75 per credit hour more for undergraduates and about \$8.50 more per credit hour for graduate students. As prelude to the voting of tuition increase, Walt Knorr presented on the Illinois budget. The state still owes \$447 million at the time of Board meeting, which still represents a sizable gap between revenues and expenditures. He reported that there is \$35 billion in state expenditures but only \$34 billion in revenue, a significant shortfall. Also concerning was the state underfunding of pension obligations: more than \$16 million is owed, so that the pension system is only about 40 percent funded. We continue to be concerned about that. The \$22 million increase in tuition will not close that gap. The tuition increase is connected to the cost of higher education index.

Pardie congratulated Keith Miller, who has received an NSF grant to do multi-institutional research on ethics in computer science. Pardie also noted that faculty

members are in the cafeteria to help raise funds for our sister city in Ashikaga and Japan tsunami and earthquake relief.

After calling for questions for the provost, Ting reiterated that the pension is underfunded by the state. She announced that there will be a pension-reform panel offered by IGPA April 11, a Monday. It is open, but it would be nice to RSVP. The location will be the lobby of Sangamon Auditorium in PAC. Ting asked senators to bring this to the attention of colleagues; it is an important matter to be more educated about.

Ting then pointed out that the end of March is the last billing to the state. She reported that Knorr made a comment that in the past, right before the March BOT meeting, university usually got a payment from the state, but that did not occur this time.

She also pointed out that the 6.9 percent tuition increase only applies to undergraduate students, but that rate is guaranteed for four years. Thus, students have a 1.7 percent increase each year, which is in spirit with the previous BOT resolution that they wanted to tie any increase in tuition to the rate of inflation.

Ting also reiterated the congratulations to Keith Miller's NSF-funded project, particularly the multi-institutional aspect, which will involve members from UIUC, Parkland Community College, and an institution outside the state of Illinois as well.

X. Li asked if the 6.9 percent increase applies to all campuses. Pardie and Ting both responded yes. Pardie reiterated that it is tied to the HEPI index.

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

Three names were put forth to President Hogan for the VPAA search: Randy Knuppel, Charles Olivier, and Nells Dale.

#### **IBHE Faculty Advisory Council Report – L. Bogle**

Bogle pointed out that he shared four documents with the senators and suggested that if senators would like more regularly updated information, then they may sign up to be contacted with a free issue of the memo. He then proceeded to a summary of the FAC's latest work. What we have seen are common threads, he said: accountability of expenditures for public institutions (K-12 and higher education), seeing through the P20 initiative, and focusing on preparation for university-level studies, which ties into the desire to have more degrees awarded, but at the same time made more affordable. Bogle questioned how the state can reconcile that demand with it owing the university so much money. The state thinks that fixing K-12 will help retention and success at the higher education level, he said. The way to do it, legislators contend, would be to force consolidation of school districts and save the cost of superintendent's salaries. Legislators remark that they can save "\$120-150 million" if they consolidate. Bogle cautioned senators not to believe that figure because it does not account for how that workload would have to be shifted administratively, including hiring additional staff. The business lobby is pushing the idea; they do not care about four-year institutions. They want students to do a single thing and to do it well; they do not support a liberal arts ideal. The

FAC is trying to change some of these ways of thinking. The business community is trying to push “performance metrics,” which they would develop over the next two years. They want to add more and more red tape and work to what administrators have to do already. They want more students to graduate and more accountability, but they have the temerity to say that they want to maintain the quality of degrees and certificate, which relates to faculty. It is a Catch-22, Bogle said, because students will rate faculty lower if faculty focus on greater rigor.

Bogle asked rhetorically, “What do you see education looking like in 5-10 years?” He feared a greater focus on one thing, thereby losing the possibility for more well-rounded education. Along with that, he said, you have for-profit universities advertising budgets that are huge compared to public education.

Retention rates are affected by a number of factors, Bogle stated, including what students bring into their classrooms. Arguing to resistant audiences that more goes into retention and preparation for higher education presents some major challenges, Bogle said. These challenges are FAC’s goal to address, particularly the need for full-time faculty, which help to develop and maintain relationships with the university and the students and shows that we do more than teach.

Bogle pointed out that Jeff Mayes, a Quincy school board member, was bemoaning the fact that their achievement scores had dropped since the current superintendent was hired. Bogle remarked to Mayes that as poverty increases, achievement goes down, and Quincy’s poverty level had increased in recent years. But Mayes ignored Bogle’s point and stated outright that administrators would get no raises until achievement scores go up. This is the type of mindset that the FAC addresses, Bogle stated.

Ting interjected that Lt. Governor Simon has been a supporter of performance-based funding and asked if the FAC has access to her. Bogle responded that he didn’t know for sure, but stated that it is important to get to these individual lawmakers to discuss what a particular bill is and how it can be reasonably amended. They are accepting research, for example, that does not involve Illinois universities. He remarked that some in our Educational Leadership department do have the contacts with these lawmakers, so we need to use them. Boltuc asked if there is a concise document with specifics regarding pending bills to share with lawmakers. Bogle said that the FAC has a subcommittee working on this document. He also stated that he will distribute to senators the FAC’s position statement on criteria and recommended procedures for the hiring of faculty.

Fisher pointed out that the summary of Mayes’ comments indicates that he thinks the relevance of four-year higher education degree has changed towards privileging what he calls STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math). She stated that the movement towards STEM has nothing to do with his arguments preferring two- to four-year universities, and that STEM can be consistent with liberal education. She said that she had been looking at NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers), which states that they value liberal arts skills even more than job-related skills because they are more about critical thinking, research skills, oral communication, and problem solving as

explicit goals. When she sees that something like this is coming from the state, she said, she is concerned that he is ill-informed, and we need to get accurate information out. Does the FAC lobby? Fisher asked. Bogle responded that the FAC doesn't have the money to lobby, but does invite individuals to meetings and offers information.

At this point, Pardie stated that it was important to keep in mind that politics isn't always about knowledge. Keep in mind, she said, that we're not alone in communicating the value of higher education and liberal arts for both undergrad and graduate education. There are institutions and associations that are communicating very intensively to get the message across about the importance of liberal arts and liberal education: The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), for example, is putting out a lot of information; the Council of Graduate Schools has put out two sets (phase 1 and 2) of reports about the value of a master's education and about the effect of a too-narrow education on jobs and the market in the future. The University of Illinois' Office of Government Relations is also tracking these bills, but that's not to diminish in any way the FAC's efforts to educate—just so that you don't feel that no one has this on the radar screen, she said.

Sisneros asked about the potential importance of the Inspector General for Higher Education in the state of Illinois. We don't really know what the IG for higher education really means, he said. Bogle and Ting both concurred that they did not know the implications of this position.

Kline pointed out that senators should take with a grain of salt that Mayes speaks for all business interests in the state.

Martin stated that perhaps the importance of the Inspector General is that the proposal would be spending on yet something else that takes away money from us.

Garmil stated regarding the Manning presentation that senators should note the growth of for-profit institutions and the invasion on accreditation from the feds. A lot of federal laws are impacting us although intended to address problems in the for-profit sector. It's something for FAC to keep in mind, Garmil said.

Ting stated that this is especially concerning for online. For-profit, after all, is mainly about online degrees, she said, and there is this issue of state authorization, a bill sponsored by the Department of Education and passed by Congress. The state would have to authorize an online degree.

Pardie pointed out the number of associations who had joined Arne Duncan regarding concerns about state authorization of online programs. Legislators can be helpful, she said: 17 U.S. senators sent a letter to U.S. Department of Education asking it to reconsider the notion of state authorization.

Ting stated that our instructional services related to online education not only has a great national reputation, but is also a resource for other institutions. For example, Ray

Schroeder went to SIUC by invitation to evaluate their instructional support services unit. This says a lot about how far we have come. We are considered to be doing very well in support services for online education.

Bogle emphasized that Manning's argument that if you do it the expensive way, as UIS is, then it is good. UIS has the training and the infrastructure to support and teach students best. He said he wanted to point out that Manning understands we set the standard for online teaching and support: "We are at the pinnacle of what online teaching is," Bogle said. He stated that our reputation in national venues and how we compare to other, larger institutions is a real compliment to the university.

Boltuc stated that "a crisis is an opportunity." The push for for-profit, he contended, exposes how we are a leader in online education and that UIS is doing it right and that we have the biggest advantage because of our reputation. This crisis is a big opportunity for us to publicize our online programs more, he stated.

Ting mentioned that last December the IBHE FAC put out a draft position statement about degrees earned primarily online. She read aloud a portion of the draft: "Institutions that require a significant percentage (i.e., more than 20 percent) of courses be taken in residence may award B.A., B.S., M.A, [sic] M.S., Ed.D., Ph.D., and related degrees. The degree awarded should be different when the student completes a program of study in a learning environment that was less comprehensive and broad." The implication is that online degrees are subpar from in-residence learning. Bogle responded that he shared the draft with Ray Schroeder, Burkes Oakley and Karen Swan, who were more than happy to discuss it with the FAC. That draft, Bogle said, may or may not return. One member who helped draft the statement will be provided copious data to refute the notion that online degrees are inferior.

Martin interjected that having someone of Bogle's expertise is important to the committee and stated that he would encourage him to continue on this committee.

Ting noted that Bogle will be unable to attend the April 8 meeting at Northeastern Illinois University and stated that she will find an alternate because all senators need to come to the April 8 meeting.

#### **Board of Trustees Report – K. Jamison**

Jamison noted that the provost had already talked about what Knorr had to say. She found the underfunding of SURS surprising, that the shortfall was \$621 million. Lack of funding by 40 percent is substantial, she said. She reported that President Hogan is creating panels for faculty and staff to help inform faculty and staff about funding issues to make sure we understand them clearly. The BOT talked a lot about preserving the quality of education and the integrity of a University of Illinois degree. Hogan also talked about budgeting and shortfalls. Hogan wants to avoid furloughs b/c they are demoralizing. She reported that Trustee Kennedy noted how compensation problems have kept quality faculty away from the University of Illinois. She also reported that

Trustee Koritz said a contraction of academic programs must be under discussion in addition to administrative review.

Ting interjected that Koritz's comment was made during the discussion of the tuition increase because the tuition can't be the only way to generate more revenue to make the shortfall smaller. Contraction of academic programs was in this context, she said.

Jamison said it was noteworthy that Daniel Soso, UIUC student trustee, said some nice things about what we need to do as a university. All three student trustees realized that we need to hold the politicians accountable and that the state needs to pay us; they are not blaming the university or faculty. They encouraged all of us to get the politicians to make the payments. It appeared the student groups were in favor of tuition increase so as to maintain academic integrity and value of the institution.

Also, Jamison noted, there was a good presentation about University of Illinois Extension, about what they do and their extension into rural and urban areas. They teach agriculture and teach science to children and help with clean water around the world. A question was discussed about how to keep them on track with funding and the Extension Services' relative importance and how to maintain funding for Extension.

Jamison also stated that the public comment section was interesting. She focused on the re-designation of APs and who has or may have authority to designate positions as Civil Service or Academic Professional. At UIC, 2/3 of the AP positions will be converted to Civil Service. Atterberry opposed reclassification of APs back to Civil Service and opposed removal of campus authority to choose APs. There was also a comment given by Mr. Mark Thompson regarding his critique for academic freedom. Senator can read her report for more details.

Also, according to Jamison, the BOT sent a resolution the night before the meeting to support Hogan and University Administrative Staffing. Kennedy also gave a statement supporting Hogan, particularly about recent hires. The BOT supports him fully, she said, and suggests reading the full report for more comments.

Jamison also noted that a number of positions were approved by the BOT (see report itself for specific names).

Ting pointed out that the Vice Presidents for Health Affairs and Research are interim appointments and that there was an extension of the portfolio for other executive directors.

Martin added that he was at the dinner before the meeting. He stated that there was a presentation from the USC about procurement issues, and that although the focus of procurement issues is on Urbana, it very much affects us as well. The report doesn't have much about UIS, although there were examples that he provided to this USC subcommittee.

Li asked what type of potential changes there were going to be to the pension system.

Jamison answered that there is a reform panel. Ting encouraged him to come to the pension reform panel to learn more. She stated that the state is scaling back the contributions to future employees, but could some of the reforms could affect some currently in the system.

Li asked for clarification regarding AP and Civil Service employees.

Martin stated that campuses are currently allowed to determine whether we need AP or Civil Service.

Pardie said that there are clear guidelines about what is classified as civil service. If AP, you have to determine how it is different than civil service. On the Springfield campus, she said, we have almost always had a representative from University Human Resources. Our procedures at UIS have been very tight. The situation that is really driving this concern is unique to UIC. It is about the reclassification of all those positions, which were really decentralized at UIC. They didn't have the tight procedures that we have at UIS. Our system will be audited this summer. Maureen Parks does not expect us to have the same kinds of issues as UIC.

Martin stated that his understanding is that sometimes the rules regarding whether an employee is AP or Civil Service has to do with when you are hired.

Pardie said that she was not aware of that. Positions that will be reclassified happen after those individuals leave those positions.

Schuldt noted that UIC has had bad audit findings, and 2/3 of APs so far were found to be inappropriately classified. Those individuals are being reclassified as Civil Service. Some of those who worked more than 40 hours for the past two years may get overtime pay, he said. We have really been tight here; we have had good audit findings. Troubling to UIUC is that UIUC had good audit findings, but now there are things happening that are going beyond expectations.

Ting stated that the concern is that civil service system will take the results of the audit too far.

Schuldt stated that there was a bill in committee at the state legislature to remove the authority of the campus to make decisions regarding whether a position is classified civil service or AP. Now, the bill is to give that authority to a state entity, the Civil Service Commission [note: the correct name should be State University Civil Service System], not the university.

Garmil noted that the Civil Service Commission covers all of state agencies. He asked whether other agencies have a designation comparable to Academic Professionals. No one answered the question.

## **Old Business**

### **Resolution 40-17 Changes to UIS Senate By-Laws – Committee on Admissions, Recruitment, and Retention [2nd reading]**

Casinova moved to discuss the resolution. Kline seconded the motion. Ting reviewed the suggested edits from the first reading of the resolution: on page 2, lines 66-68, she said that she accepted the amendment to remove the word “programs,” which came out of a discussion with the Undergraduate Council (UGC) chair, Harsh Bapat. Programs related to retention, such as remedial programs, are under the purview of UGC. Ting said we wanted to be sure that CARR is about policies. She also accepted the previous clarification from Borland regarding the language “one from each of the degree granting colleges.”

Zhang renewed his amendment to relax the requirement of one faculty member from each degree granting college. He said he could see the merit of doing this, but considered it a little bit strict. He proposed an amendment to insert on line 82, after “members”: “ideally, but not mandatorily.” Ting asked for the rationale and noted that the change amounts to at-large representation. Zhang stated that finding a volunteer on a particular year from each college could be challenging. Ting said that Zhang’s rationale could be relevant for all senate standing committees. Martin stated that he opposed the amendment because it could leave a particular college without representation. Kline voiced his opposition to the amendment, pointing out that if there is so much trouble staffing the committee, then perhaps we don’t want the committee. Helton noted that volunteering for a committee is immaterial because we sometimes have to track down and “force” volunteers rather than rely only upon those who have officially volunteered.

Borland called a point of order, pointing out that there had been no second to the amendment. Ting called for a second. Helton seconded the motion to discuss the amendment on the floor.

Zhang continued his rationale, stating that perhaps there is more than one representative of a college who has the passion or expertise to contribute, but would be denied a spot on the committee. He stated that he was arguing for committee effectiveness.

Ting responded that it is good to have representative from each of the degree-granting colleges. The issue of recruitment and retention is across the whole university, she said, so we need a voice from each of colleges to work with the VCSA and VCAA, to really get to know what is being discussed and what is being done in individual colleges. If you staff with at-large, it may skew to or away from a particular college’s interests. So, what would the issues of other colleges be, she asked. They may not be addressed because the committee might not know the issues.

Fisher stated that as a former member of the Committee on Committees, she likes the CARR committee generally, but it is complicated b/c required one from each college, plus other requirements of online representation, etc. It was a plaid of requirements, she

said, for who goes on that committee. The specific language, she stated, that Zhang suggested would be tough because it is general. Some other committees and the bylaws state that no more than two colleges may be represented, which gives a clear directive for the staffing process.

Ting reminded the senators that the resolution pared representation down to four faculty members from the original.

Wassenberg stated that she would oppose anything that would move away from representation of each college. Since she has become dean and learned about other colleges, she has come to appreciate how different each of our colleges is in admissions, recruiting and retention. Public Affairs and Administration, for example, is majority graduate and has to deal with stringent accreditations; CLAS serves mainly undergraduates and has a few high-profile graduate programs. This committee should be looking for expertise from constituencies that live in very different places even in the same university, she said.

Ting called for vote on amendment. There was one favorable vote. Amendment failed to pass.

Garmil asked a question about the removal of the word “programs.” Would CARR still have ability to make recommendations about academic-related programs, such as creating a task force?

Ting pointed out that the UATF that grew from CARR’s initial recommendations was appointed by the senate separate from any authority of the committee. Thus, the committee would not be limited in its ability to make recommendations, which the senate could then use to create issue-related taskforces.

Ting called for a vote on the resolution. One negative vote was recorded. The resolution passed.

### **New Business**

#### **Resolution 40-18 Revising the UIS General Education Requirements [1<sup>st</sup> Reading]**

Martin moved to discuss the resolution. Li seconded.

Ting introduced guests who could answer questions regarding the resolution: Peter Shapinsky, Harsh Bapat, Karen Moranski.

Bapat made an opening statement regarding the UGC’s memo of support. The memo, he said, resulted from consideration of a proposal from the General Education Council (GEC). UGC discussed each of the individual changes being proposed. Bapat emphasized the importance of careful implementation of the proposed changes, particularly regarding the proposed freshman seminar. He stated, however, that the proposals are a really positive step and that the University needs to continue on this path. He stated his belief that UIS needs to reconsider the general education curriculum, how it

is benefitting students, and the changes that can be made. He argued for future data-driven decision making instead of relying upon anecdotal evidence.

Moranski summarized the proposal briefly. There are four main changes, she said; one of those is the substitution for freshman seminar for comparative societies requirement, which came out of discussions about the retention of our freshman students. She traced the proposal from 2005 and the General Education Working Group. She also stated that both Academic and Student Affairs support the proposal. ENG 101 and 102 is a straightforward suggestion proposed by English Department, she said, that puts us in line with public and most private institutions in Illinois. The most interesting and politically complicated change, she stated, is the elimination of the ECCE elective and the flexibility suggested by ECCE elective hours being allotted for three remaining categories. The key request for internship (6 hours) will remain. There had been requests from adult learner students who don't want the internship and find it difficult to get that done. This proposal allows them flexibility to do U.S. Communities and Global Awareness instead of the engagement experience. Moranski acknowledged that there are ways in which the whole discussion has come full circle towards old university requirements. She reiterated that the proposal increases flexibility, reduces the number of required hours in the general education curriculum, and hopefully increases retention, a "win-win-win for the whole campus."

Switzer asked that if the senate approves the proposal and the total number of hours for general education drops from 55 to 50, then how does that compare to our peer institutions?

Moranski replied that compared to Illinois publics, UIS would remain on higher side of required general education hours. They run the gamut from 40-48 hours, she said. She remarked that all other public institutions primarily follow the IAI, but they may have a couple of extra categories as we do for ECCE. In terms of COPLACs, we are right in the mix, if not on the low side, she said. Two or three of them have as many as 60-65 required hours and others go from 40-52 hours. UIS ends up being in the middle.

Ting asked if COPLAC institutions that have 65 hours allow double dipping. Moranski indicated that she suspected they must, which UIS also allows.

Switzer remarked that she thought Harsh made good points in his memo. She pointed to the second bullet on the first page of the memo and asked about how UIS can ensure equitable distribution of general education commitments across colleges. She asked Pardie if there was a way to realistically ensure such a thing. Pardie stated that the situation is complicated, but that she can bring up the issue again in dean's council and especially address the colleges particularly concerned with outside accreditation.

Wassenberg stated that there have been other ideas bandied about in dean's council. She suggested that the challenges to the "non-enthusiastically participating" college may be dealt with through scutage, a Medieval term that means to provide payment for someone else to render services in the place of the entity initially committed to provide the service.

Martin inquired who implements these changes and oversees that implementation. Ting responded that the Office of Undergraduate Education must spearhead the implementation effort. Martin then stated that he believed the implementation details should be specified in the resolution. Ting stated that Moranski could instead address implementation concerns now.

Moranski then distributed a document regarding staffing of freshman seminar, which the UGC memo directly addressed. She explained that the document is a staffing analysis done to address the issues of how we would staff comparative societies and freshman seminar. The upshot, she said, is that the 10-11 sections of freshman seminar in the fall each year should be divided equitably—not equally—between the four academic colleges, the library, and select staff from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. We have among these constituencies very interested people to teach the classes, she said. The data show nationally that when faculty members teach freshman seminars, retention is higher. That doesn't mean we need them in every section, she said, and it may be possible to use a highly qualified staff person from Academic Affairs or Student Affairs with a great syllabus that goes through governance to teach these courses. She has talked to all these constituencies about the possibilities for finding just one section that might be taught by a specific college (CBM or EHS). If you look at the enrollments in the colleges and divide among the colleges, then you might say that CLAS should be responsible for four, not eight or ten, and that PAA should handle two. We should try to get sections from EHS and CBM, a librarian, a student affairs and an academic affairs person. It doesn't take much, and it does reduce the burden on CLAS and PAA of comparative societies staffing, Moranski stated. CLAS could reduce its general education obligations, at least in the number of sections taught by using this model.

Ting stated that the freshman seminar will replace one comparative societies course, so we won't need as many comparative societies courses anymore. Some of those faculty members might be able to turn that comparative societies course into a freshman seminar, which might help staffing of the freshman seminar, she said.

Fisher commended GEC on the proposal and chart. She stated that this represents outstanding work and that she knows much work hard went into getting feedback from everyone on campus. The process has been productive, from her perspective. She stated that she supports the proposal. She explained some of the frustration with teaching comparative societies has been balancing both the goals of diversity education with those of basic college skills. She stated that this complaint was likely part of the impetus for this proposal. She said she loves the idea of freshman seminar being about any topic that can get freshman excited about their college experience and that it broadens the topics out beyond humanities and social sciences. However, it still leaves us with the problem of training faculty to teach freshman college skills.

Moranski pointed out that on the top of the back page of the proposal, the issue of training is addressed. It specifies that faculty receive course development stipends for freshman seminars and this stipend is intended to encourage the faculty member to obtain

training. She remarked that even with the stipends, we are still paying less than we are for adjuncts teaching UNI 101.

Ting asked about funding, particularly in the short term trying to fund UNI being taught and at the same time come up with course development stipends.

In the short term, Moranski said, we want to increase faculty on-load participation in those sections of UNI 101, a two-hour course. That will help a little in paying the stipends and the adjunct pay, she stated.

Ting then inquired about when the call for course proposals would go out and when the training of faculty would occur.

Moranski stated that the freshman seminar course approval criteria go to GECO on Monday. She stated that they cannot put out the call until the proposal is approved. If approved, she said that she put out the call and provide the approval criteria the very next week. Presuming this resolution is passed, she said, she expected to put out a call for proposals by the end of this academic year. She stated that February of 2012 would be the deadline for proposals for the fall of 2012. Ting stated that this provides time to specify the cohort of teachers for Fall 2012.

Moranski continued to explain that freshman seminars will be different than other general education courses because they would focus on freshman skill building such as note-taking and critical reading skills. She states that her office will schedule regular workshops for those faculty teaching those skills in freshman seminar. Those folks who have been teaching comparative societies who are very experienced are very aware of the type of skill-building that needs to be done. All can benefit from additional training, she said. We will do that over 2011-12 academic year, she stated.

Boltuc pointed out that he thinks it is great that faculty can share passion for a subject in first year of study. He cautioned, however, that over-regulating the process could be a barrier to those who want to share their passion for a topic. He also stated that eliminating the ECCE elective may not be much of a problem, but he was concerned about the red tape that seems to create problems for those who might like to get a class like Ancient Greek Wisdom on the books. How, he wondered, would someone get those types of electives in the general education curriculum if the criteria for ECCE classes don't match the course objectives as the instructor outlines them?

Shapinsky responded that there was no automatic transition from the old PAC/LIS/LSC system to the new ECCE system, but that GECO is happy to help individuals transition their courses to the ECCE. Boltuc reiterated that his class wouldn't fit and suggested that the categories themselves are too narrow and need to be revisited.

Shapinsky stated that GECO continually works to refine the categories and that the criteria for Global Awareness ECCE classes are next. He explained the process of refining and that GECO specifically solicits feedback from faculty throughout the process.

Ting stated that faculty members do not have to designate classes as ECCE in order for them to be considered general education. This proposal is not intended to constrain what a faculty member offers.

Martin stated that he wanted to broaden upon Boltuc's concern. He stated his worry as a member of Gen Ed Council that there is pressure to produce a catalog where every course has a special designation. Maybe we should create a catalog that includes courses that are just there, he said. He stated that he doesn't know how he will vote for this proposal, although he understands the logic, but the freshman seminar raises concerns for him, as a science faculty member who is already overtaxed in general education obligations and the major. One of the selling points of this is that it will open up to faculty teaching its passions, he reiterated, but he wondered just how many freshman seminars would get proposed from the sciences. He reiterated his hesitance, in part because he wants no reprisals or directives from the dean that would imply a need for scutage at the department level. Scutage isn't going to work for a group that can't give, he said.

Wassenburg argued that the discussion of scutage was at a college level, and no one would suggest that CLAS isn't pulling its weight in general education.

Martin reiterated his concern about how the dean could turn this around and expect a diversity of departments delivering these courses. He said he didn't think the departments he represents could support that.

Ting stated that the science faculty has nothing to do with comparative societies at this point. By opening up one comparative societies to freshman seminar, sciences could participated if it wanted to, but the division would not be commanded to do so.

Martin reiterated his apprehension with the idea and its implementation.

Sisneros asked what the last two sentences about IAI of Moranski's handout mean.

Moranski clarified that UIS would have the potential to move some of these courses proposed for freshman seminar forward for IAI approval, which is not something any other institution in state of Illinois does. The way we are doing this seminar is as content-based courses, which allows us the hope that some of these courses are approvable as IAI.

Ting asked: When faculty member propose the freshman seminar course, will it be required to meet IAI criteria? Moranski answered: No. The point of the IAI designation is in part to help students to plan to transfer out of the university because we don't have a particular major that the students want. Not all classes transfer, and we want to advise students into the ones that will. We can advise them into the ones with IAI designation if we know that they will be transferring out of UIS, she explained.

Ting stated that this resolution will come back for second reading April 8. She reiterated the importance of the next meeting because of the two reports regarding student recruitment and retention and because of the second reading of 40-18.

**Adjournment**

Kline moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:05 p.m. Borland seconded the motion.