

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

MINUTES
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2011-2012
FRIDAY, November 4, 2011
10:00 A.M. – 12:18 P.M.
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “G”

Senators Present: J. Villegas, Y. Zhang, X. Li, A. Sisneros, T. Helton, P. Salela, , C. Hoelscher, J. Tienken, R. Bouray, D. Ballard, E. Wilson , A. Mulvey, D. Bussell, K. Jamison, L. Atkinson , J. Case-Pease, G. Simo, D. Schuldt, , L. Fisher, R. Garmil, P. Wassenberg, J. Martin, C. Switzer, K. Sheridan and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: W. Kline, P. Boltuc, D. Ruez, , S. Miller

Ex-Officio: Lynn Pardie

Guests: Kathy DeBarr, Hilary Frost-Kumpf, Wendy Johnson, Cecilia Cornell, Scott Day, Deborah Anthony, Alissa Groening, Jennifer J. Berry, Karen Moranski, John Transue, Evan Stanley, Jim Korte, Kathryn Kleeman, Tammy Craig, Kristi Barnwell, Tim Barnett, Eric Thibodeaux-Thompson

Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order by T. Ting at 10:00 a.m. A motion to approve the agenda made by J. Villegas and seconded by X. Li carried unanimously.

Approval of the Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes from the October 21, 2011 Senate meeting was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by C. Switzer. The motion to approve the minutes carried unanimously. Minor corrections were indicated by T. Helton and D. Schuldt.

Announcements

T. Ting announced that the week of November 7-11 is the 4th Annual Sustainability Week to include many activities dedicated to Sustainability education. On November 7th, there will be an electronic recycling event in Parking Lot E. On November 8th, there will be a viewing and discussion regarding the film, *Green Fire: Aldo Leopold and a Land Ethic for Our Time* in Brookens Auditorium at 7 pm.

T. Ting announced Chancellor Koch made a personal contribution of \$25,000 to kickoff the *Access Illinois* student scholarship initiative. She inquired as to whether or not senators would endorse the SEC looking into ways that UIS Senate might also contribute to this initiative by endorsing or encouraging campus community giving. One approach would be to have a letter sent from the UIS Senate to the campus community identifying a goal of \$2500 and encouraging members of the campus community to contribute. It is more about raising awareness and encouraging participation however. The Senate endorsed the idea of exploring with the development office.

R. Garmil announced there will be two more performances of *I hate Hamlet* by the UIS Theatre group tonight and tomorrow night.

D. Bussell announced a significant endowment was made by a former student to English department.

P. Salela announced that the library is conducting a series of drop-in workshops for students both at the library and online. She encouraged faculty to have their students check into it and perhaps to give class credit for attendance.

52
53 J. Villegas reminded Senators to complete the Climate Survey and to remind students to complete the
54 survey as well.

55
56 D. Schuldt announced that the Center for State Policy and Leadership is hosting two faculty research
57 forums for faculty who received funding from the Center for their research to present their research
58 findings. These will be held November 17th and 29th at 1:30 in PAC G.

59
60 Provost Pardie announced a faculty workshop on student perceptions of teaching at UIS to be held
61 November 18, 1:00-2:30 in UHB 2034.

62
63 Reports

64 **Chair- T. Ting**

65
66 T. Ting reported that the Chancellor has announced the membership of the search committee for the
67 VCAA & Provost position. Professor Mike Miller chairs the search committee. The committee includes
68 Tom Ambrose (AP), Harsh Bapat (faculty), Tim Barnett (administrator), Karen Brewer (CS), Beverly
69 Bunch (faculty), Tammy Craig (AP), Clarice Ford (administrator), Jay Gilliam (faculty), James Hall
70 (faculty), Kemau Kemayo (faculty), Michael Miller (faculty), Ted Mims (faculty), Sheryl Murray (CS),
71 Laurel Newman (faculty), Jeremy Nelson (graduate student), Carolyn Peck (faculty), Aaron Shures
72 (administrator), Karen Swan (faculty), Jorge Villegas (faculty), Pinky Wassenberg (Dean), Shonda White
73 (undergraduate student).

74
75 **Provost – L. Pardie**

76
77 The Provost's office is tracking the registration report. While it is still very early, so far registration
78 numbers are looking good. She encouraged faculty to have discussions with their department to ensure the
79 availability of faculty to answer questions from potential transfer students and prospective applicants. It is
80 important that we are doing everything that we can be doing to ensure registrations.

81
82 L. Fisher asked if there has been a specific percentage of the budget to be set aside in the event there will
83 be budget rescissions in the remainder of the academic year.

84
85 L. Pardie responded that no set percentage has been identified and that there will likely be several
86 scenarios identified by U of I administrators and several plans to respond to each of the scenarios. She
87 clarified that reserves were produced and left-over from last year, as the amount projected to be cut in the
88 funding from the State were not as deep as anticipated.

89
90 **Student Government Association - E. Wilson**

91
92 E. Wilson reported a successful Lobby Day at the State Capital. The SGA was able to speak with several
93 Senators. At Lobby Day, E. Wilson was able to speak with the UIUC SGA president, who is very
94 receptive to the idea of a university-wide SGA dialogue. No topics for the agenda have been identified.
95 Finally, the SGA has planned an event, *Chocolate with the Chancellor*, to be held Sunday evening
96 beginning at 9:30.

97
98 **Old Business**

99
100 **Resolution 41-19 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 10 – Modification of Scholar in Residence**
101 **Title [2nd reading]**

102

103 A motion to consider Resolution 41-19 was made by J. Martin and was seconded by D. Ballard.
104 There was no discussion and the Resolution carried with unanimous support.

105
106 **Resolution 41-20 Definitions of Majors, Minors, and Concentrations at the Undergraduate**
107 **Level [2nd reading]**

108
109 A motion to consider Resolution 41-20 was made by J. Villegas and was seconded by T. Helton. A
110 motion for a friendly amendment was made by R. Garmil and was seconded by J. Villegas. The
111 amendment includes the following language; *whereas the Bylaws of the Senate give the Undergraduate*
112 *Council is charged with reviewing, evaluating and facilitating development of academic standards for*
113 *undergraduate programs.* The Resolution carried with unanimous support.

114
115 **New Business**

116
117 **Resolution 41-21 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 5, 6 & 7 - Clarification of Reappointment,**
118 **Tenure and Promotion Application Procedures [1st reading]**

119
120 A motion to consider Resolution 41-21 was made by X. Li and was seconded by C. Switzer.
121 D. Anthony explained that this resolution came about due to inconsistencies in policy the exact
122 procedures for faculty applying for reappointment, both at tenure and reappointment. This resolution
123 clarifies that faculty must submit materials to the department, into the personnel file, and to the Dean.
124 Failure to submit to the Dean is not grounds for waiving the right to apply for promotion. Further, the
125 resolution clarifies that the materials need to go to the chair of the committee. These changes apply to all
126 three levels of review.

127
128 **Resolution 41-22 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 3 & 9 (Appendix 10) - Clarification of Faculty**
129 **Advising Responsibilities [1st reading]**

130
131 A motion to consider Resolution 41-22 was made by T. Helton and was seconded by R. Garmil.

132
133 D. Anthony explains the resolution is in response to the Undergraduate Advising Task Force which
134 recommended changes in how advising is done at UIS. Changes proposed in this resolution clarify and
135 strengthen the language in the Faculty Personnel Policy we have now and recognize the importance of
136 advising to the success of students. This resolution incorporates suggestions and recommendations for
137 faculty to document their advising tasks in the process of performance/reappointment/tenure/promotion
138 review.

139
140 T. Ting reminded Senators that the Task Forces' report indicated a need for language which clarifies
141 faculty responsibilities for advising. This resolution is a direct response to those recommendations.

142
143 K. Moranski added that another recommendation of the Task Force was the development of an instrument
144 for students to use in evaluation of advising. The task force is continuing to work on developing the
145 instrument and it should be ready for the Senate to review in the upcoming weeks.

146
147 J. Villegas asked if it would be appropriate to wait, or table, the discussion on this resolution until we
148 have a clear understanding of what the student evaluation of advising form will look like. In that way, the
149 resolution might include all pertinent information and language regarding the process of advising, as
150 recommended by the task force.

151

152 J. Martin and T. Helton agreed that more discussion is needed regarding the content of the evaluation of
153 advising should occur prior to setting forth recommendations regarding the process of advising in policy.

154
155 K. Moranski commented that there needs to be agreement about the standards of advising, but that
156 maintaining the status quo is no longer an option. There also needs to be agreement on recommendations
157 for quantitative and qualitative measures of advising performance and effectiveness.

158
159 **Resolution 41-23 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 2 - Modifications in Personnel Review**
160 **Procedures [1st reading]**

161
162 A motion to consider Resolution 41-23 was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by X. Li.

163
164 R. Garmil commented that he believes this resolution contradicts language in current policy regarding the
165 personnel file including issues of anonymity, the opportunity for candidates to review the file and asked
166 how things were moved, and others. He believes this is the wrong solution to concerns about first-hand
167 knowledge and retribution.

168
169 D. Bussell commented that first-person knowledge is part of the process and can't be ignored. The
170 problem, in her view, is that this is operating covertly in that there is no explanation in the letter produced
171 by a committee as to the basis of their decision.

172
173 J. Martin is concerned that this resolution does nothing to incentivize good practices by committees.

174
175 X. Li supports this resolution because it addresses inconsistencies in practice. He supports faculty
176 documenting problems in the personnel file.

177
178 T. Helton commented that she is unlikely to document some small thing. However, if a committee is
179 sitting together, they may be likely to talk about their observations, and could say something positive. She
180 believes it is not fair to ask junior faculty to vote on tenure decisions. But because we do that, they
181 deserve extra protections such as not being asked to put something in writing in a file. She also agrees that
182 first-hand knowledge is at the essence of what occurs in personnel committee. She questions the extent of
183 the rationale which should be set forth in the letter produced by a committee regarding their vote and
184 recommendations.

185
186 Y. Zhang commented that personnel committees could create documentation as a committee, rather than
187 an individual. This might occur because an individual might hesitate to put their name on negative
188 comments compared to doing this as a group.

189
190 K. Sheridan commented that there are too many issues presented in this resolution, making it difficult to
191 vote on. She does not support this resolution. As long as a resolution puts forth language regarding the
192 use of first-hand knowledge, then it must also include language which allows for a candidate to have
193 adequate time to respond to negative perspectives or experiences of faculty.

194
195 R. Garmil asked Y. Zhang to clarify if his recommended committee letter would occur prior to the
196 personnel committee review. Y. Zhang clarified that yes it could occur before-hand, but then there might
197 be concern regarding having such documentation removed from the file.

198
199 After discussion, it was clarified that there is a process by which any employee can have something
200 removed from their personnel file.

201
202 L. Pardie verified this to be true, but that there are very narrow circumstances under which that can occur.

203
204 D. Bussell commented it would be beneficial to provide departments with some support regarding how to
205 approach the provision of formative supports for faculty throughout their years in working towards
206 tenure.

207
208 A. Sisneros recommended that perhaps direct first-hand knowledge be limited to years 2 and 4 of the
209 reappointment process.

210
211 J. Case-Pease is not overtly against first-hand knowledge, she is against it not being documented. There is
212 no reason why it can't be documented. If in a position to review other faculty, there should be time to
213 consider the whole context of a faculty's performance and this must include having both first-hand
214 knowledge as well as the candidate's response to the issue.

215
216 **Resolution 41-24 Modification to Academic Integrity Policy - Sections III & V [1st reading]**

217
218 J. Martin moved to table discussion of Resolution 41-24. This motion was seconded by X. Li. The motion
219 carried with 16 yes votes and 1 abstention (D. Bussell). J. Martin moved to extend the meeting for an
220 additional 30 minutes. The motion was seconded by X. Li. A friendly amendment was made by L. Fisher
221 to adjust the time extension to 15 minutes instead of 30 minutes. J. Martin accepted the friendly
222 amendment and the motion carried with 21 yes votes.

223
224 **Discussion**

225
226 C. Switzer explained that she is on the USC ad hoc committee for enrollment management and that it
227 would be very helpful to know the senators' feedback regarding the recommendations set forth in the
228 enrollment management and services report.

229
230 P. Salela commented that more focus might be given to diversity, not just in recruitment efforts but in
231 developing a culturally desirable climate. Such a climate would include diversifying the faculty and also
232 making highly visible those courses that we offer that are reflective of the university's diversity.

233
234 J. Villegas commented that the first time he read the report, the recommendations related to diversity
235 seemed predominantly to focus on the Chicago campus.

236
237 C. Switzer replied that President Hogan, in a discussion with the USC, made it clear that the Chicago area
238 is not the only campus that he is concerned about in terms of diversity, and that he is just as concerned
239 about the other two campuses.

240
241 T. Ting commented that some focus was given to Chicago in the report due to the fact that it is the area
242 that is highly recruited by other colleges and universities looking to diversify their own campuses.

243
244 L. Fisher asked to whom do the recommendations of this report go? Who has responsibility for
245 implementing the recommendations?

246
247 T. Ting clarified the recommendations go to the Board of Trustees and the responsibility for
248 implementation falls on the president and the vice president for academic affairs.

249
250 L. Pardie added that efforts regarding diversifying all three campuses are complicated by questions
251 regarding appropriations from the State of Illinois.

252

253 C. Switzer asked Senators to comment specifically on recommendation 17 regarding capitalizing on the
254 University's brand and recommendation 18 is in regards to consolidating marketing efforts. She asked
255 Senators for their perceptions as to whether or not these recommendations are harmful or a beneficial to
256 UIS.

257
258 J. Villegas commented that we need to present ourselves as one university, three campuses. Therefore, he
259 strongly supports the recommendations related to branding and marketing.

260
261 L. Fisher agreed that a unified voice is likely to strengthen our position and our financial position at UIS.
262 She suggested ensuring that our distinctive message is heard, especially the perspective of students.

263
264 T. Helton was concerned about the recommendation to fill UIS to capacity. She wonders what the details
265 of such a plan would entail. She is concerned that the changes might result in students coming here as a
266 second choice.

267
268 T. Ting commented that we do have the capacity to grow.

269
270 K. Moranski added that we have already been getting the students that Urbana didn't want for
271 approximately 10 years. These students are known as *UIUC redirects* and about 10% of our student body
272 comes to UIS in this way. They do very well at UIS. T. Ting commented that the redirects program has
273 not been working to its best extent possible for UIS to get qualified students. More collaboration between
274 campuses can greatly improve that.

275
276 T. Barnett commented that centralizing the processing of student applications might be harmful because
277 we could lose the opportunity to process applications specifically for UIS in a timely manner because of
278 the possibility that greater attention might go to UIUC and UIC applications first. It is critical that we turn
279 around applications in a very short period of time. If the process is centralized, we need to make sure UIS
280 does not get left out.

281
282 R. Garmil commented that we should also address on-line and non-traditional students in the enrollment
283 management efforts.

284
285 **Adjournment**

286
287 A motion to adjourn was made by J. Martin and was seconded by C. Switzer. The motion carried with
288 unanimous support and the meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.