

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

**MINUTES**  
**CAMPUS SENATE MEETING**  
**AY 2011-2012**  
**FRIDAY, October 7, 2011**  
**10:00 A.M. – 12:15 P.M.**  
**PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “H”**

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

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

19  
20  
21  
22

**Senators Absent:** L. Atkinson, P. Boltuc, J. Tienken, and Y. Zhang.

23  
24

**Ex-Officio:** Lynn Pardie

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

**Guests:** Deborah Anthony, Marcel Yoder, Aleta Carlberg, Kate Richardson, Barbara Hayler, Cecilia Cornell, Karen Moranski, Rachel Wells, Jay Gilliam, Shawna Nazarian, Megan Waldschmidt, Kim Pate, Ed Wojcicki, Gloria Amos

34  
35

**Approval of the Agenda**

36  
37  
38  
39

The meeting was called to order by Ting at 10:00 a.m. A motion made by Ballard and seconded by Wilson to approve the agenda carried unanimously.

40  
41  
42

**Approval of the Minutes**

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

A motion by Switzer and seconded by Fisher to consider the minutes from the September 23, 2011 Senate meeting was made. The motion to approve the minutes carried unanimously. Salela inquired about the possibility of electronically linking documents handed out in Senate meetings on the Senate website. Ting clarified that reports from Vice Chancellors are not necessarily available beforehand and that there is a concern that the content of the documents may be taken out of context by readers who are not present at the senate meeting. Pardie indicated that it would be possible if the reports included text to contextualize the documents' content. The turnaround time for something like that would be long. Two minor corrections were indicated by Salela. The minutes were unanimously approved.

49  
50

**Announcements**

51  
52  
53  
54

Wassenberg commented that the Senate very much appreciated the invitation by the Chancellor to attend the Jazz performance at the Lincoln Center. It was a wonderful opportunity both to hear great music as well as to spend time with colleagues.

55  
56

**Reports**

57  
58

**Chair-** T. Ting

59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64

Ting announced that President Hogan will be in Springfield on October 28 for a meeting with IBHE as well as for a Foundation Day at UIS. He would like to meet with the Senate; however, there is no Senate meeting scheduled for that day. One option put forth was to switch the Senate meeting from October 21 to October 28. Another option was to start the Senate meeting earlier. A decision was made to keep the Senate meeting on October 21 at its regularly scheduled time and to schedule a special meeting with President Hogan on October 28.

49  
50 Ting announced the names of the 16 (out of 20 nominations) faculty members that the SEC put forth to  
51 the Chancellor to serve on the VCAA and Provost Search Committee. The 16 names included Harsh  
52 Bapat, Beverly Bunch, Jay Gilliam, James Hall, Tena Helton, Kamau Kemayo, Mike Miller, Ted Mims,  
53 Don Morris, Laurel Newman, Carolyn Peck, Baker Siddiquee, Peter Shapinsky, Karen Swan, Jon  
54 Transue, and Jorge Villegas. It is anticipated that the committee will comprise of 10 faculty members;  
55 however, the Chancellor reserves the right to make any final adjustment to the number and makeup of the  
56 search committee,

57  
58 Ting announced that the external review of enrollment management initiated by President Hogan last year  
59 has been completed and the final report has been released. The purpose of the review was to identify ways  
60 to increase diversity as well as ways to enroll students with higher AC T scores and to attract more  
61 nonresident students, more transfer students, and ways to approach a common application. The reviewers  
62 also examined branding for University of Illinois to enhance recruitment across all three campuses. Ting  
63 announced that she would forward that report to senators. Further, the current dashboard indicators have  
64 been released, although this is still a working document. These will be forwarded to senators as well. The  
65 USC has put together an ad hoc committee to review the final enrollment management report. The UIS  
66 representatives for this committee include Carrie Switzer and Harsh Bapat.

67  
68 Ting announced that the new ODS Director, Sarah Weaver, started this past week. Vice Chancellor  
69 Barnett has also moved forward with the search for the Director of Admissions. Two faculty members  
70 serving on the DOA search committee are Kate Sheridan and Shuang-Yueh Pui.

71  
72 Fisher asked for clarification regarding the ad hoc committee on enrollment management.

73  
74 Switzer clarified that the USC wanted two members from each of the three campuses on the committee to  
75 talk about the enrollment management report as well as the recommendations that are made in the report.

76  
77 **Provost – L. Pardie**

78  
79 Pardie did not have a report but wanted to comment on the dashboard indicators. She reiterated that it is a  
80 working document, and that there are a couple of errors in the report regarding UIS. She has provided  
81 feedback on that. Further, additional indicators are being added. The IBHE peer group for all three  
82 campuses was developed last year using statistical analyses. Additional information about the peer group  
83 institutions can be found on the campus website.

84  
85 **Student Government Association - E. Wilson**

86  
87 Wilson reported that the SGA representatives attended the IBHE-SAC meeting last weekend which  
88 included a discussion of performance-based funding. The SGA is developing a memo to send to IBHE  
89 regarding student concerns with performance-based funding. Four students have been nominated for the  
90 Provost Search committee. The SGA is currently working to prepare for the U of I lobby day on October  
91 26.

92  
93 Ting asked for additional information on the student position regarding performance-based funding.

94  
95 Wilson clarified that they are concerned because UIS has a large number of transfer students which may  
96 affect funding, potentially resulting in higher student tuition and fees.

97  
98 Fisher asked for the composition of the Provost search committee.

99

100 Ting clarified that the committee will include 19 members including 10 faculty members, 2 students (1  
101 undergrad, 1 grad), 2 AP, 2 civil service, 2 administrators and VC Barnett. However, the Chancellor  
102 reserves the right to make any final adjustment.

103

104 C. Switzer requested a copy of the memo that the SGA is preparing for the USC to review.

105

106 Li sought clarification regarding the performance-based funding. Ting clarified that the changes in state  
107 funding take into consideration institutional level metrics and not individual faculty performance per se.

108

109 Martin added that what performance-based funding is about is not yet clear and that UIS wants to be  
110 involved to influence those decisions about what metrics will be used.

111

112 Pardie indicated that the administration is also tracking this very closely.

113

#### 114 **Athletic Director - Kim Pate**

115

116 Pate reported that she was thankful for the opportunity to introduce herself to senators and to report on her  
117 vision and goals for UIS athletics. During her first two months at UIS, Pate has spent time meeting with  
118 various constituencies to better understand the culture and the priorities for athletics at UIS. Her goal is to  
119 build consensus and to have transparency in the decisions regarding athletics. She has also met with  
120 people in the community. She has conducted workshops to orient student athletes to campus as well as to  
121 the Springfield community. She has finalized goals for the upcoming year including gaining an  
122 understanding of the budget and the fiscal position of the athletic department to make sure that the goals  
123 moving forward are sustainable. Along with the IAC and an external consultant she will be working to  
124 develop a five-year strategic plan. She will also be working to develop internal operating systems such as  
125 policy and procedures, a business and finance compliance manual, and a revision to the student athlete  
126 handbook.

127

128 Additionally, she aims to reinvigorate the booster club and the marketing strategy. Part of the game of the  
129 booster club is to connect with the community. A final goal is to assess the organizational structure and  
130 roles and responsibilities of personnel.

131

132 Martin asked for clarification regarding Director Pate's definition of competitiveness.

133

134 Pate clarified that competitive means winning as well as having programs that are successful.

135

#### 136 **BOT Report- C. Switzer**

137

138 Fisher asked what the UIS priorities are that were mentioned in the BOT report.

139

140 Switzer clarified that the dashboard indicators include student access and enrollment, student outcomes,  
141 tuition and financial aid, faculty and scholarship, and financial indicators.

142

143 Martin added that not every campus has the same indicators.

144

145 Fisher commented that the University is looking at its performance at the same time that IBHE is looking  
146 at performance-based funding. She asked if this was perceived as an opportunity to present a message  
147 regarding what might be included in performance-based funding.

148

149 Ting indicated that the review of performance indicators was coming from the Board of Trustees and that  
150 perhaps President Hogan could speak to this further when he visits.

151  
152 Pardie indicated that looking at dashboard indicators is a process and that there are many ways of looking  
153 at different institutions. She clarified that dashboard indicators are rather abstract and that campus level  
154 decision-making requires more detailed information. The senators discussed whether or not dashboard  
155 indicators were seen as a measure of performance of individual colleges and universities and whether or  
156 not factors included in rankings such as U.S. News & World Report should be included. Pardie  
157 commented that there will be plenty of opportunities for input into this process by colleges and  
158 universities.

159  
160 Kline asked as to whether or not UIS students and faculty will have an opportunity to present UIS to the  
161 Board of Trustees.

162  
163 Ting clarified that the BOT meeting on December 2 will be hosted by UIS and at that point we will have  
164 the opportunity to make reports and have student involvement.

165  
166 **Old Business**

167 **Resolution 41-15 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 9 -- Request for Reallocation of Faculty Duties**  
168 **[2nd reading]**

169  
170 A motion by Garmil and seconded by Wilson to consider Resolution 41-15 was made. No questions or  
171 discussion. The resolution passed unanimously.

172  
173 **Resolution 41-16 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 5 & 7 -- Campus Service for Terminal**  
174 **Contract Faculty [2nd reading]**

175  
176 A motion by Ballard and seconded by Salela to consider Resolution 41-16 was made. No questions or  
177 discussion. The resolution passed unanimously.

178  
179 **Resolution 41-17 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 2 -- Clarification of Personnel Committee**  
180 **Operating Procedures [2nd reading]**

181  
182 A motion by Kline and seconded by Bussell to consider Resolution 41-17 was made.

183  
184 Ting reported that she had not received any language regarding potential changes to this resolution as  
185 discussed at the last Senate meeting.

186  
187 Bussell indicated that she would like to see further discussion on this resolution.

188  
189 Helton read her opinion regarding the resolution from her typed notes. She indicated a belief that the  
190 policy as set forth in this resolution is ambiguous at best. She will not support this resolution as it  
191 currently stands.

192  
193 Fisher broadly agreed with T. Helton's comments. She commented that it may be that current policy is  
194 not specific enough or that they are not being consistently and actively followed. It is critical that  
195 personnel committee letters are transparent and well documented.

196  
197 Anthony clarified that the committee's goal was to clarify policy so that personnel committee letters  
198 regarding faculty decisions were well-documented.

199  
200 Garmil commented that he felt the policy is clear in regards to what information can be used in decisions  
201 regarding promotion and tenure. He can see both positions, he would rather see something put in place

202 where personnel committees have preliminary meetings to make decisions about whether or not  
203 something needs to be documented.  
204

205 Bussell commented that personal knowledge is part of the process. The letter that comes out of personnel  
206 committees goes into the personnel file, so the issue is that that document needs to be transparent.  
207

208 Helton commented that we have a multilayered process and that we might be quibbling about what is  
209 meant by documentation- we are talking about documentation going into the personnel file as well as the  
210 fact that the personnel committee letter is documentation as well. Documentation that is unclear means  
211 that the candidate doesn't have anything to respond to and that that is an issue that should be taken up in  
212 policy.  
213

214 Martin commented it is important to protect the individual. He is trying to figure out the best way to  
215 ensure this. He needs more time to think about how to achieve this.  
216

217 Kline commented that there is federal law to protect retaliatory action against whistleblowers. The  
218 sentence in the resolution that reads, "deliberations shall be based solely upon applicable criteria" can be  
219 interpreted to mean that the deliberations and the voting need not be based on the same criteria.  
220

221 Garmil clarified that he is really only concerned with the tenure application at year six. At the 2 and 4 year  
222 review, there may be more room for a wide variety of discussion.  
223

224 Anthony stated that there is a need for clarification because the policy is being interpreted in varying  
225 ways across campus and that policy needs to be clearer to support consistency in personnel decisions.  
226

227 Salela commented that deliberations in personnel committees also focus on material in the file. So there is  
228 an additional question as to whether or not the documentation is suspect.  
229

230 Kline added that other senates also have judicial bodies charged with interpreting language and that this  
231 resolution may be trying to do too much by both stating policy and interpreting policy by statute.  
232

233 Fisher commented that departments and personnel committees have a responsibility to better understand  
234 policy to ensure better consistency in its application to personnel decisions. We may not want to change  
235 by statute something that may be an issue of practice.  
236

237 Wassenberg clarified that, at the college level, Deans usually e-mail the chair of the PPC and the Provost  
238 for an authoritative interpretation of personnel policies.  
239

240 Ting clarified the need for clear policy regarding personnel deliberations and added that even an  
241 authoritative interpretation of policies will vary according to whoever is currently the chair of the PPC  
242 and Provost. She reminded senators of the nature of last year's resolution regarding the use of first-hand  
243 direct knowledge in tenure and reappointment decisions and that the previous resolution was voted down.  
244 She wondered if it's even appropriate to bring back last year's resolution should the current resolution be  
245 voted down.  
246

247 Kline pointed out that this was the second resolution in the current Senate that was voted down based in  
248 part because of a previous Senate's decision to vote down a resolution. Because this current body has  
249 different membership, it may be beneficial to revisit the previous resolution from last year.  
250

251 Case Pease likened the resolution to her experience in EAP. She mentioned the idea of progressive  
252 discipline which allowed for communication of issues that needed to be addressed at the time that those

253 issues arose. She wondered if the personnel decision-making process could include something to that  
254 effect.

255  
256 Wassenberg also could empathize with both positions, but in her opinion the worst thing to do would be  
257 to continue with the language that is currently in the policy because it is being differentially interpreted.  
258

259 Fisher agreed with Garmil regarding the importance of providing faculty with feedback at the two and  
260 four year review periods. She commented on the importance of consistently applying policy particularly  
261 in the instance of non-reappointment.

262  
263 Pardie clarified that the issue is about whether or not personal knowledge can be discussed at the  
264 department level during the review process. She also reminded senators that it is a multi step process, and  
265 that the purpose of a personnel committee letter is to provide the candidate with an opportunity to clarify.  
266

267 Ting called for a vote on Resolution 41-17. The resolution was defeated with 5 yes votes, 11 no votes,  
268 and 6 abstentions (Wassenberg, Sisneros, Schuldt, Simo, Bouray, and Wilson).

269  
270 Sisneros recommended a workshop focusing specifically on the use of direct knowledge and  
271 documentation and personnel process.

272  
273 Ting asked the PPC to review the resolution from last year and to bring forth a new resolution that takes  
274 into account feedback from last year's senators.

275  
276 Helton commented that the current resolution had clear language compared to last year's resolution and  
277 was easier to vote on for that reason.

278  
279 Kline recommended that the PPC bring forth a new resolution with mild modifications and then allow  
280 senators to discuss it at the first reading.

281  
282 Ting moved senate to executive session for the next item. The motion was seconded by J. Martin.

### 283 **Adjournment**

284  
285  
286 A motion made by Bussell and seconded by Wilson to adjourn carried with unanimous support and the  
287 meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.