The Senate was called to order at 10:03 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Thompson and seconded by Bogle to approve the day’s agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of September 11, 2009

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Gilliam and seconded by Van Vossen. With some minor spelling corrections and changing “…SGA Treasurer” on line 153 to “…Senator for the College of Liberal Arts and Science” the minutes were unanimously approved.

Announcements

Senate Chair Ting announced that a faculty senator is still needed for the Campus Principle Initiative that W. Weisenburn discussed at the last senate meeting. The task force is to have representation from academic professionals, civil service, students and faculty. She approached some faculty but due to their schedule they were unable to attend the retreat. The retreat is scheduled for October 14th. Faculty representatives are still needed.
Reports:

Chair – T. Ting
Ting reported President White’s resignation is effective December 31st. She pointed out that President White’s decision to forego his retention bonus of close to half of a million dollars shows his commitment to the university.

VPAA Meena Rao has sent out the latest draft of the Admissions Code of Conduct to members of the policy council, including all chancellors and provosts. The draft version dated September 22nd reflects concerns voiced by the three senates and University Senates Conference; it clarifies the faculty role in admissions matters. Ting read the draft version to the Senate.

An ad hoc committee comprised of J. Gilliam, B. Siddiquee, and B. Clevenger was formed to work on the academic calendar and grading deadlines. They have developed academic calendars through the 2015/2016 academic year. One issue that is still under discussion is the grading deadline.

J. Casinova approached Ting just before today’s senate meeting and asked what the senate could do to help restore MAP funding for students. She explained that Governor Quinn will be on the UIUC Campus on Monday to discuss the MAP Grant and the need to restore it. UIC has sent forward a resolution that demands and encourages the legislators and the governor to restore the funding. On October 15th there will be a rally downtown organized by students demanding that the funding for the MAP Grant be restored. It would be a good idea for the UIS Campus Senate to issue a statement of support. The Executive Committee will bring forward a resolution for Senate endorsement at the next meeting on October 9th. This resolution will be forwarded to the governor’s office and all of the legislators in our district.

Eisenhart suggested that students contact all the members of the legislature’s Education Committee, or at least the Chair thereof, requesting funding for the MAP Grant.

Fisher requested clarification regarding the function of the MAP grant, and Ting stated the MAP Grant is a need-based financial aid for economically disadvantaged students, many of whom will need this to be able to continue with college.

Eisenhart stated that 800 students at UIS, 13,000 students from the U of I system, and 140,000 to 160,000 students statewide will be affected if funding for this year is not restored.

Olivier asked if the students whose parents were veterans will be affected. Berman stated the veteran’s policy is a separate program guaranteeing tuition waivers for Illinois veterans. Eisenhart pointed out that the reimbursement for those tuition waivers are not being paid by the state and therefore are being picked up by the university and fellow students.
Ting had one more report regarding Resolution 39-6. A lot of questions were raised during and after the last senate meeting; therefore, when we get to that business there will be a full discussion. Ting disseminated some information regarding the athletics committee compositions from other Great Lake Valley Conference schools for use in the subsequent discussion.

**Provost – H. Berman**

Berman stated he had three items upon which to report. Regardless of the opinions people have about the admissions situation that lead to his resignation, President White did agree with UIS’s vision of being one of the leading public liberal arts universities. He bought into our vision one hundred percent and publicly praised our progress especially at the September Board of Trustees meeting.

With regard to Admissions Reform, UIS did meet the deadline for the campus report. This report has been posted to the website and an email will be sent indicating where the information can be found. This version contains the language from the Code of Conduct that created such an outpouring of response from the universities. It is clear that the draft version ready by Ting addresses our concerns. It clearly points out that admissions policy are set by the faculty and in certain circumstances faculty actually make admissions decisions.

Berman reported on the formation of several ad hoc committees and task forces. An Institutional Resource Management Task Force has been formed to address ways to make the best use of faculty time. Discussions are occurring in each college on this subject and the deans agree with the Provost that it would be valuable to have discussion across colleges.

Other ad hoc committees include the Furlough Policy Advisory Committee and the E-Learning Initiative Committee that will deliberate on the proposals submitted in response to the Global Campus, examining resource allocations for proposed new programs or adding to existing programs. There is also the Governance Approval Reform Task Force that will be reviewing and updating our current Level of Governance Approval Table.

Today there will be the investitures of three professors which is unprecedented in our history. Accepting new endowed professorships this semester are: Karen Swan, James J. Stukel Professor of Educational Leadership; William Holden, Margaret Wepner Professor of Political Science, and Keith Miller, Louise and Karl Schewe Professor in Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Ting had one more item to report. There has been media speculation regarding the possibility of Stan Ikenberry to be interim president. He was the President of the University of Illinois from 1979 to 1995. Ikenberry was also involved with the merger of Sangamon State University and U of I.

**Student Government – M. Van Vossen**
Van Vossen reported that last Tuesday the Public Safety Building and Day Care Center Committees met jointly to discuss the current location of those new buildings. The conclusion of that meeting was that there are better locations for both of these buildings. There may be an issue with the location of utility lines.

The Student Union Committee met yesterday to discuss and estimate the cost of a student union building, and to consider how to pay for it. D. Felix sent out a survey to students to get their opinions on the possibility of a student union.

SGA is also working on a MAP Grant petition to be taken to representatives on Lobby Day.

**Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Calendars – J. Gilliam**

Gilliam stated he would try to answer any questions that people might have but he wanted to focus on the issue of grading deadlines. Last spring there were complaints from faculty about the short time allowed for grade submission after the end of finals. According to Clevenger the grading deadlines are not listed on the calendar because the deadline is flexible. The deadlines are built around the fact that some faculty do not turn their grades in on time and time is needed to contact faculty about missing grades. This is especially important in the fall semester because if grades are not in before Christmas then the grades often will not get turned in until after the New Year. This creates problems for students in areas of scholarship, probation, signing up for classes and especially those classes that require pre-requisites.

Ting noted that it would be important to find out the prevalence of the tardy grade submission problem. Wassenberg stated she can attest to the problem with faculty and most of the time it will be the same faculty. Having the grade deadline at noon gives the Dean’s offices time to contact faculty to resolve problems or fill in late or missing grades on the day of the deadline. Bodenhorn added that in CLAS there are typically 4 or 5 faculty out of 103 that turn their grades in late. Wassenberg stated that they had about as many in her college.

Borland suggested moving the fall starting dates for the years 2011 and 2012 so there will be two weeks of classes before Labor Day. Salela noted that at her prior institution the deadline was often after the holidays, and grades would therefore need to be submitted after the holidays. Gilliam stated the committee looked back at previous academic calendars and they appear to coincide with UIUC starting dates. Borland asked if we were supposed to be on the same schedule as other campuses, and Gilliam indicated that was not the case.

Martin indicated that we often start our academic year the week after the State Fair ends. Berman stated that was not the case.

Wassenberg stated the department staff and dean’s office staff would prefer to be out of sync with the other campuses because Banner becomes overloaded and slows down.
What used to take seconds to do in banner now takes minutes with all three campuses being on similar schedules.

Bodenhorn added that aligning our schedule with UIC and UIUC for the sake of doing what they’re doing is not a compelling basis upon which to create our schedule. Rutherford noted that in the past we had tried to align our schedule with Lincoln Land.

Berman stated the start dates coincide with the start date for faculty contracts. Contracts start on August 16th and faculty are not obliged to be at the university prior to the contract date. Then there is the prep time needed before classes begin, including orientation sessions for faculty.

Borland pointed out that she did not think the university had always started on Mondays. Ting and Gilliam indicated that we’ve been starting on Mondays for quite some time. Berman indicated that Borland was correct; at one time we experimented with starting on a Thursday, however there were problems with balancing out the holidays. Faculty determined that classes should always start on a Monday.

Ting stated she would prefer to have a short grading deadline rather than to shorten the summer or Thanksgiving breaks.

Berman stated it would be beneficial to get faculty informed and thinking about grading deadlines, which will allow them to make necessary adjustments to their syllabi.

Eisenhart pointed out that even though there are only five days to get grading done, that faculty can be correcting papers while giving exams and it is much easier now that the grades can be entered from home on the computer.

Thompson indicated continued concern about the grading deadline that falls on the 23rd or 24th. Fisher suggested if the grading deadlines were published on the website well in advance faculty could take those into consider when setting their syllabi.

Wassenberg stated when finals week ends so late and the grading deadline is even a couple days before Christmas that you run into staffing issues due to already established holidays and reduced services days. Because of staff unavailability a deadline on the 22nd could effectively be pushed to the 3rd or 4th of January.

Wang suggested using blackboard to force the calendar into the blackboard system. Currently faculty are forced to do certain things on blackboard now.

Martin pointed out that contract start dates are set to a particular date, but the grading deadline is tied to a lunar calendar. That gives rise to this problem.

Ting said the calendar will be sent back to the ad hoc committee to look at 2012 being so close to Christmas. Before the calendar is endorsed the senate wants to see what the
grading deadline would be for the years in which the deadline is extremely close to Christmas.

**Old Business**

Resolution 39-4 Changes to the UIS Campus Senate Bylaws Article VI. Section 2. and Section 2.C. 2) (second reading)
Martin offered a motion to remove the resolution from the table for consideration, Thompson seconded. Fisher made a motion to approve the resolution, Eisenhart seconded. There were no questions and the resolution was unanimously approved.

Resolution 39-5 Social Responsibility and Leadership Development Minor by EXS-L (first reading)
Ting explained this resolution was originally scheduled to have a second reading today; however after further discussion with the CLAS dean, Moranski, and the Management Department the proposal is going back to the Undergraduate Council for further review. The Council will meet next Friday to discuss this and it will come back to the Senate on October 9th. Eisenhart made a motion for the resolution to be tabled, Borland seconded.

Resolution 39-6 Changes to the UIS Campus Senate Bylaws – Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (second reading)
Martin offered a motion to open discussion; Bogle seconded.

Ting explained that a lot of questions came up during and after the last senate meeting. She handed out a comparison sheet from other institutions detailing their committee sizes and compositions.

Ting indicated that the changes in the bylaws were brought about by UIS joining the NCAA Division II. During the site visit from NCAA, they recommended the Chancellor to establish an Athletics Advisory Committee. They then met with the Senate IAC Committee and after meeting with the members they learned a senate committee was already in place and recommended that the IAC membership be expanded. The recommendation from NCAA Division II said the committee should include the FAR, members of the faculty, representatives from administration, representatives of student body selected by SGA, a male and female student athlete, representatives of alumni and boosters, and ex-officio members should include the athletic director, assistant athletic director, and compliance coordinator. Before the amendment the recommendations were followed very closely. Establishing the committee composition prior to last session’s amendment was a very lengthy process.

Ting stated that the committee is about education policy related to student athletes and the athletics program, and educational policy is the primary responsibility of faculty. Last year IAC collected data that was available from other institutions within the Great Lakes Valley Conference and UIS’s composition, before amendment, was already on the low end in terms of the percentage of faculty members and on the high end with regard to size. With the amendment the percentage of faculty voting members went from 62%
down to 54%. Another concern is to maintain a committee size that will be manageable. This amended IAC composition would only be three members smaller than the UIUC Athletics Board. The recommendation from NCAA did not recommend an academic professional and civil service representative; however, there are three academic professionals on the committee already. Looking at the data from other institutions their committees do not have AP or civil service representatives as designated voting members.

Giordano pointed out that the recommendation from NCAA says “it should include but are not limited to” on the list of individuals Ting named. There is no rule that states the makeup of the committees should be uniform. The three APs that are on the committee are ex-officio and non-voting members. Under the duties she pointed out specific wording from lines 46 through 49 and stated these are not academic in nature. The duties also include such things as overseeing creation of new teams, legal compliance, conduct of exit interviews, and so on. Regarding the concern about the committee size there are other committees that are larger; an example is CARR which is much larger and they are very productive.

Martin stated that the functions Giordano pointed out are being cast in light of the committee’s academic charge. There are several other committees that have the same type of charge that are 100% faculty memberships, such as the Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, and the General Education Committee.

Bogle asked if the proportions reported in Ting’s handout are in terms of voting members. Ting explained it was the total size of the committee and not voting.

Martin asked that M. Yoder be allowed to speak from the audience.

Yoder indicated he has been on the committee since it started, chaired it for several years, and continues on the committee for the last couple years as the FAR. He felt that, regarding the NCAA recommendations are concerned he would not want UIS to ask “how high” when they ask us to jump. UIS needs to do what is best for our institution.

Yoder expressed his position using a sports analogy. There are several decision makers on a sports team, and they need to look at their players and determine what is best for the team. This is especially important in times of change, such as we have now. Deciding what is in the best interest of the team may mean cutting a senior player. That does not mean that the time that player spent with the team was not meaningful and that the player did not provide valuable contributions, it just means that the team has evolved, times have changed therefore modifications are needed for the good of the team. Since 2002 he has remained a constant on the committee and he is aware of the valuable contributions the AP and CS representatives have made. However, that past “value” should not be used as part of the criteria when deciding who should be on a reformulated committee. When deciding who should be on the committee, “Who are the stakeholders” is the question that needs to be asked. In the abstract, having AP and CS representatives on the team is a great idea, but the size of the committee becomes problematic. He asked who would want
to serve on a committee of that size, who would want to chair it, and who would want
to schedule meeting times for such a large body? He also asked, if 17 committee members
isn’t too large, then what would too large look like? He acknowledged that these
arguments are coming from someone who isn’t feeling marginalized, but he wanted to
make clear that this isn’t personal. This is what the committee needs to do now and in the
future, not what was needed for the past.

Gilliam stated he was uncomfortable with the rush made to denounce the original
resolution at the last senate meeting. There were intense conversations between the chair
of the committee with the Chancellor, Wojcicki, and the Provost that went on for almost
a year in arriving at the makeup of this committee. While APs are on the new IAC, the
sticking point seems to be that they do not have a vote. How often was a vote on the
committee an issue? Also, would the lack of a vote hinder the contribution the person
has to make when deciding issues? He used the example of Provost Berman on the
Senate – he does not vote, but he contributes significantly. Yoder replied that the voting
privileges are uncorrelated with the contributions. Voting as a practical matter is fairly
irrelevant – they have taken one vote since he started on the committee. That vote was
taken when the committee brought the report to the Senate regarding moving to NCAA
Division II.

Martin stated with the new information and new arguments brought to the senate and
answers to questions he would make a motion to reconsider the amendment that was
voted on at the last meeting. Ting stated that the reconsideration motion can stand as it is
being put forward by a member of the majority vote from the amendment vote. Gilliam
remarked that this motion does not require a second.

Ting stated the size of the committee should be made in comparison to that of other
institutions’ athletic committees and not to other senate committees. She also urged
everyone to consider if the overall committee size is manageable. A vote is required. A
vote of “yes” will be to keep the language as amended; a vote of “no” will restore the
original resolution language.

Kullick asked if it would be possible to add a civil service person who is associated with
athletics in an ex-officio capacity similar to AP’s. Ting stated that would be a separate
issue.

Fisher explained that UIS often operates from a model that views us as a set of
constituencies that are represented, and the senate is the big one. We are unique in that
aspect. The senate is the decision making body. We delegate some work to committees,
and they are working groups for the senate. With regard to those working groups the
determination should be made as to why a constituency needs to be represented on a
certain committee. Not all constituencies have representation on all senate committees.
However when business comes to the Senate for action all constituencies are represented.
Martin added that the argument for AP members to be on the committee because it oversees many APs is not a good idea. That poses a potential conflict of interest, and those members should then recuse themselves.

Giordano replied that APAC feels strongly about this because the only APs on this committee are from athletics. This is a campus wide committee dealing with a wide variety of student issues, APAC would want to have other APs on that committee to ensure representation of AP stakeholders from outside of athletics.

Martin called the question. Ting explained when the question is called it means a vote is to be taken. Ting reminded the senators that a “yes” vote means we stay with the amended language, a vote of “no” restores the original resolution language.

Ting pointed out that Cass had been requesting the floor, and Martin withdrew his motion to question to let Cass speak.

Cass explained that contrary to what people think our reaction to wanting an AP on this committee was not a product of feeling marginalized, but a reaction to what the resolutions states regarding the broadening of membership. As pointed out that there are three AP’s on the committee, but they are from athletics and do not represent all of APAC. APAC wants to have an elected member on this committee with a vote, because having a vote carries weight. When the NCAA recommended community members need to be involved with the committee they did not say to eliminate contributing members, members who bring to the table a voice and a perspective that enlarge what can be presented. She went on to ask that the Senate truly consider maintaining the amended language from the last meeting. Despite the suggestions she has heard that the Chancellor could appoint an AP as his designee, a voting member, that person would still not be the elected member from APAC.

Williams stated he was left a bit speechless at the last meeting after being accused of holding secret meetings, which was evidently a misunderstanding. He stated that he echoes what Yoder said and liked the analogy. When the committee had seven members it was a very effective committee. He pointed out that the students often did not show up for the meetings but maybe that will change. He believes that there are five non-faculty members who could come off the committee but the makeup of the committee are the recommendations from the NCAA. A size of fourteen might be a challenge however only time will tell. A size of seventeen gets to be of such a size that he does not know if it can be functional or how productive it would be. IAC has always been open and transparent and that will not change. He stated that a major goal of the IAC has been to remain independent. When the senate asked IAC to take on the role of investigating athletics the committee declined for precisely that point, because that would have involved investigating their own committee members, such as the athletic director.

Van Vossen asked Williams if the committee has annual meetings. Williams explained they have always tried to meet at least once a month however when the prospect of
joining of NCAA Division II was brought to the committee it was necessary to meet every week. The committee always sends a report to the Senate twice per year.

Ting stated it is necessary to have IAC in place. Questions of advising for student athletes have arisen. Mae Noll, who is the academic advisor to student athletes, has taken on this task of trying to minimize the conflict between class time and practice or game time. She went on to remind everyone that educational policy and academic integrity are the primary charges of this committee, and that is also the primary responsibility of faculty. She reiterated the importance of keeping the committee size manageable.

“Yes” votes to keep the amendment was two (2).
“No” votes to go back to the original resolution without the amendment was fourteen (14).
There was one (1) abstention.

As a result the resolution returned to the original version, deleting the amendment made at the last senate meeting.

A motion was offered by Eisenhart to bring the resolution to a vote, seconded by Fisher. There was one abstention and the motion carried.

**New Business:**
None

**Adjournment:**

A motion was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Bogle to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 am.