UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010
OCTOBER 9, 2009
10:05 AM – 12:46 PM
PAC Conference Room “G”


Senators Absent: L. Bogle, C. Olivier, P. Salela, T. Sullivan-Stewart, and P. Wassenberg

Ex-Officio:  H. Berman


The Senate was called to order at 10:05 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

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

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of September 25, 2009

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Martin and seconded by Thompson. The minutes were unanimously approved with one correction.

Announcements

Thompson announced that Safe Zone training will be held today at 1pm in PAC C-D.

Ting announced that the BioBlitz will be held at the Emiquon Field Station tomorrow.
Reports:

Chair – T. Ting
Ting reported that the Board of Trustees held a special meeting last Saturday, at which they accepted the resignation of President Joe White. They also appointed President Emeritus Stan Ikenberry to be Interim President effective January 1, and Ikenberry has already begun working on the transition with White. The Board also decided upon the Presidential search committee composition. There will be a total of 19 members, including three trustees, eight faculty members from all three campuses, three students, one academic professional, one civil service employee, one administrator, one representative from the Foundation, and one representative from the Alumni Association. The faculty representatives will include three from UIUC, three from UIC, and two from UIS. The Board requested that each campus put forward 3 nominees for each faculty seat – so we need to send six faculty nominees to the University Senates Conferences, which will in turn forward those to the Board. The selection is ultimately made by the Board, which has stated their desire to make this group diverse and representative of faculty. They want this committee formed as soon as possible, as the search season is already underway. Ting sent out the call for nominees over email previously, with nominations due Oct. 14 at 5pm. The Committee on Committees will deliberate on the slate Oct. 16th, and send the slate to the Senate for approval. That approval is needed by October 19, so the approval will need to be granted electronically. The Board needs our response by Oct. 20th. The goal is to have a new president by the beginning of the 2010 academic year.

Ting also reported on the MAP program issue. She stated that the Governor visited UIC last Tuesday and visited UIUC and SIUC campuses in the past two days to discuss this matter. Other university senates have already passed resolutions encouraging restoration of MAP funding.

Ting reported that on the early morning of last Saturday a hate crime was reported to UIS police, the Chancellor quickly issued a statement to the campus. Additional details have come from the press via police reports and court records. The investigation is still ongoing, but the alleged perpetrators are reportedly being charged with a hate crime. Ting requested that Chancellor attend today’s meeting, and he wanted to attend but is traveling out of state. He has asked Ed Wojcicki and Harry Berman to address this on his behalf.

Chancellor – E. Wojcicki

Associate Chancellor for Constituent Relations Wojcicki stated that a terrible thing did happen on campus on Saturday. He reported that he saw a picture of the victim and felt as though he had been kicked in the gut. He reported that the Chancellor got a phone call from the campus police chief early on Saturday morning. The Chancellor called Wojcicki at 8:45 am to inform him of the alleged hate crime. Wojcicki spoke with 5 or 6 administrators over the next two hours, and at 11 a.m. administrators met to determine the university’s response and to discuss how to handle the involvement of students. One concern that has been expressed is “why don’t you say more?” Part of the problem there is FERPA – students might be listed in the directory, and that information can be
revealed, but we need to ensure that they have not signed waivers rescinding the public nature of their student status. At the 11 a.m. meeting three concerns were discussed: the well being of the victims, the well being of the LGBTQ community, and the rights of all involved parties. The Chancellor prepared a statement that was released Saturday afternoon. Wojcicki offered an aside, indicating that he has spent 31 years in management and in that time he has learned that clarification is always needed before public discussion. He added that the first thing people approach you about is often not what they really want to address. Thus, he stated that what one must know in these situations is: What is important? What do you really want? And what will we do?

Dr. Barnett and Dr. Ford met with students from the LGBTQ community at 3 p.m. on Saturday to discuss what we knew and what the next steps would be. Students requested a meeting at 9:30 that evening. Chancellor released his statement at 4:26 p.m. Four administrators met with the LGBTQ community that evening at 9:30. In the meantime Provost Berman emailed the campus senate leadership to inform them of what had happened. Athletic Director Jehlicka contacted Faculty Athletic Representative Yoder and asked Yoder to relay this information to IAC Chair Williams, as he didn’t have Williams’ private contact information at the time.

In addition to these initial conversations, administration made counseling available, and proceeded with the already-planned raising of the pride flag and rally events on Monday. Wojcicki indicated that administration expressed support for students and for the rally. He described the rally as good and stated that there were many good speakers, including faculty.

Wojcicki stated that some have asked “why don’t you communicate more with the campus?” about such events. He stated that administrators have learned from prior events that they have not always communicated in a timely manner, and he acknowledged that doing so was important. However, Wojcicki stated that he felt this incident was handled in a timely matter. He also stated that priorities must be taken into account, and administration’s top priority in this instance was to ensure that the victims were taken care of. He stated that it is also important to make sure that the campus community knows what happened, but administration is often asked for more detail than can be addressed either due to time constraints or privacy concerns. He added the concern that everything administration communicates to the campus is on the news within an hour, suggesting that private meetings are sometimes more fruitful in light of the priorities.

Fisher noted that after events such as this, students, faculty or staff may be very frightened or grieving. One thing the administration could do more rapidly is to convey their options to the broader community – who do they talk to about what? What are the policies that address these concerns? Fisher noted that Dr. Ford sent the email about counseling availability- are there any plans to do more? Wojcicki responded that the counseling availability was indeed an administrative effort, and not only was the counseling center involved but they also brought in some outside counselors to address LGBTQ issues specifically. He added that there are additional plans, and once the LGBTQ coordinator is hired that person will be handed these plans to work with.
Ting asked that Wojcicki ensure that Athletics Director Jehlicka make sure that he has the IAC chair’s contact information so that he can directly inform Williams about such things in the future. Wojcicki said he would do so.

Kline asked if it was possible to return to the discussion on the Chair’s report – Ting indicated yes, we can get back to that after completing this discussion.

Thompson emphasized her desire to see the LGBTQ coordinator position filled and to have the resources needed to make this work. Berman indicated the resources are already allocated, and Wojcicki indicated that the search is still ongoing and there are some political issues that needed to be addressed. Wojcicki stated that he is anticipating a successful outcome to the search.

Fisher asked Wojcicki if he could update us on the beaten victim’s recovery. Wojcicki indicated that he could not talk about that publicly. Ting indicated that the assault victim was not a UIS student. The other victim was a UIS student and did not suffer any physical harm, but did have mental and emotional harm as well as property damage. Wojcicki has spoken with the student victim several times and that student has had some special requests and we’re trying to make sure those get taken care of. Wojcicki added that he contacted the UIS student to ensure that that student’s concerns were being addressed.

Pressley asked if the alleged perpetrators would be allowed back on to campus after being released from jail. Wojcicki stated that the three students were suspended, and students on suspension have rights to a judicial process with Jim Korte. The same process applies to housing. Garmil then asked what happens between the suspension and the hearing, and if they could stay in housing while the hearing process is underway. Wojcicki indicated that it depends on the nature of the suspension.

B. Siddiquee asked if students or faculty are involved in illegal activities perhaps off campus, would the university also need to respond to that? Does the location matter? Wojcicki noted that the incident happened on campus, and it does matter where the activity happens, as we have codes of conduct for students and for housing. Berman indicated that Siddiquee’s question was a very broad one, probably too broad to address here. Ting asked if administration could look into that question and Berman indicated that they would need to reflect on that for a while

Ting returned to the discussion of the chair’s report, and Kline asked if there were any objections raised regarding the composition of the faculty representatives on the Presidential search committee. He stated that UIS is not a 2/3 member of the system, but we only have 2/3 of the votes of the other campuses. Ting stated that faculty from the other two campuses were being collegial by giving us 2 seats, when they could argue that from a true enrollment numbers perspective we should have far fewer votes. We are a full-fledged campus, but their enrollments are much larger. Martin added that on the University Senates Conference UIS has three members compared to eight from UIC and
UIUC. Our representation on the Presidential search is better than our representation on the USC.

**Provost – H. Berman**

Provost Berman expressed his dismay at the violent event of Saturday. He noted that he was pleased with the constructive tone of discussions with Senate leadership in constructing the resolution on campus violence. During those discussions the concept of workplace violence arose, and he wanted to remind everyone that we have a Campus Behavioral Intervention Task Force that we can go to when we have concerns about students. Faculty concerns about students should go to K. Moranski or L. Pardie. Student affairs staff concerns about students should be directed to J. Korte. Berman mentioned this today because some materials recently came to that committee regarding concerns about a student and there is a process for addressing this.

On the budget front, we have been working on a resolution addressing the MAP grant issue. Another concern that has escalated in the last several weeks is the question of whether the state will pay the appropriated money to the university in a timely way. He noted that at the end of FY 2009 there was an outstanding bill of $20 million owed, and the state did finally pay that. We are now 3 months into the fiscal year and we have not yet received any state money.

Berman also reported that on Monday we had the Faculty Scholarship Recognition luncheon, a wonderful event. This year’s University Scholar is Svet Braynov, who gave a very moving talk about collegiality, work with his colleagues and the support of his department chair.

Ting asked if Berman could email the faculty about the Campus Behavioral Intervention Task Force, including contact information. Berman said he would do so.

Thompson expressed her appreciation for hearing that the Behavioral Intervention Task Force is working. In her counseling program there is also sometimes concern about making sure that students “fit” with their professional goal of becoming counselors. Is that part of this discussion? Berman replied that this task force focuses on risk assessment, but not on professional suitability or temperament-profession fit. Berman suggested that they discuss this further outside of today’s meeting.

**Student Government – M. Van Vossen**

Van Vossen reported that the SGA has been charged with selecting three student nominees for the Presidential search, and those will go to the Board who will choose one student as the representative. Due date for nominations is 10/15 at midnight. SGA will make the selection sometime prior to next meeting.
Van Vossen stated that there will be a MAP grant resolution coming before the SGA that is almost identical to the one before the Senate. He stated that he will be traveling to Bradley University to meet with other student government presidents to sign a resolution agreeing that they will all call for MAP grant restoration.


Kirkendall stated that the committee meets every year and applies regression models to assess for areas of needed salary adjustments. There were concerns about the model that had been used in the past, so the committee met early in the fall to revise the model even though the fiscal situation made it likely that no adjustments would be made.

The group includes individuals with statistical expertise. A smaller subgroup worked on the statistical model and took it back to the larger group. The report this year is very long and statistically very deep. The group applied the model from last year, and developed a new model to try to address compression better by including the variables of longevity and disciplinary groups. The critical inclusion was longevity/time on tenure track. That allowed for an increased ability to account for variation across all colleges. The report makes some recommendations for use of this model. It is recommended for future analyses that the extended model be used. It is apparent that compression is occurring across all faculty areas and the committee asks the Provost to have the faculty compensation committee look into promotion raise increases as a way to address that.

The group has not convened yet this year because they are all very tired – the group did not finish last year’s work until June. She stated they will probably reconvene in the latter part of the semester. They will be holding open forums on this topic this year. Those forums will be separated by statistical sophistication: one for individuals who understand statistics, and one for folks who just want to understand the brass tacks. Those will be scheduled for this winter.

Headman asked what this new model would do. Berman replied that the bottom line is that in years when we have funds for a salary program, then this model provides guidance to the deans about people who, on the basis of the model, have salaries that are below what would be predicted. As background, we have been fortunate to have a dedicated group of people who’ve been working on this for quite a while. This effort goes back to November of 2002 and a campus resolution that established an ad hoc committee that began meeting in January of 2003. That committee worked for three years on this. In August of 2006 they issued a final report. In Fall 06, Fall 07, and Fall 08 semesters there was an equity adjustment program that was guided by, but not fully determined by, those initial statistical findings. In Fall 09 there was no salary program. Berman expressed appreciation for Kirkendall’s leadership – she is a stalwart and has provided good guidance for the committee.

Siddiquee asked for clarification on the race variable. He wanted to know if that was a comparison of Caucasian faculty versus all others. He also asked if the race variable...
influenced salary in a positive or negative way. Kirkendall replied that we should probably reserve statistical questions for the forums. Siddiquee also asked if the CBM data include all programs, and Kirkendall stated that it is broken into three disciplinary backgrounds. Berman added that it is broken down by discipline group, and not just by college. Siddiquee noted that while this is excellent work, there is a serious flaw in this report because on the question of compression it can lead to a wrong conclusion. In a program with no new faculty hires, they would not appear to have any compression issues. But a program with a new hire that has a higher salary would make a compression issue appear, suggesting the need to look at salaries compared to national averages. Kirkendall noted that CUPA data was included in the report, but that data only provides us with averages and standard deviations. We need specific data points to do meaningful comparisons. She stated that their committee has thought about contacting peer institutions to see if we can arrange a salary data swap, but even that might be patchy. She invited Siddiquee to attend those forums and address concerns there, as it is important to continue addressing the problem of compression.

Ting noted that the CUPA data does address salary information across disciplines, so we could use that and it does reveal some serious compression problems. Kirkendall indicated that was possible but there are many holes in the CUPA data because we’re so small. It can be hard to map all of our departments onto the disciplinary listings they have.

Fisher asked if Kirkendall could clarify the “policy of indexing” on page three in summaries and recommendations. Fisher stated that perhaps this question might be reserved for a forum, and Kirkendall stated that would be ideal. Fisher also expressed her excitement at seeing this report as it is good for a small institution to have this transparency. There have not been many salary programs, so it is good to have this discussion be open. There was no salary program this year; however, there were some salary equity-like programs in CLAS. She asked if those were guided by this model. Berman stated that was a different kind of program. The Dean of CLAS was in a position to do something that targeted a different problem, that of addressing salary issues in lowest paid tenure and tenure-track assistant professors.

Kirkendall added that she has heard some rumors that in past years salary equity has been applied in ways that are not consistent with this model. She clarified that once the report leaves her committee they are not a part of the process. That would need to be addressed elsewhere. Berman stated that the best way to understand this process is to examine the philosophy laid out in the August 2006 report, which is posted on the Academic Affairs website.

**Graduate Council Charges AY 2009/2010 – J. Hall**

Hall represented the Graduate Council in presenting the Charges. The GC is summarizing both standing and continuing charges and responsibilities. The new charges for 2009-2010 include conducting a review of written standards policies and procedures pertaining to graduate education at UIS. He noted that there may be some confusion regarding what
is published and what policies we should or should not be implementing. The GC thought it would be good to establish a task force independent of the GC to do this fact finding. Kline asked if item #15 is pertaining to the application process, and Hall replied that this is referring to everything, not just application or admissions. While there is no specific policy focus to this task force, there is a concern that there are a lot of activities going on and we want to know what the GC needs to be attending to. Martin asked if the purpose was to evaluate the availability of these policies, and not the content per se, and Hall answered that it was. Ting noted that the SEC received a memo last week about the Graduate Education Task Force and the SEC had some concerns about the composition thereof. The concern is that the charge of the Task Force is very broad. The SEC will be providing feedback to the GC on that point. She also asked that Hall report back to the GC that at the end of the academic year the Senate expects to receive a report from their committee summarizing their activities. That report does not need to be long or elaborate. This expectation of reporting holds for all senate committees.

Rutherford added the GC has sent periodic reports to the Senate in years past, and she wondered if the senate wanted them to continue doing that in addition to a final report. Ting replied that we just need a final summary of what each committee has done so that we can disseminate this to everyone. Charges are considered to be in discussion at present.

**Old Business**


Martin offered a motion to remove Resolution 39-5 from the table, which was approved by voice vote. Motion to approve the resolution was made by Fisher, with Thompson seconding.

Bapat represented the Undergraduate Council. He stated that questions were raised regarding the list of courses for use in this minor, and this version of the resolution does not include that list. The interim EXL director will contact the affected departments and make sure the departments are agreeable to the use of their courses in the minor. She has already received several positive responses already. Also, there was a concern about overlap between EXL minor core courses and ECCE. The proposal was rewritten to specify that courses cannot be used for both EXL minor and ECCE/major requirements. Start date of the minor was also changed to the Fall 2011 semester. The deadline for approval for Fall 2010 has already passed.

Siddiquee asked about the courses are from other programs, which are subject to negotiation. He asked several questions on this point, including: Is there a clear understanding about what will happen if those negotiations fail? Will there be an additional request for resources if there’s a hole in the minor courses? Would EXL need
resources to deliver those courses? Bapat did not believe there would be a hole, as the core courses will still be offered by EXL.

Hall expressed his appreciation for EXL working with his college. Martin also expressed his appreciation for the efforts to obtain a letter of support from Dean Ermatinger. The motion was approved by voice vote.

**New Business:**

Resolution 39-7 Changes to the UIS Academic Integrity Policy – Section IV.1.– Plagiarism [1st reading]

Felix offered a motion to open discussion, VanVossen seconded.

Hall asked if there was a reason for the changes. Fisher stated that these are intended as minor clarifications, targeting parts of the policy about which questions had been raised. Hall noted that lines 29 and 30 were a major topic of discussion when this was first passed. Pressley stated that those lines address duplication of work, which is now addressed under the section on Misrepresentation. Martin asked if the intention of the addition of line 34 was to give faculty the leeway to set rules that are specific to their discipline, and Pressley indicated that it was. Hall asked if she could provide an example. Pressley indicated that she did not have a specific example, but she knows that Computer Science does have different expectations from her department of Psychology.

Headman asked if it would it be helpful to rephrase this as “faculty may incorporate additional discipline-specific requirements.” Wang asked what would happen if you wanted to remove some elements of plagiarism? Ting stated that the intent is to make sure that students are made aware of any discipline-specific expectations.

Martin suggested that it might be helpful to modify the language further, and Ting suggested that the language of the final bullet point be modified by Pressley for the second reading.

Kosmetatou asked if she could comment on the plagiarism policy. She stated that she and her colleague Bertaina feel that the whole procedure should be simplified. Ting suggested that she send a memo directly to the chair of the AIC, and begin the discussion there. Whatever comes out of that discussion can then be brought to the senate.

Resolution 39-8 Changes to the UIS Academic Integrity Policy – Section V.1.B. – Pending Charges in Courses [1st reading]

Fisher offered a motion to open discussion, Casinova seconded. There was no discussion on this item.
Resolution 39-9 Changes to the UIS Academic Integrity Policy – Section V.2.A. – Informal Resolution [1st reading]

Van Vossen offered a motion to open discussion, Thompson seconded. Hall noted that lines 23 through 27 remove the 10 business days requirement. Pressley stated that requirement is still present, it has simply been moved to another line.

Resolution 39-10 Changes to the UIS Academic Integrity Policy – Section V.3.C. - Pool of Panel Members [1st reading]

Van Vossen offered a motion to open discussion, Thompson seconded. Hall asked for clarification on the reasoning behind the resolution, which shifts responsibility for selection of members of the student pool for hearing panels from SGA to departments. Pressley stated that this resolution came about due to SGA operations. The AIC needs to have the student pool arranged very early in the semester, and SGA often does not meet early enough to get those students named by early fall semester or summer. While not spelled out in the resolution, the thinking was that departments might make this a responsibility of their elected student representatives. Martin shared Hall’s concern insofar as this is an abdication of power by the students, and he expressed the desire to see the students really involved in this. Ting noted that we discussed this with Van Vossen. Van Vossen suggested that we could add language stating that departments would select student member, and that selection would be approved by the SGA. Pressley noted that change still would not address the difficulty of finding students to serve on the panel over the summer, and wondered if that modification would be feasible. Van Vossen stated that over the summer the outgoing SGA could still serve as the approving body. Berman suggested that a way to think about this is, whether the students are going to have a substantial role in the implementation of the AIC policy. This revision does not undermine the role of students in the implementation. This discussion would only modify the way those students get selected. Earlier, the student government leaders were comfortable with this, the practicalities of the process of getting students into the panel made selections difficult.

Fisher noted that departments may not get those student selections done faster than SGA. If the concern is with the summer, then perhaps the SGA could provide a pool that would be willing to serve in the summer. Felix noted that either way you will have departments that lack students who want to volunteer in the summer. Most students leave for the summer. Ting responded that the AIC chair can then go to the departments over the summer to find somebody who can work with AIC.

Martin stated that he disagreed a little with Berman. The student selection process matters. Would faculty select the same students that the students would select? He expressed a desire for students to understand that they have to step up and make sure that they have the people in this process that they need to make it work. Martin is not in favor
of this. Ting clarified that if SGA cannot make this work it does not mean that they do not care.

Gilliam noted that the resolution doesn’t specify how those student selections are made. Pressley indicated that was correct. Felix asked if this would work with, perhaps, one person from each college, and asked whether students serve for their departments alone or for the whole college. Pressley stated that is not the case, the actual panel members are drawn randomly from the pool and panel selections are not based on departmental or college affiliation.

Headman asked if we have reason to believe that the selection process will fundamentally change anything. If SGA is not bothered by the selection changes, then why should we not support this?

Van Vossen does not see this as SGA losing power, provided that SGA has final approval authority. Over the summer the incoming SGA reps could handle the approval process, perhaps not using a formal vote as would be the case in the fall and spring. It is simply much harder to find students over the summer. As long as SGA oversight is present this would not be a problem.

Hall stated that he is concerned that this will not solve the problem of finding students over the summer. If this resolution changes things in the spring and fall, then perhaps this would help. Pressley stated that a clarification might be needed here. She stated that she envisioned that over the summer she would contact departments to get their summer pool representative. Ting stated that she would send this resolution back to AIC to work with SGA on the selection process details.

Resolution 39-11 Public Administration Certificate with an International Perspective

Hall offered a motion to open discussion and Thompson seconded. Wang offered an editorial comment, noting that the memo from GC has a font size change in the final paragraph.

Kullick asked whether, as was stated in the eligibility section G. 2A of the document, it was a requirement to be an international student. The GC memo dated September 21st does not indicate that. Hall reported that the GC has required that any reference to international students as a requirement must be changed and indicated that section G. 2A would need to be modified. Fisher expressed the opinion that this is probably an editing and communication error, and asked whether it is the understanding that all references to international students should be removed. Miller indicated it was, and that the eligibility section needs to be changed. Ting asked Miller to revise that and return the document to the senate.

Siddiquee asked if there were any projections on enrollments. Miller indicated there were not, but that the proposal began with a conversation with a group in China who were
interested in such a program. They have moved on, but by creating the new certificate they are hoping to have a vehicle for collaboration. He noted that there is a program in Myanmar that they would like to collaborate with. Martin noted that under staffing and resource requirements it says no new resources are needed, and asked if that meant the department has the capacity to do this at present. Miller indicated they did. Martin also asked if this program would this require changing any class sizes, and Miller stated that it would not.

Resolution 39-12 UIS Campus Senate on Requesting the Restoration of Monetary Award Program (MAP) Funding [1st reading]

Van Vossen offered a motion to open discussion and Casiniova seconded.

Casinova offered a friendly amendment to modify the language in the resolution to emphasize the severity of the situation. He suggested “emphatically implore” to replace the word “request.” Fisher suggested the phrase “very strongly urges” instead, as “implores” implies begging. Casinova noted that this will affect 827 students on our campus and many will not be able to return if MAP is not restored. He thus wants to have the strongest possible language in this resolution. Fisher agreed that the language should be changed. Kline suggested that language that is too “over the top” could turn some people off, and keep some readers. Ting suggested the word “beseech.” Casinova indicated that such strong language is warranted in this situation. Fisher wanted to see language that argues from a position of strength such as “urges”, rather than weakness which is implied by “implores.” Ting noted that ISU did use the word implore in their resolution. There is a friendly amendment for “strongly urges.”

Joseph added that “immediacy” is a key concept here. He stated that restoration of MAP must be done immediately. Ting agreed and suggested the language “strongly urges the state of Illinois to fully and immediately restore the MAP funding to ISAC for 2010 and thereafter.” The amendment motion was approved by voice vote.

Martin offered a motion to suspend the rules and approve the resolution on the 1st reading. Seconded by Felix. That motion carried, and the resolution was approved by voice vote.

Resolution 39-13 UIS Campus Senate on Condemning Campus Violence and Supporting the LGBTQ Community [1st reading]

Van Vossen offered a motion to open discussion and Thompson seconded.

Headman noted that this resolution very timely given recent events and everyone has been affected by those events. He noted that while this resolution was brought on by a specific affected group, but perhaps we ought to expand the language of the resolution to include everyone. Ting expressed the opinion that this was written to be inclusive. Headman noted that resources are being suggested for one group, but Ting stated that this
does not limit resource allocation to just the LGBTQ group. The review of best practices would apply to everyone, and while it does mention the Sanlo report it does not specify that resources should not be used for other things. Headman reiterated his opinion that this was very group-specific.

Kline cited the lines addressing training programs and expressed his worry that we are about to force the entire community to do more time consuming activities when the problem is just a few bad apples. He expressed concern that this would not address the problem, but acknowledged that his concerns might stem more from the vagueness of the language rather than from the idea itself.

Thompson expressed her happiness at seeing this resolution. She stated that this kind of resolution has been needed for a long time, and that this resolution does need to have some group specificity.

Murphy encouraged everyone to refuse the logic of scarcity and embrace the logic of community. He noted that everyone can be a member of multiple communities, and that these types of events affect everyone. In response to Kline’s concerns, Murphy mentioned that the goal is not to mandate that everyone go through training, but it is increasingly the case that national standards require HR-based cultural sensitivity training in both public and private sectors. He expressed the need for UIS to address a culture of violence.

Ting noted that the only mandatory element in this resolution is orientation, and this resolution only mentions that these materials be presented as part of orientation. Fisher added that she was also pleased with this resolution, noting that this is a much-needed statement of support for a community that has not received much support from this campus in the past. She expressed her admiration for the wording of the resolution, and indicated that she felt the “Resolved” sections of the resolution were inclusive.

Kline reiterated his support for most of the resolution, but indicated that his specialty area is business ethics and noted that there are deep questions about the kinds of HR activities Murphy mentioned. He suggested that the idea of training should be addressed in a separate resolution, and offered an amendment to remove lines 23-25 from the resolution. The amendment was seconded by Borland.

Discussion of the amendment began with Thompson acknowledging Kline’s concerns. However, she expressed the sentiment that this resolution only requires that training be part of orientation, and does not specify what precisely goes on in that training.

Martin stated that he appreciates Headman’s concerns, and noted that recent history shows us that the senate can sometimes be in a rush to respond to things and in so doing we can sometimes produce unintended consequences. He added that there is often an assumption that faculty will have a more liberal mindset and that is not true for everyone. He expressed the desire to ensure that a resolution such as this brings the community together.
Giordano suggested changing some wording on line 24 that would remove the language about the inclusion of this in orientation. That would allow the resolution to continue to encourage such training without forcing it into an orientation. Ting replied that we do have some programs in place, and it is vital to emphasize to new students just arriving on campus the value of cultural sensitivity, violence prevention, and sexual assault prevention. We do not have such a program for students presently. The intent of lines 23-25 is not just to support ongoing programs, but to develop additional programs that we desperately need. Students, staff and faculty all need to be aware of these things.

Murphy stated that he was sensitive to Kline’s concerns, but encouraged a close look at the language in the resolution. He stated that it does not mandate anything, but rather it supports. He added that this is not a matter of political orientation – violence, rape and sexual assault are crimes. He expressed the opinion that it is not outrageous to speak to our students about how to avoid becoming a felon while at UIS. He added that this is a topic for a task force on rape and sexual assault, but we do not have such a task force. He stated that we have a culture of violence on this campus that has been unacknowledged. Murphy said he has been on this campus seven weeks and that he believes there is an epidemic of rape and sexual violence on this campus, not just of females but also of males. Kline responded that this underscores his point that the training element needs to be removed and given its own important resolution.

Headman stated that it is timely to reach out to LGBTQ community and to express our condemnation of this violence. He reiterated the need to expand this language to apply it to everyone on campus. Ting replied that this resolution is indeed universal. It is derived from recent events, but these principles apply to everyone. Headman stated that this creation of support services can entail financial concerns that should be considered. Ting noted that we must go back to the Sanlo report to review their recommendations, as that is what we are recommending.

Martin suggested that it would be useful to address training and resources in a separate resolution, which would allow this resolution to be a stronger, purer statement of support. Fisher replied that she supports retaining lines 23-25, as the goal is to improve the campus climate and removing those lines effectively removes the “teeth” from the resolution. Without those lines the statement becomes too vague.

A vote was conducted by a show of hands. Eight voted to remove lines 23-25, and eight voted to retain them. The chair broke the tie by voting to retain the lines. The final vote is 9-8 against the amendment, with the original language retained.

Discussion returned to the resolution, and Felix offered an amendment to remove language from line 24 addressing “orientation and training,” seconded by Borland. Martin stated that this amendment would not address the concerns mentioned earlier, as it does not specifically remove the training language but it simply removes the language specifying where it will occur. Gilliam expressed the desire to keep the language intact, because the location of this training does matter. Removing this language makes it more
vague. Casinova added that the point of entry for students is an important element, and so keeping the word “orientation” is necessary.

Kline stated that while the intentions being expressed here are good, those intentions will not matter once the resolution is passed. That resolution will be sent to committees and the additional vagueness introduced by removing this language from line 24 will further obscure those intentions.

Martin called the question. Voting was done by a show of hands with 7 approving the amendment, and 9 opposing. The amendment did not pass and the original resolution language was retained.

Fisher stated that she can see the point made by others regarding the difficulties with implementation, but indicated that part of our discussion may be a bit beside the point. She stated that this is not a policy document, but rather is a contribution to an ongoing conversation. Most campuses have these training programs, and we do not, which could be putting our students at risk. This is simply a matter of the Senate adding its weight to this ongoing conversation. Martin expressed his agreement with Fisher’s point, and indicated he would still support this resolution despite the failure to change the language.

Siddiquee explained that he voted for the prior amendments because we are not giving proper emphasis to the training. This resolution is about condemnation of the act of violence, and he felt that training should be considered separately. Ting indicated that he is correct that training can be considered separately. The senate can still bring that up as a separate resolution. This resolution is not the end of the discussion. This is a statement of support.

Borland moved to suspend the rules and vote on the resolution without a second reading and was seconded by Van Vossen. The motion passed by voice vote with one opposed and one abstention.

Murphy expressed the sentiment that there is a widespread need on this campus for creation of a task force addressing these issues, and he volunteered to serve on such a task force if it would be created by the senate. Ting stated that Student Affairs would need to be involved in that discussion to assess what they currently have in place and give them the opportunity to respond to this resolution.

Siddiquee noted that lines 7-8 addresses physical violence on campus, but in the next Resolved section we specify different types of acts of violence. Kline stated that he did not read them as disjuncts, but rather as conjuncts, and he did not view that language as a limitation.

The resolution was approved by voice vote with one abstention.

**Adjournment:**
A motion was made by Casinova and seconded by Thompson to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 12:46 pm.