

Ex-Officio: H. Berman


The Senate was called to order at 10:03am

Approval of the day’s agenda
A motion was made by to approve the agenda by Casinova, but Martin raised a point of order regarding the placement of Resolution 40-2 as Old Business. Ting explained that this is being considered old business because it was discussed and endorsed by the previous senate. The SEC felt it would be awkward to introduce this resolution as New Business which would then require finalization in the fall semester. It is Senate practice to give a resolution number to any SGA resolution that we endorse. The Chair ruled it in order to classify this resolution as Old Business. The motion was seconded by Kline.

Nominations for Chair
Motion to open floor offered by Borland and seconded by Martin. Ting was nominated last session, and Salela offered to nominate Bogle. Casinova indicated that he had asked Bogle if he would be interested in being nominated, and Bogle had indicated to him that he would be too busy over the next year to accept such a nomination. Martin offered a motion to close nominations, seconded by Kline.

Election of Chair
The vote was 13 for Ting, 4 no votes and 1 abstention.

**Nominations for Vice Chair**
Motion to open the floor offered by Borland and second by Martin. Kline and Burton had been previously nominated and Burton withdrew his nomination. Garmil moved to close discussion, seconded by Borland.

**Election of Vice Chair**
Kline received 15 votes, Burton received 1 vote, there was 1 no vote, and 1 abstention.

**Nominations for USC Representative**
Motion to open the floor offered by Borland, seconded by Casinova. Borland nominated Martin and Martin accepted. There were no other nominations. Motion to close nominations was offered by Eisenhart and seconded by Garmil.

**Election of USC Representative**
Martin received 17 of 17 votes. His term will be from 2010 to 2013.

**Approval of the minutes from the meetings of April 23rd**
A motion to approve the minutes of the first Senate meeting held on April 23rd was offered by Martin, seconded by Casinova. There were no questions or corrections. The motion was approved.

A motion to approve the minutes from the second Senate session held on April 23rd was offered by Eisenhart, seconded by Salela. There were typographical corrections to lines 154-155, line 227, and 220. The motion was approved.

**Reports**

**Chair – T. Ting**
Ting offered her thanks for her re-election as Chair. She commented that this last year was a busy one for the Senate and expects that next year will be busy as well. She noted that the Chair has the power to appoint the Secretary and based on her previous discussions with Burton, he is willing to continue in that capacity.

**Provost – H. Berman**
Provost Berman stated that there are several issues to cover today. Regarding the budget, the state still owes the University $367 million for this FY. He stated that it was nearly inevitable that the state would end the FY with a shortfall in funding. This is especially problematic in light of the need to budget for next year. The dilemma that produces is this: do we engage in budget planning based on the notion that we will get that money, or not? That is currently under discussion.

There is legislation going to the governor that would allow universities to borrow to maintain our budget. While this is very distasteful, it appears necessary to keep the institution functioning.
When one borrows one also needs to put up collateral, which presumably will be in the form of future tuition payments. This is unprecedented and undesirable.

Regarding enrollment, admissions and deposits have fallen off a bit in the last few weeks but overall registrations for the fall continue to look strong. There will be an enrollment-related initiative coming before the Board of Trustees at their May meeting, which will allow for in-state tuition rates to be offered residents of neighboring states. There have been considerable discussions with our sister campuses and with University Administration, and we have produced a proposal to allow students residing in bordering counties on the west border of the state to be eligible for in-state tuition rates. This would allow us to recruit from the St. Louis metro area and in the Quad Cities area population centers, and also from the smaller communities along the border. Berman distributed a map showing the region encompassed by the Contiguous Area Tuition Pilot Program.

Chair Ting had asked Berman to discuss the accelerated BA degree program, which is something President Ikenberry has asked the three campuses to consider. Initially this was described as a three-year program, but it includes any degree completed in less than four years. The three-year degree would not change the curricular requirements, as students would still need to complete the same number of credit hours. In some places a three-year program is done via accelerated semesters, but that is not on the table for us. We instead would be looking at a combination of high credit-load semester enrollments along with use of summer sessions. He thanked Moranski for her work on developing these plans, and acknowledged that there is nothing actually new about this idea. It is a good option for some students, but it will not be viable for all students.

We have in fact had students doing accelerated degree programs on their own since the advent of Cap Honors. UIS is well-positioned to do this as we have a robust summer school, but UIUC does not. We have also been working to put additional online General Education courses on the schedule for the summer to help students accomplish their General Education work. Such students would need to follow a very highly-prescribed pattern of courses. Interestingly, as Moranski was developing these plans she discovered that three majors would not require the use of AP credits. Advising will be essential to make such programs work well, as students cannot just stumble into this. This accelerated plan would not be appropriate for all degree programs, and it would not be ideal for all students. There are some students who need to put in long hours working in the summers which would be incompatible with heavy summer loads. In addition, it is important to consider the student’s academic ability as an 18hr load might be too much for some to be able to succeed. There are also some arrangements such as study abroad or some internships that might make such an accelerated program infeasible. From here on it will be a matter of discussing with deans and department chairs and admissions. No departments will be forced to adopt an accelerated program, rather the idea is to explore how this might be done naturally and feasibly.

Kline asked if summer course costs are paid by colleges, where revenues go, and if the arrangement provides an incentive for Deans to avoid summer courses. Berman stated that all tuition that comes in to UIS comes in centrally, and budgets for overloads and summer schools are set within colleges with the resources they have and the challenge is to do the best they can to fund summer courses. Those credit hours benefit the institution overall. Wassenberg noted that
Kline has identified a problem that the Deans and Provost have discussed, which is how to manage summer school. Right now it is managed out of colleges on a budget line that includes overloads and part-time instructors, and summers are funded on what is left over in that line. Substantial budget cuts put further strains on that line. The Provost’s office has provided some flexibility for funding additional courses. She stated that the more online courses the better, as the colleges find the online fees that they generate to be very attractive.

Ting noted that Wojcicki needed to leave by 11am and asked if provost Berman would be willing to cede the floor to him for the moment, and Berman agreed.

**Progress Report on the Recommendations by the Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Intercollegiate Athletics – E. Wojcicki**

Wojcicki presented an update on the progress that has been made on the recommendations from the Athletics report since March 12th. The AIC has met three times and there have been many discussions. One of the report’s recommendations was to improve information sharing and Wojcicki believes that good efforts to do so have been made. He distributed a list of issues to work on, and noted that Items 3A through J are the issues are focusing on at present. Finally, he noted that there are some skeptics and cynics around, but he pointed out that of the 65 recommendations that have been made over the last two years, the committee felt they had completed 74% of the recommendations and he felt that was pretty good. He often hears that we have not addressed important recommendations yet, but he hopes that everyone will realize that 74% is pretty good progress so far and they will be continuing to address remaining issues.

Ting noted that Wojcicki reported there is a meeting scheduled with VCSA Barnett, FAR Yoder and former IAC Chair Williams and asked if he could share the agenda for that meeting. Wojcicki stated that there was no set agenda, but the goal of the meeting is to try to build bridges and enhance communication.

Ting commented that since the March 26th Senate meeting the SEC has been contacted by AD Jehlicka for input on staffing search committees for the compliance officer and for the women’s softball head coach. On the former a faculty member was suggested and placed on the committee, and on the latter the request was made yesterday for suggestions for faculty members of the committee. Martin asked who was suggested for those committees, and Ting stated that the compliance officer search faculty member is Bussell, and the other committee does not yet have a suggestion as we just received that request yesterday.

**Intercollegiate Athletics Committee – L. Fisher**

Ting asked Fisher to provide the IAC report while on this topic. Fisher stated that she has been appointed to be the SEC liaison to the IAC and she has been very pleased with the work they have done so far. She offered special praise for the student members of the IAC, who have been very active and provided good ideas, as well as the SGA representative on the committee. The faculty members on the committee are FAR Yoder, Williams, Morsch, and Winand. Fisher asked the committee about their priorities and short-term action plans that come out of the Investigation on Athletics Report. The biggest priority is the governance of athletics on campus generally, information flow, and an idea from the students to generate additional awareness of athletics on campus perhaps via an awards ceremony, which is apparently something that other athletic
departments do. On the topic of information sharing, there has been progress on that front as exemplified by the Chancellor’s office quickly providing a budget document that can be updated on a monthly basis, if needed. Finally, she described an important issue for the IAC in addressing the relationship between Campus Health Services and Athletics. Part of this issue has resulted from staffing shortfalls in Campus Health Services, as they have not had several positions refilled. That has led to some differences in opinions in how those entities interact. Wojcicki and VCSA Barnett will be working with both bodies to resolve this as soon as possible, as it needs to be addressed prior to fall orientation. There is another list of priorities that will be discussed starting in the fall. Ting asked about the chair for IAC next year, and Fisher stated that the vote has not yet been held but she has been nominated.

Garmil asked if there have been any discussions about the athletics scholarship issue, and Fisher stated that there has been some discussion. She stated that, generally, the issue should focus on the student athletes and the general reliance on visiting appointments for coaches which can create instability of the kind we are seeing. This point was made very articulately by members of the student advisory committee. Ting invited Wojcicki to comment, and he declined.

Martin asked about the absence of IAC meeting schedules on the Campus Senate website, and Fisher apologized for not getting that done yet. Her work as liaison has been rapid-fire and this is something that did not get done but is on the agenda as an issue to address for next year.

**Provost – H. Berman (continued)**

Berman stated that he received a report from the Faculty Compensation Committee, which is convened every other year to make recommendations for summer teaching, overloads, promotion raises, off-campus instruction, and faculty development allocation. That report made some recommendations for adjustments but he needs to review the FY11 budget before making his recommendations to the Senate. He will do so in the fall and the Senate can then vote on those recommendations, which would go into effect that year. He thanked Wassenberg and all the other members of the committee.

A final report he received was from CAPTIV, the curricular approval task force, which worked for the last year to update the curricular approval process. He hopes to bring it to the Senate early in the fall for approval. Berman offered thanks to Bodenhorn for his work chairing that committee.

Berman also offered congratulations to the recipients of the Summer Competitive Scholarly Research Grants. A total of $30,000 awarded to Longo, Sheridan, Miller, Dong, Bonacum, Vazquez, Landsberg, Owusu-Ansah, Hwang, and Graf. The recipients come from all four colleges, and he thanked Pardie for her work on these awards.

Eisenhart noted that her college chairs have expressed concern about the decision to modify the process for summer chair compensation, which now has some chairs receiving $5,000 for summer chair work and others receiving $10,000. She stated that her discussions with her dean indicated that this change arose out of a resolution passed two years ago. Her concern has to do with the role of the college executive committees in determining the compensation for chairs, which was evidently not done with this recent change. She expressed her college’s surprise at
this abrupt change and noted that she is currently receiving less compensation for summer chair work than she has received in 10 years, while chairs in other departments are now earning $10,000 or $12,000. She asked provost Berman to approach this issue with greater equity in mind.

Ting stated that the resolution in question is 37-27 from April of 2008. She noted that the resolution’s language discussed the specific process by which a variety of factors contribute to the workload of department chairs. The dean does this in consultation with an ad hoc committee appointed by the CEC, and makes recommendations to the Provost and SEC to ensure comparability across colleges. Fisher added that her college was also surprised by this, as their ad hoc committee is currently in the midst of this process and was operating on the assumption that the summer stipends for chairs were anticipated to stay the same.

Provost Berman stated that Article 9, section 6 is the portion that was revised two years ago, and there is an appendix that addresses the chair compensation issue. In that appendix it had stated that the chair work would be based on the average compensation of all faculty, but in the revision that concept went away. That change was approved by the Campus Senate. That being said, he recognized that this was hitting folks fairly abruptly. What needs to be done now is for Deans to work out transition plans. Regardless, the concept of basing summer stipends on average faculty salary is clearly gone from the policy.

Eisenhart indicated that the resolution clearly states that the college makes these decisions and they were not a part of this process. She stated that Berman may feel it is clear, but she does not and she recommended that it be worked out with the Personnel Policy Committee and ad hoc committees. The comparability responsibility lies with the Provost and SEC, but not the decision regarding compensations. Berman stated that they are in disagreement, but clarified that this process is currently based on the same formula for teaching assignment compensation.

Ting stated that the SEC feels it clear that the process being spelled out in the personnel policy is not being followed in the same way across colleges. Ting asked if Eisenhart was on the Senate in 2008, and Eisenhart indicated she was but it was not her understanding that this policy change would result in this change in compensation. She expressed the concern that this confusion is costing people money and needs to be looked at.

Martin asked if the chair compensation money comes from a salary program or from a separate pot of money, and Berman stated that it comes out of college budgets. Ting stated that the Provost’s office does not pay for that compensation.

Ting asked for additional detail on the enrollment changes Berman mentioned earlier. Giordano stated that transfer applications are up 10% but we are down 19 admitted students, or 4%. At the graduate level applications are again up but we are down 13 admitted students. Freshmen deposits are down by 15 compared to last year, but she hoped that may improve as we had 9 new freshmen coming in on Monday. However, registration for summer and fall looks good.
Ting asked which faculty members served on the compensation committee. Wassenberg stated that Yoder, Peck, Rivera, Bilal, and a CBM member whom Wassenberg could not name at the moment.

**Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen (absent – Casinova presenting)**
Casinova offered his congratulations and thanks to Felix for his graduation and for his work representing students on the Board of Trustees. He also offered congratulations to Olivier who has been elected as the Board of Trustees student representative. Finally, he congratulated Van Vossen on his reelection as President of the SGA. Ting commented that Olivier’s election has generated considerable positive responses from the Board.

**Committee on Committees – L. Fisher**
Two vacancies have arisen on the ATC, and Fisher nominated Ortiz from PAA for a 2009-2012 vacancy. Bilal has resigned from the GEC and Tagge has agreed to serve in her place. Martin offered a motion to accept the slate of nominees, seconded by Eisenhart. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Chancellor Search Advisory Committee**
Ting stated that President Ikenberry has selected the final slate for the Advisory Committee, with the exception of the community member. Ikenberry agreed with us on the size and composition of the committee, which is 15 in size and includes 8 faculty, 1 AP, 1 CS, 1 Dean, the VCSA, 1 alumni representative, 1 student and 1 community member. All costs for the search are to be borne by the President’s office. The President kept diversity in mind when making his selections, including gender, disciplines, units of the campus, and so forth. Ting distributed the final slate of faculty nominees. She reminded everyone that two nominees were requested for each seat on the committee. The faculty slate includes Morris, Newman, Peck, Kemayo, Bertaina, Reminger, Mouw and Ting. There is representation from each college. Salela noted that the faculty of the library does not have a representative on this committee, and Ting noted that none of the library faculty were on the 16 faculty nominees that were sent to him. A motion to endorse the slate was offered by Eisenhart, seconded by Kline. The motion passed with four abstentions.

Ting also distributed the complete list of committee members and noted that each constituency put forward its own nominees. The Senate only endorses the faculty members of the committee.

**Academic Integrity Council – K. Pressley**
Ting asked if Pressley had anything to add to the report she filed, and she stated that the only addition is that there have been several new cases that have come in over the last week and a half. Fisher thanked Pressley for her leadership of the Council and for developing the forms and processes for the AIC operations.

Martin asked about the status of student representative nominations for the AIC hearing panels, and Pressley stated that she has received 9 nominees from the 30 departments, and they have all been approved by the SGA. Martin asked her to provide an update at the end of the summer about how well the new student rep nomination process is working.
Ting asked if there were any other policy items that would need to be revised. Pressley stated that they have identified one issue on immediate suspension that will require clarification.

Committee on Admissions, Recruitment, and Retention – D. Ferk
Ting asked if Ferk had anything to add or would like to emphasize. Ferk stated that there are members from each of the subcommittees present who can answer or provide brief presentations if there is time.

Ting asked about the relationship between the faculty advisor, professional advisor, and a master advisor arrangement that is being proposed. Egizi indicated that the committee is not wedded to those specific terms, but the idea is to have a staff member who has a general background in many programs that can provide some efficient advice. The faculty member would bring not only their disciplinary expertise but also perhaps has an understanding of General Education. The recommendation was to form a committee to explore these ideas, not necessarily to push for this specific arrangement.

Helton asked about how the recommended hand-off would happen. Ferk observed that the sense of the committee was that there are multiple requirements across campus, and that the faculty advisor cannot be expected to be an expert on all matters of cross-campus advising. The idea was to have somebody who has a good understanding of the big picture. The major advisor can provide career advice and suggestions for courses to take within the major. However, because there is so much ongoing change in courses it would be ideal to have a centralized source of specialists for the more administrative elements of advising at the campus level. The feeling of the committee was that it is essential to have an examination of undergraduate advising across the campus. Egizi added that, while it is important to have a centralized role it is felt that the colleges should also be involved in the implementation.

Moranski responded to Helton’s question about the hand-off between undergraduate advising and major advising. She noted that there is already an advising transfer form that is given to departments when a student moves from lower division to upper division advising. How those forms are used varies across departments and requires some fine tuning. That form was revised this year to reflect outstanding General Education requirements. Helton stated that she has not seen these forms, and Fisher agreed that she had not seen them either. Moranski stated that it is possible that copies of those forms are not being kept in departments or that secretaries are signing off on them, and thus faculty might not see those forms. Fisher noted that she believes her department has never even received such a form. Eisenhart stated that her department has been making copies of those forms and puts them in the student files.

Ting observed that the student perspectives on advising from the student survey is that advising is an area they want to see improved, and we probably need to strengthen that area. Ting stated that she does not know what is presently in place and working with regard to advising, but she gets the sense from the committee’s report that advising definitely needs work. Moranski reiterated that advising has needed reform and further discussion for some time now, and that is a product of the growth of the campus into a four-year curriculum. We have never clearly decided the role of faculty in advising given the changes that have occurred. We need to discuss the
various models for advising. There are multiple discussions in the colleges and we will need to standardize what comes out of those discussions. There remains, of course, a resource issue.

Helton followed-up on the recommendation of the creation of a Task Force on this idea, and asked if the Senate needs to support this idea. Ferk stated that the committee would like for that to happen so that we can have a “shovel-ready” program when resources do appear, or when colleges are ready to pilot.

Fisher proposed that we endorse this recommendation, which will be especially timely as we are moving to a different graduation process. That motion was seconded by Borland. The motion was approved unanimously.

Martin asked about the statement that there are several instructional time slots that are over-used, and asked if we could have that information available when we do scheduling. He had previously heard that the hardest time slots to get courses are on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday evenings. This would appear to contradict the committee’s report that we are overscheduling the 10-4 time slots. Wassenberg stated that this information is available from the Dean’s office, including scheduling from past semesters. Ferk stated that previous semester data is available on the dynamic course schedules, but there is no tool to determine when courses are being planned while the schedule is being developed. Eisenhart stated that this is an ongoing issue.

Moranski stated that this information is publicly available, but is limited in its utility. She added that the time grid schedule is something that the campus should review as it was a long time ago by Wayne Penn. There are, for example, time slots for MWF courses but there has been no encouragement of developing classes for those times. Likewise, we have no time slots for odd-houred courses. Ting asked when we could move forward with that idea, and Moranski stated that faculty and students and ATDs and secretaries all need to be involved in a conversation about how this would work.

Helton noted that item #2 recommends better coordination of course schedules across campus units and asked who is doing that coordination at present. Butler indicated that there is very limited coordination by various people across campus, but it remains problematic. Helton asked if there was a recommendation as to who should be doing this coordination, and Butler indicated that the committee did not take a position on that. One idea was to have a master scheduling program that would allow for conflict detection. He added that the recommendation #3, that programs develop 3-4 year schedules, becomes irrelevant if the courses that are on that schedule are in constant conflict.

Moranski noted that last year there was a three-campus committee that examined course scheduling issues, on which and Marvel and Eslahi served. What we need is some kind of software that can identify conflicts. The software we have is solely for room scheduling, so some discussion has been had regarding either the creation of software or publicly available software that could address that need.
Ting observed that each Dean gets the full schedule before it is finalized, and asked if it would be possible to have the Deans get together and identify obvious conflicts. Berman stated that we could give some thought to how best to do that kind of thing.

Eisenhart asked about item #3, and the recommendation that 3-4 year schedules become problematic with the addition of new faculty who will not be able to have input with regard to the courses and class times. She expressed concern about the possibility that senior faculty would be able to get the prime teaching times.

Ting stated that more important would seem to be the course rotation schedule, not necessarily the precise scheduling of the times of courses over 3-4 years. Butler indicated that was indeed what they were intending to emphasize in their reports so that students know when to expect courses to be offered. Helton added that departments need to know what is required of them 2 to 3 years out before we can possibly be expected to create such a rotation schedule. Her department, English, along with a variety of other departments have a lot of General Education pressures that impact course rotations.

Borland thanked the committee for making writing an area of emphasis in their report. Helton asked that we do recommendation #2, and assess the relationship between writing and retention, before establishing a Task Force on writing. Villegas agreed that the first step would be to identify whether there is a link between writing and retention before the development of a Task Force.

Committee on Diversity, Equal Rights, Opportunity, and Access – E. Kosmatatu
Fisher thanked the committee for addressing and thinking about these important issues. She expressed appreciation for the committee’s continuing focus on LGBTQ issues that are important to the campus, but asked if the committee could begin to focus on the increasingly growing minority populations that are appearing on our campus. She expressed some surprise at not seeing some discussion about the minority issues in both student and faculty recruitment and retention, and encouraged the committee to consider directing some attention to that topic. Ting agreed, stating that 28% of our incoming students are minorities, and 20% of our overall student body is minority. This issue does not appear to be listed on the items covered this last year and is not listed as a topic to be covered next year. Brown thanked Ting and Fisher for their comments and expressed that some members of the committee have had the same concerns. She stated that the committee has focused fairly heavily on sexuality and she would like to see some additional focus on other elements of diversity.

Eisenhart stated that in the past there had been separate committees on the various sub-constituencies that are addressed by this committee. The idea in creating a single committee was to focus on the strength in numbers, but that can unfortunately produce a focus on a single issue. Ting stated that the committee is fairly large but based on the report it does not appear that the committee has used a sub-committee approach. Kosmatatu stated that the committee has not used that kind of approach and appreciated that idea. She agreed that there is a need to expand the focus of the committee, although she noted that the committee has addressed some other elements of diversity such as ESL issues for international students. The focus on the LGBTQ director search was in part a product of the long process for the completion of that search, and
also because of the alleged hate crime that was committee last year. There are also privacy concerns with regard to what the committee can address.

Martin stated that this was another committee that has not publicized its meetings and asked that they do so. Ting stated that the senate office has requested that many times of the committee chair.

Kline agreed with Eisenhart and noted that the committee has done nothing with regard to disability services. He asked if the ODS office would have openings that need to be filled as well. Ting stated that the current director of the ODS office is on an interim appointment, and there is a plan to do a search for a permanent position for that office next year.

Ting stated that there were concerns about the process for the search on the LGBTQ director. Ford stated that we had a candidate on campus yesterday and there is another coming in next year. The hope is to have a permanent director July 1.

Casinova stated that Woods is an ex-officio member of the committee and regularly attends.

**Graduate Council – S. LaFollette (absent)**

Ting asked if Pardie could provide an update on the Graduate Task Force. Pardie stated that she has contacted several faculty members about joining the Task Force this summer, but that is not yet finalized.

**Personnel Policy Committee – K. Kirkendall (absent)**

Martin commented that this is another committee that has not publicized its meeting schedule. He also noted that a faculty member had contacted the chair of this committee about the idea of providing upward mobility evaluation of administrators and had been told that would be a topic to be considered, but sees it is not on the committee’s list of topics for next year. Ting noted that the list Martin is referring to simply lists accomplishments of the last year, and is not a list of topics for next year. Anthony has been elected as the next chair of PPC.

**Committee on Sustainability – T. Ting**

Ting stated that the committee has been very busy. There have been numerous educational outreach efforts this last year, including the Earth Day celebrations. A new chair was elected for next year, Klingshirn. Kline complimented the committee on their nice work this year.

**Biology Undergraduate Program Review – H. Bapat**

UGC chair Bapat, Biology Chair Vazquez and Biology faculty member McEuen are present to discuss the report. Bapat commended the department for the high quality of education they provide, the research they conduct, their involvement in the Emiquon Field station and the annual Science Symposium. He stated that there were some concerns from the UGC about the report, as there appears to have been poor communication amongst faculty members in the preparation of this review, and data that is expected to be in a report such as this was missing. A specific recommendation had to do with their major program, and the committee asked them to consider a restructuring of their curriculum if they feel it is appropriate. The UGC would like to
see a follow-up report that provides a reassessment of their learning outcomes and development of a rubric to measure student learning.

Fisher commended the department for their growth in majors, which continues to be very strong and her perspective is that students regard the Biology program as being a strong one. The College Curriculum Committee in particular noted that the faculty scholarship and the quality of the faculty in the Biology Department was outstanding. She added that the Biology department’s role in being the prime mover behind the Emiquon Field Station is phenomenal and she considers it to be amongst the most fun things the university has done in the last 10 years. One recommendation that she was surprised to see was that they continue to expand their General Education offerings, and her understanding is that this is a department that is already offering a heavy load of General Education courses, such that they have had to discontinue offering some electives. She asked that the UGC reconsider that recommendation.

Kline stated that the recommendation also emphasized the need for focus on the graduate program; however it appears they have not submitted a review of their Graduate program. He asked if it was late, and Helton stated that it was. Kline opined that some of these questions raised presently cannot be addressed without the graduate program review.

Martin stated that the report indicates that there has been one retirement and five new hires since their last review, and that many of those hires were specifically for General Education. Consequently he felt it was fair for the UGC to recommend they focus more on General Education offerings. He noted that they provided a chart indicating the distribution of upper division electives, but did not provide similar information about their General Education distribution amongst faculty. He noted that they have recently submitted a new course proposal, which was very welcome, but it has been a long time since they submitted a new General Education course proposal.

McEuen stated that for General Education and ECCE the department serves approximately 200 students per semester. She asked for clarification on what was recommended – a greater variety of courses, or greater enrollment? If the latter is requested, there are resource issues and limited lab space. Vazquez noted that they have heavy demands from their major and from a graduate program as well.

Wassenberg commented that she has seen a pattern in the program reviews that is somewhat troublesome. We have been seeing reviews that make heavy requests of very junior faculty in departments with very junior chairs while they are going through very crucial times in their personnel processes. She recommended a support structure that would make reports timely and complete.

Kline asked if NIAs were given for the generation of this report. Garrott stated that the Biology department is very junior; there are only two who were tenured at the time of this review and only one that was involved in the last program review. The program review was complicated by the chair’s sabbatical which occurred when this review should have begun. Consequently another faculty member was given an NIA to do this, but he received very little guidance and consequently it was not very productive. She expressed the opinion that the Division Director
should have some role in programs review and she could have been helpful, but that is not a part of the divisional structure. She added that the NIA did not actually go to the person who was writing the report. She stated that this program is filled with very talented faculty who know what they need to do to move forward. Kline followed up by stating that he did not intend for there to be any individual recriminations against anyone, but rather was interested in the institutional policy about such things.

Moranski added that there are annual presentations on how to do program reviews and the individuals who do the reviews are required to attend. The problem here is that the person who did the report was not the person who attended that meeting. Wassenberg’s point about resources is well taken, but she noted that there is some assistance currently available. In addition to Moranski and Pardie, support is also offered by Dorman in the Institutional Research Office. She noted that they do not regularly check in with departments on their progress.

Vazquez stated that her department acknowledges several areas that they need to improve upon, in particular assessment and retention. She expressed that they are not experts on these things and would need assistance. She asked that the UGC consider the timeline for an update, as they are losing two faculty lines and it is not clear that they will be replaced. That will limit the amount of service time their faculty have to work on these recommendations.

Ting stated that the department’s report expressed concern about space and equipment limitations and asked if there were concerns about those limitations affecting the quality of the program. Vasquez stated that quality remains good despite those limitations.

Martin stated that he does not want departments to feel that they cannot be critical of themselves.

Ting asked about the capstone closure idea, and McEuen stated that it would satisfy some requirements and could be part of the assessment process. The department is still exploring that idea.

**Old Business**

**Resolution 40-1 Approval of Minor in Public Health [2nd reading]**

A motion to begin discussion was offered by Eisenhart, seconded by Garmil. Martin stated that, with all due respect to Kline who at the previous meeting had expressed an opposing viewpoint, that this is not sufficiently rigorous to be a minor. The minor is built heavily on double-dipping and does not provide sufficient depth. Kline stated that he finds this minor very interesting, it meets the requirement for a minor, double-dipping is allowed, and he is unaware of any stated standards for rigor. Wassenberg stated that at this institution we have always recognized very different kinds of minors, those that are heavily discipline-specific and those that are multidisciplinary. The latter would not go into the kind of depth of the former, and this proposal is not very different from other minors in her college.

Fisher added that her department is interdisciplinary and that such programs use a different model. Many discipline-specific programs have prerequisites or requirements that build on each other; however, in her program there are no prerequisites except for the closure course.
Martin stated that here the MPH department has decided to do both General Education and Minor with the same setup of courses. He questions whether it is possible to do that.

Garmil asked if one could consider this to be interdisciplinary when all of the courses are offered by MPH. Wassenberg stated that the department itself is interdisciplinary.

Martin raised a point of order, as several senators had left, and asked if we still had a quorum. Of the 28 senators, only 17 were remaining which is less than the 60% required for a quorum. He called for a quorum, and Ting stated that we cannot thus vote on the 2nd reading of this and it will be revisited in the fall.

Resolution 40-2 Campus Senate Endorsement on SGA Resolution on the Proposed Follett Book Rental Program
This resolution had been previously approved by the Senate.

**New Business**

None

**Adjournment:**
A motion to adjourn was offered by Casanova. The Senate adjourned at 12:45 pm.