
Ex-Officio: L. Pardie


The Senate was called to order at 11:15 AM.

Approval of the Agenda

Martin motioned to approve the agenda. Case Pease seconded the motion.

Seating of the New Senate

Ting welcomed all of the new senators. She asked that everyone introduce themselves. Senators introduced themselves as follows: John Martin, Astronomy/Physics; Lynn Fisher, SOA; Ross Garmil, ESL; Peter Boltuc, Philosophy; Tony Sisneros, PA; Dennis Ruez, Environmental Studies; Xiaoqing Li, MIS; Yifeng Zhang, MIS; Donna Bussell, English; Leslie Schoo, Comm/Language; Aaron Mulvey, SGA; Ryan Bouray, Treasurer of SGA; Erin Wilson, President of SGA; John Tienken, Trustee Elect; Jenene Case Pease, Human Services; Gloria Simo, Public Administration; Dick Schudt, Survey Research Office; Carrie Switzer, Psychology; Jorge Villegas, Business Administration; Pinky Wassenberg, PA&A serving as the administration representative; Corey Hoelscher, Mathematical Sciences; Kate Sheridan, Social Work; Holly Thompson, acting secretary; Tih-Fen Ting, Environmental Studies; Bill Kline, LIS; Tena Helton, English; Kathy Jamison, Communication.

Ting stated that nominations would be opened for the senate Chair, Vice Chair, and USC representative for the upcoming year. At the next meeting, the nominations would again open, close and a vote will be taken.

Nominations for Chair

Kline made a motion to open nominations for Chair. Martin seconded the motion. Martin nominated Ting and Zhang seconded the motion. No other nominations were made. Boltuc motioned to close the nominations and Garmil seconded.

Nominations for Vice-Chair
Garmil motioned to open the nominations for Vice Chair. Villegas seconded the motion. Switzer nominated Martin and Villegas seconded the motion. No other nominations were made. Boltuc motioned to close the nominations and Fisher seconded the motion.

**Nominations for USC Representative**

Boltuc asked Ting to provide an explanation for the USC. Ting stated that USC stands for University Senates Conference. It is comprised of twenty faculty members: 10 from UIUC; 7 from UIC; and 3 from UIS. Representatives serve a three-year term. Ting serves on the USC and is in her second year, Martin is ending his first year, and Eisenhart’s term will be ended in Spring 2012. The new representative will serve a term from 2011-2014. According to Ting, the USC meets once a month and the position involves a lot of travel to Urbana and Chicago. She stated that it is really important that each of our representatives is able to attend the meetings, especially since we only have three members. Martin moved to open nominations. Helton nominated Switzer and Fisher seconded. Sheridan moved to close the nominations and Garmil seconded.

**Reports**

**Committee on Committees - W. Kline**

Kline reminded senators that they have a copy of the slate in front of them. He thanked everyone for their service. The following slate was presented for approval: *Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure* - Sviatoslav Braynov, Robert Wright, Chris Mooney, Tena Helton, and Carolyn Peck; *Academic Integrity Council* – Atul Agarwal and Denise Sommers; *Academic Technology Committee* – Jan Waterhouse, Junfeng Wang, and Michael Cavanagh; *Committee on Admissions, Recruitment, and Retention* – Laurel Newman, Linda McCown, John Transue and a vacancy still exists for EHS; *Committee on Assessment of Student Learning* – David Bertaina and Sae Kwang Hwang; *Campus Planning and Budget Committee* – Jenene Case Pease and Shuang-Yueh Pui; *Committee on Diversity, Equal Rights, Opportunity and Access* – Nithyakala Karuppaswamy, Jorge Villegas, Amy Kincaid, and Angela Winand; *General Education Council* – Heather Dell, John Martin, Donald Morris, Stephen Schnebly, and Amanda Binder; *Graduate Council* – Elizabeth Kosmetatou and Ranjan Karri; *Intercollegiate Athletics Committee* – Jay Gilliam and Angela Winand; *Committee on Library* – Allan Cook, Stephen Owusu-Ansah, and Sarah Sagmoen; *Personnel Policies* - Holly Thompson and Nathan Steele; *Research Board* – Lan Dong and Dennis Ruez; *Committee on Student Discipline* – Deborah Anthony and Leonard Bogle; *Committee on Sustainability* - Stefano Longo; *Undergraduate Council* – Kim Vera and Michael Cavanagh; and *Parking Appeals and Advisory Board* – Carol Saltsgaver. Wassenberg corrected the spelling of Kim Furumoto. She is now Kim Vera.

Martin moved to approve the slate and Garmil seconded the motion. The committee slate was approved. Kline asked for committee chairs to email the new members regarding meeting times to elect the chair. Ting stated she will follow up as well.

**USC OT-269 UIUC Call for a University-wide Summit on Organization and Governance – T. Ting**

Ting stated that UIUC is asking that all senates and the USC endorse a university-wide summit on organization and governance. She hoped that everyone has read the provided materials. Speaking to new senators, Ting shared information regarding the title realignment for
chancellors and university restructuring that happened in the fall. UIS campus senate endorsed all of the proposed changes made by the BOT. UIC also endorsed the proposed changes, but were split regarding the title realignment for the chancellor. UIUC opposed all of the proposed changes. As a result, the USC was split. Ting asserted that UIUC continues to challenge the changes that were implemented. Wassenberg stated that UIUC strongly objects to President Hogan’s efforts to unify the campuses. Wassenberg reported that UIUC has publicly stated that any further unification will serve to dilute the reputation of UIUC.

In the past, members of the UIS senate have commented that we are not receptive to their criticism of us. Martin noted that continuing members on USC (Martin and Ting) are at the end of our rope on this issue. They have constantly tried to direct the focus back to more important issues. However, because UIUC has the majority representation on the USC, they are able to steer the agenda. Martin stated that he and Ting are seeking ideas from the senate.

Talking about a call for a university-wide summit on organization and governance, Ting referenced Kennedy’s letter which did mention the need for a dialogue about the future of the university. However, the questions on organization and governance have been settled. Important questions now exist relative to how the three campuses can work together to make the U of I stronger. Ting said the SEC discussed this proposal and does not oppose having university-wide summit and dialogue. However, keeping the university solvent and addressing pressing concerns is much more important especially given that we are all more and more tuition dependent. Efforts to coordinate enrollment management would be much more beneficial.

Helton expressed a concern that this is thinly veiled rebel rousing. She asked if it might be better to not participate on their terms, or to participate and rearrange the terms. Given that we only have 3 representatives on USC, this is very difficult. She suggested that we not participate anymore but recognized that if we don’t participate that would be used against us as well. Kline suggested looking at points 4 and 7. He asked if the President has an interest in talking with APs. He also suggested that there is a more savvy way to address. He encouraged us to participate if we are on equal representation. Ting, talking about point number 7, did not believe that this has been violated on this campus. Ting asked Schultdt if President Hogan had met with APAC. Schultdt stated that Hogan meets with UPAC. Pardie reiterated that the President acts very quickly and delegates appropriately.

Ting stated that point number 4 is about who should represent the U of I at the AAU conference. Ikenberry used to attend and at one point chaired the AAU. However, this is not our concern. Garmil said that he was thinking back to Chairman Kennedy’s talk and how he described what he believes the trustees’ roles are in providing leadership for the campus. Garmil thinks this should be a top down invitation from the BOT given that UIUC is saying this stems from Kennedy’s letter. Ting asserted that they are calling for representatives from the BOT, the President, faculty and student governance, and the three chancellors. Our new chancellor will not begin until July 1, 2011 and Urbana is still in the middle of their search.

Bussell pointed to number 8, about academic policy matters. She asked what kinds of discussions have happened and whether this provides an opening for working. Martin said the President and the BOT have made it clear that they want academic stuff to remain at the campus level. Bussell asked if UIUC is worried that their rankings in U.S. News and World Reports are going to drop
if they are connected to us? Ting said yes. Martin emphasized that UIUC has had many of their own struggles relative to rankings that have nothing to do with us.

Ting noted that UIUC has used a centralization argument very loosely all year. She asserted that they don’t want to change the status quo. President Hogan had external reviewers from the University of Texas and the University of Connecticut to talk with all of the enrollment management directors to find out what we are doing with admissions, retention, and recruitment. Currently, we don’t even have a common application process. This would be really positive to have that level of coordination between campuses.

Bussell asked if it is possible to begin working on any of these academic initiatives. Ting stated that it has not been. She talked about the resistance to opening discussions about the creation and implementation of an intercampus articulation. Ting went on to say that last November she was told by a faculty leader at UIUC that they would accept credit hours and courses from Parkland Community College over ours because they are more familiar with the folks who teach there and also TA at UIUC. Anything dealing with coordination and collaboration has not been open for discussion.

Kline noted that it is important to pay attention to the language used in the request for the summit. He emphasized the structure and organization of the campus senate, which is much different than ours. Ting stated that the full academic senate at UIUC is 245 members. However, in order to have a quorum, they only need to have 100 present. When they do not have a quorum, they call for a committee of the whole. In order to have a committee of the whole they only need 50 members. She stated that they do not include attendance in the minutes and only do a voice-call vote which makes it impossible to know who is present and active.

Switzer asked what Ting and Martin need from the senate for their upcoming USC meeting. Ting stated that the response from the senate is necessary to see if we want to endorse as is, or if we want to accept the concept but not on the organization and governance issue. Bussell suggested using number 8. Helton asked if Ting is asking us to specify the most important things. Ting said yes. Switzer asked whether we need a motion to do this. Helton responded affirmatively, but believed separating the motions was important to process. Switzer motioned on the importance of having a university-wide summit and Bussell seconded the motion.

Garmil asked if the reason to endorse is to remove this from the USC agenda. Sheridan suggested that this may be a unique opportunity. Kline said that currently the documents we have are framed from the UIUC senate. He thinks it is important for us to also be allowed to shape some of the discussion. Ting called for a vote to support the idea of having a university-wide summit. A vote yielded almost unanimous favor, although 1 abstention was noted.

Ting asserted that next, the senate wants to endorse the call as it currently exists. Sheridan suggested that this may be a unique opportunity. Kline said that currently the documents we have are framed from the UIUC senate. He thinks it is important for us to also be allowed to shape some of the discussion. Ting called for a vote to support the idea of having a university-wide summit. A vote yielded almost unanimous favor, although 1 abstention was noted.

Ting asserted that next, the senate wants to endorse the call as it currently exists. Sheridan suggested that this may be a unique opportunity. Kline said that currently the documents we have are framed from the UIUC senate. He thinks it is important for us to also be allowed to shape some of the discussion. Ting called for a vote to support the idea of having a university-wide summit. A vote yielded almost unanimous favor, although 1 abstention was noted.

Ting asserted that next, the senate wants to endorse the call as it currently exists. Sheridan suggested that this may be a unique opportunity. Kline said that currently the documents we have are framed from the UIUC senate. He thinks it is important for us to also be allowed to shape some of the discussion. Ting called for a vote to support the idea of having a university-wide summit. A vote yielded almost unanimous favor, although 1 abstention was noted.

Ting said we voted no to the call from UIUC senate but supported the idea of a university-wide summit. Fisher suggested framing our response around the need for establishing general
university wide priorities relative to financial sustainability. Schuldt agreed and suggested using Chairman Kennedy’s language, “about the future of the university” which can then include Fisher’s ideas.

Helton highlighted the importance of including conditions of group formation. For example, Helton said that three representatives from each campus, equally distributed, is critical.

Garmil asked if we need to formulate our own bullet points. Kline asked if a general statement about creating a group with equal delegates and details to be agreed upon later may be a good strategy. Martin said that he is taking close notes. Ting asserted that she need to send a response to USC Chair Wheeler for the written record. Schuldt said that he appreciated the point made earlier about their lack of identification of staff in the call by UIUC senate. Inclusion of APs and Civil Service is important. Wassenberg suggested requesting a summit on the future of the university with concerns for sustainability, rather than focusing on bullet points at this time. The summit will have an agree-upon the agenda. Ting liked Wassenberg’s idea. Sheridan asked if Ting would copy the Chair of the UIC senate. Ting said that this will go to the USC Chair, who will then distribute the document to the other campus senates.

Bussell wondered what the consequence of this will be for us. Ting did not think there would be any consequence. The UIUC SEC brings resolutions and statements to the senate which then comes to us. Ting said that we could do the same thing to them if we want. Switzer said that maybe there will be negative consequences, but a positive consequence will be that we are portraying our senate in positive light.

Ting asked the senate what everyone thinks about having our own resolution. Bussell supported the idea. Martin stated that it is worth noting that the BOT and administration has tried to stay out of the discussion as they understand the importance in not seeming to favor one campus over another. Ting asked if the senate would be comfortable having Martin and the SEC vet the letter so that it does not have to come back to the entire senate. She said that she would make the final copy available. Wassenberg moved to accept and Schuldt seconded the motion.

Old Business

None.

New Business

Resolution 41-1 Modification of Faculty Awards Process [1st reading]

Kline motioned to discuss Resolution 41-1. Helton seconded the motion. Anthony said that the resolution is fairly straightforward and seeks to align policy and practice. Currently, policy explicitly prohibits self nomination for awards; however, one does allow. No questions emerged.

Resolution 41-2 Resolution to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies in the College of Public Affairs and Administration [1st reading]

Helton motioned to discuss 41-2 and Ballard seconded the motion. Bapat asserted the importance of timing with this resolution. Fisher stated that this will be a great addition to our curriculum and applauded the interdisciplinary focus. Martin expressed appreciation for the inclusion of the resources information.
Resolution 41-3 Suspension of the Academic Politics Concentration and the Practical Politics Concentration in the Political Science Master’s Degree [1st reading]

Helton moved to discuss 41-3. Martin seconded the motion. Martin asked for clarification about what suspension means. LaFollette stated that this suggestion came from the Registrar. Rather than formulate the resolution around the notion of elimination, suspension allows continuation of the codes to allow for completion of students already in the system. Additionally, if the department later decides to retrieve the concentration they will be able to do so. Martin clarified that suspension means no new students. LaFollette agreed. Ting asked Pierceson if students have to apply according to concentration beginning in Fall 2012. Pierceson said that students have one core, not concentrations; concentrations are for advising purposes. Ting also asked if that means students can graduate without having to take a certain number of courses from any particular concentration. Pierceson said yes.

Resolution 41-4 Creation of the Graduate Certificate in Practical Politics [1st reading]

Garmil moved to discuss 41-4 and Kline seconded the motion. Ting noted that this accompanies the previous resolution. No questions or comments emerged.

Resolution 41-5 Graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Systems in the Department of Environmental Studies [1st reading]

Villegas motioned to discuss 41-5. Kline seconded the motion. Fisher said that she is glad to see this addition too and believes it will be of interest to people in a variety of fields. Martin asked about the memo from Graduate Council. Ting stated that Graduate Council did not submit a memo. LaFollette stated that the GC did not have any concerns about the proposal and noted the time sensitive nature of the proposal. Fisher noted that the application of GIS are so interdisciplinary that it will be important that ENS reach out to other departments like Business and Management, Political Science, and Biology.

Resolution 41-6 Graduate Closure Guidelines (Replace UA Bill 20-3) [1st reading]

Fisher motioned to discuss resolution 41-6. Switzer seconded the motion. Ting asked LaFollette if the document was drafted by the council. LaFollette said that they began by surveying departments and then created the document. Ting noted the interchangeable use of capstone and closure course throughout the document. LaFollette suggested that capstone typically refers to undergraduate experiences, whereas closure is typically reserved for master’s work. Ting suggested using uniform language. Sisneros stated that he thought that capstone was one method of the closure requirement. Referring to lines 38-40, Ting read, “Academic programs may select from five closure options: master’s thesis, graduate project, creative/artistic project, capstone course, or comprehensive exam.” She then said that on line 62-75, three options are given including (1) thesis, project, or creative/artistic work; (2) comprehensive exam; and (3) closure course. She said that she is simply asking for consistency.

Referring to lines 44 and 45, “All closure exercises must include a written component, prepared in accordance with the effective formatting and style guidelines of the Office of Graduate Studies,” Ting asked where the guidelines can be found. LaFollette asserted that this will be part of the new graduate student handbook that should be ready for Fall 2012. Ting asked if it is important to specify the terminal degree in the language of lines 100-103 which read, “In consultation with the closure advisor, students may request an additional committee member from outside the university representing disciplinary expertise important to advising the student on the closure option.”
LaFollette said that this was discussed, but that site supervisors may or may not have a terminal degree.

Kline asked who the request goes to? LaFollett was not sure. Kline suggested specifying in the policy so that it might be vetted for appropriateness. Helton stated that the advisor is the person who is doing the vetting. Garmil asked who approves the committee overall? Sheridan suggested adding “in consultation and with approval from the closure advisor.” Fisher pointed to line 96. Helton said that in CLAS, the department creates the faculty advisor. The Dean’s rep. is added to that and the Dean will sign the form. Wassenberg stated that in her college she will sign documentation ensuring that the outside person is qualified. Ting noted a variation in the implementation.

Boltuc argued against over-regulating the process. Bussell asked if there is any kind of a timeline or protocol issues for having the process go forward from proposal to completion. LaFollette suggested that it is typically dependent upon the timeliness dictated by the student’s movement. Bussell offered that sometimes it is because of faculty non-responsiveness. Helton reminded senators that this policy is for all closure processes. Zhang stated that his department has a timeline in their student handbook and the program level is the appropriate place to have such information. Ting also said that there is no way to sanction. What is really important, according to Ting, is the expectation of criteria and document inclusions for the closure. Kline said that 6 year rule is already in place.

Resolution 41-7 Applications from EHEA 3-year Undergraduate Degrees Will Be Reviewed Using the Bologna Framework [1st reading]

Garmil motioned to discuss resolution 41-7. Kline seconded the motion. LaFollette noted that historically, we require 4 year degrees. This resolution comes from the increased recognition by the European Union that 3 year degrees can be an adequate educational experience. Our first application has come to the university. The GC has been investigating the issue. Giordano stated that 46 European countries are regarding these educational experiences as equivalent to the standard 4 year bachelor degree.

Martin asked if the 3 year degree is still a B.A. or a B.S.; Giordano said that it is. The second cycle is a master’s degree which takes approximately 2 years and a third cycle for a doctorate. Giordano specified that the difference is that these are 90 semester credit hours. LaFollette noted that there are 3 year degrees that do not apply the Bologna Framework that we wouldn’t accept. For example, Nepal has a 3 year degree that would not meet our requirements.

Kline stated that in Hungary, a 5 year undergraduate degree was equivalent to a bachelor’s and master’s degree. He asserted that this has been in the works for a while. Ruez asked what the implications are for reaccreditation. Giordano asserted that as long as we accept, it’s fine. Ruez then asked students about the fairness of this for them. Wilson said it would be fine if everyone is receiving the same amount of education. Ruez noted that this would not be the case. Giordano noted the importance of the learning outcomes. Ting also said that it would be up to the department to decide whether to accept or not. LaFollette said that this is a screening mechanism, not usurping departmental authority.
Wassenberg said that this has been largely discussed and is an effort to move away from credit-based assessment to competency based focus. Boltuc argued that a student who takes 90 hours does not get as much as a student who takes 120 credit-hours. He asked if it is fair to our students. Furthermore, he urged caution in creating catalog language. He did express support for recruitment of international students.

LaFollette stated that is already implied. She will clarify and be prepared to address the suggestion at the next reading. Fisher noted that many of the 3 year, 90 credit-hour degrees are predicated upon a high school system that has an additional year. Kline noted that the Carnegie unity is based upon a person in a seat and suggested that we reflect upon this. Li said that is very difficult to assess and asked how we will be able to control? Giordano reiterated that the students will have a Bologna compliant degree and many schools who have been approved. Garmil noted that education is happening differently in different systems.

Resolution 41-8 Minimum Requirements for Accepting Undergraduate Degrees Granted from Degree Consolidating Institutions [1st reading]

Helton motioned to discuss resolution 41-8 and Villegas seconded the motion. LaFollette asserted that this policy is coming as part of an effort to specify the requirements for granting a degree. Villegas asked for clarification of the term. LaFollette stated that the last institution is considered the degree-consolidating institution. Giordano stated that this takes residency and the transferable credit hours that can be allowed. LaFollette asserted that some institutions will give credit for work experiences and prior learning.

Garmil raised a concern regarding the second bullet point. He believed that it may be too high. LaFollette said that the GC looked at the standards nationwide which typically require between 45-60 credit hours. We are suggesting a 30 credit hour minimum and would be undercutting what most institutions require. Garmil suggested turning the “must” into “normally” to allow some flexibility. Kline pointed to line 29. He asked if we are being overly narrow. Giordano said that there are some religious schools that we accept and some that we don’t. We always say regionally accredited.

Ting, commenting on Garmil’s concerns, stated that it is important to specify residency requirements. While we want to cast a wide net, we also want to accept students who will have the potential to succeed and must meet a certain standard. If they cannot establish 30 credit hours, what might say something about the student. Case Pease talked about military spouses possibly being the exception. Ting asked how difficult it is to take hours from the same institution. Martin noted the importance of understanding why UIS specifically has this residency requirement. We want students to have invested time here. Giordano agreed and argued that we are not a diploma mill.

Garmil said that the two bullet points satisfy this. Pardie encouraged senators to think about what you say when we say we offer a major in a program. Programs are designed with integrity across the curriculum. She asked how much of the integrity would be lost without the minimum requirements.
Resolution 41-9 Undergraduate or Graduate Degree from an Accredited Institution is a Minimum Requirement for Admissions to Graduate Degrees at UIS [1st reading]

Garmil motioned to discuss 41-9. Sheridan seconded the motion. LaFollette stated that this too came from the Admissions Office. Boltuc strongly supported this resolution. Giordano stated that she has some concerns regarding this resolution. She believed that this may open some loop holes for students to come through the back door. Ting stated that if we are going to have the intercampus articulation dialogue with UIUC. They will scrutinize heavily this kind of policy. Boltuc asked Giordano what might be considered the appropriate number of hours. Giordano said that she believes that this is important for faculty to decide, but wants to make sure that we are admitting students who will be successful. Helton stated that this is an initial screening. The departments may make very different decisions. Giordano suggested that departments might not know that the school was unaccredited. Helton asserted that importance of balance between getting people in and not seeing them at all. Ting said that this will come back for a second reading at the next meeting.

Adjournment

Sheridan motioned to adjourn the meeting. Martin seconded the motion.