MINUTES
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2011-2012
FRIDAY, December 2, 2011
10:00 A.M. – 12: P.M.
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “H”


Senators Absent: K. Sheridan, G. Simo, A. Sisneros, J. Tienken

Ex-Officio: Karen Moranski for Lynn Pardie

Guests: Len Bogle, Deborah Anthony, Cecilia Cornell, Hilary Frost Kumpf, Kate Richardson, Evan Stanley

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

Approval of the Minutes
A motion to approve the minutes from the November 18, 2011 Senate meeting was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by R. Garmil. The following corrections to the November 18, 2011 minutes were requested. L. Fisher requested a correction to the spelling of the name Vicki Megginson, which appeared as “Magnusson” in the Chair Report in the November 18, 2011 minutes. E. Wilson indicated that Shonda White was present at the November 18, 2011 Senate meeting, but her name did not appear under “Senators Present”. D. Ballard was listed as absent, but Shonda White was his alternate. L. Fisher requested clarification to lines 40 through 47 to indicate that Resolution 41-21 was tabled because Senators were not provided with a copy of the revised resolution. T. Ting clarified that it was tabled because the Senators wanted to see the amendments made to the Resolution and brought back after it was amended, rather than moving for a friendly amendment to the resolution that was being considered at the November 18 Senate meeting. A motion to append the minutes was not made. A motion to approve the minutes carried unanimously

Announcements
Parliamentarian Switzer is absent as she is serving as the BOT faculty observer on behalf of the USC. Secretary Sheridan will be running late due to grant problems.

Reports
Chair- T. Ting

T. Ting reminded senators that the University Climate Survey will be closed today at midnight.

J. Villegas was unsure of the closing time and advised Senators to complete it as soon as possible.
T. Ting reported that faculty/staff completion rate of the climate survey is around 26%, and student completion rate is around 7%. This positions UIS’ response rate “in the ball park” of the University-wide response rate average. The UIS faculty/staff response rate was approximately 4% higher, on average, compared to the other two campuses.

L. Fisher brought forth a concern regarding the climate survey. Specifically, the items in the second half of the survey requested information about individual faculty members, which for many participants could equate to identifiable information.

J. Villegas responded that the climate survey committee discussed this potential issue and he clarified that the data would never be analyzed in such a way that individual participants could be identified. There will be a committee specifically focused on how to approach data analysis, and that data will be presented at the aggregate level by department or even at the college level as indicated by the number of faculty members in any given department.

T. Ting reported on the ACCESS Illinois initiative, which the UIS Campus Senate is involved with. Vicki Megginson wished to convey that it is both a pleasure and an honor to assist the campus Senate with the initiative. She will add her check to kick off this initiative. At this point, they are working on the website specifically for the campus Senate's account so people can make contributions. They are also going to update the gift card so that there is a QR code on it. The formal kickoff of this mini campaign will occur in January. There will be a letter from the campus Senate to the campus community regarding this initiative. The draft will come from the SEC and presented to the Senate for feedback.

T. Ting thanked Sen. Ruez for following the IBHE agenda and for reading the IBHE materials regularly. IBHE is approving Governors State University to start offering lower division programs and admitting undergraduate students beginning in 2014. Governors State has a similar history as Sangamon State. T. Ting posed the question, “What does that mean for us?”

K. Moranski replied that we don't know yet. It probably does not mean a whole lot. The folks they serve are largely going to be Chicago's students who want to stay in Chicago. They are largely educating place-bound people, even though their population has largely been transfer students. When they pick up freshman, they are going to pick up students who are not interested in going down to the Prairie to attend college. One of the things we hear from our freshman parents from Chicago, is that they're looking for a place out of the city. They're looking for a quieter, smaller environment. K. Moranski believes it will have little impact on UIS.

T. Ting is concerned that Gov. State is cheaper and that that will make them competitive.

J. Martin asked if we know whether they will be open enrollment or if they will have in admissions system like us?

T. Ting replied that we don't know yet. She believes it is even more important that UIS is well-positioned in the enrollment management report because we do not have the same resources for marketing as the other two campuses. University wide collaboration and facilitation is important because Governors State could be competition in that market. T. Ting reported that she recently learned that Urbana has hired three recruiters to specifically recruit in California. UIC specifically has recruiters working in New Orleans and in the South. It is her personal view, that if we could have the kinds of recruiters for all three campuses that would be beneficial because we don't have the resources.

R. Garmil commented that we also have to include online recruiting.
T. Ting apologized to senators for not having the draft enrollment management report today as promised to the Senate and SEC. She wanted to receive feedback prior to forwarding to President Hogan. She hopes that the Senators would allow her to send this via e-mail in order to receive feedback.

P. Wassenburg indicated that everyone was nodding.

T. Ting reported that the UIS resolution regarding leadership rotation at USC is being taken up by the UIUC and UIC senates. It had its first reading by Chicago campus Senate yesterday. It will have its first reading by the Urbana Senate by next Monday. Their SEC's and respective statutes committees recommended a vote of “No”, to go against our resolution. Additional discussion is invited at a later point in time.

**Provost – K. Moranski for L. Pardie**

K. Moranski reported that the BOT is on campus today. Dr. Schroeder reported on the online presence at UIS which was very well received. He also talked about the national perspective regarding online education. It is worth noting that WCIA did a 5 min. spot on UIS’ online learning, saying “online learning's finest is here in Illinois”. The article is available on their website. We are looking forward to Ray’s appointment today as the associate vice chancellor for online learning by the BOT.

W. Kline asked if the position of Associate Vice Chancellor for online learning is a permanent office.

K. Moranski indicated that she believed it would be, as it is a prominent piece of our educational puzzle. To have representation and the Provost's office for online learning is important.

T. Ting indicated that she believed that to be the case as well and that someday Ray will retire and that the desire to maintain our competitive edge will remain. This position elevates the importance of online education. The position is a cabinet position under the Provost's office.

**Student Government Association - E. Wilson**

E. Wilson reported that the SGA co-hosted an event, *Chocolate with the Chancellor* this past Wednesday. There was a good turnout (about 50 students) and a wide variety of questions and comments.

She has also heard back from the Illinois Student Senate (ISS) President, Dave Pileski about setting up a student conference to the USC. They're looking at meeting the week prior to winter break.

E. Wilson reported good news regarding the IL MAP grant which has been funded for the remainder of the academic year.

W. Kline asked, for the benefit of Senators going up for tenure, what is Chancellor Koch’s favorite chocolate?

E. Wilson reported that she likes the hot chocolate and the brownies.

**IBHE FAC Report - L. Bogle**

L. Bogle began his report by explaining that FAC stands for faculty advisory Council. The FAC meets with IBHE once a month except for July and August in Chicago. Its sole purpose is to influence IBHE policy which impacts us as well as to explain to senators why it is that some of the things they would like to do aren't very smart. L. Bogle invited senators to think about volunteering as an alternate which
typically would require attending 1 to 2 meetings a year. It is interesting to see the inner workings of this
group.

L. Bogle indicated that the handouts provided to the Senate were regarding Performance Based Funding.
The handouts indicated some of the measures that the Illinois State Board of Education is considering.
ISBE has experienced dramatic staffing cuts, and there is question as to who will pick up the work of
performance based funding. The current best estimate is a 1 to 2% reduction in funding if performance-
based standards are not met. L. Bogle then explained the, “60 by 25” language, which means Illinois has
set a goal indicating 60% of Illinois residents will have some kind of post secondary certificate or degree
by 2025. Right now, only 41% of citizens have some type of certificate or degree. L. Bogle indicated that
a 19% increase by 2025 is challenging at best. The P-20 initiative is a goal to track every preschool
student until the age of 20 to see how they're doing. This relates to the common core standards, which are
national standards, to hold every child to the same standards. The common core standards and P-20 are
grounded towards increasing standards which is good for colleges and universities in terms of admitting
well-prepared students. L. Bogle also reported that the majority of MAP grant monies are being used for
remedial-level (below the 100 level) courses. This means that MAP monies are not going towards college
credits. In short, the ISBE has a number of good intentions and ideas that are not going to work. The
IBHE puts forth documents which suggest things that will work. In the Performance Based Language
wording, quality is not addressed, transfers are not addressed and affordability is not addressed. The FAC
is doing its best to navigate these complicated issues.

W. Kline commented that he would like to note that the Senate is not in unanimous agreement that some
of the core standards presented in the handouts great. For example, one standard reads, “the common core
State standards provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn so
teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them”. W. Kline finds that patronizing to parents
as most parents do not refer to the state standards in deciding how to help their children. At the same time,
it is aggrandizing to the committee which seems to say, we have now enabled you to help your child. W.
Kline commented that there are other horrible things about the common core State standards, including
the assumption that diversity and experimentation is not a good thing. The P-20 tracking implies that the
Social Security number will not be used to track a child's educational history, rather than solely for the
purposes of Social Security.

Additional discussion revolved around Senators’ opinions regarding the macro and micro level influences
government intrusion into the educational practices of Illinois colleges and universities.

Levels of Governance Approval Table on Curricular Matters

T. Ting reported that this came back from last Senate meeting and reflects feedback from senators. K.
Moranski’s office made the adjustments to clarify items 18, 27, and 36. Item 27 is only applicable to
CBM, and reflects how that college has been handling cross-department courses. Changes to the cross
listing of courses in CBM are handled at the department level. Item numbers 18 & 16 will need also to be
reflected in the course catalog or website, in addition to departmental approval.

K. Moranski commented that for item 18, this will also include the college curriculum committee
approval. The college curriculum committee in CBM requires approval of any change to a syllabus or to a
course.

T. Ting reminded senators that this chart is a “living” document including a year pilot testing. Following
Senate endorsement the table will be made available on a website.

Y. Zhang commented that it makes sense to have a timestamp on the document.
W. Kline was thankful for an extra week to look at this document. He suggested that the endorsement before one year and then, at the end of the year, we look at this again. He would also like to see that items presented for endorsement go through appropriate channels. He remembers looking at this document as part of graduate Council, and thinking this was a healthy aspect of shared governance. This time it seemed that it just appeared without going through councils.

T. Ting clarified that the Provost's office received feedback from several councils following the pilot year including, graduate Council, undergraduate Council, the Dean's Council, and also from departments.

W. Kline clarified that cross-council collaboration would be very helpful. He feels that the Senate having the opportunity to remain active in the ongoing development of this document is important.

T. Ting clarified that the process involved in the development of the governance table involves the undergraduate and graduate Council chairs. The understanding is that both the graduate and undergraduate Council can bring forth concerns, and the Senate can discuss the issues.

L. Fisher commented that she agrees with W. Kline and that this is something that the Senate specifically has to make decisions about which committee review what because that’s the academic policy part of it. At the right end of the document, it goes more into the administrative end of things. It is appropriate that the councils have been asked about this and that the Senate has the opportunity to review the document at the end of the year. She commented that this process did involve expanding what we do by systemizing across colleges, for example. Taking the idea of changes to courses and making it related to faculty do. In that way it affects our curricular work.

J. Martin commented that the document does not affect our curricular work. The rules that are summarized by this document affect our curricular work. If there’s an issue, it’s the rules we should be looking at, not this document. This document might help us highlight issues.

L. Fisher replied that the finer point is that it’s not actually written down anywhere but here, which committees have to approve certain things.

T. Ting commented that we have had this governance table for years. Never once has the GC, UGC, or Senate asked about it. T. Ting asked for a review of the governance table because there was no systematic approach to how colleges were making these decisions.

R. Garmil commented that was only one line addressing all minors in the first draft. This second document does a better job of distinguishing between types of minor. He recommends that future reviews of the governance table include descriptions of what is being changed.

K. Moranski commented that the current document reflects current campus policies as well as IBHE and U of I policies. The committee working on this table also compared the governance table to the other two U of I campuses. So our policies in the chart are now consistent. UIS created the chart, which was borrowed by the other two campuses. In the future it may be that the SEC could periodically check to see if there are changes to the table to bring forth for Senate discussion. The changes in policy should drive changes to the document.

W. Kline commented that a review of the governance table in one year would allow for constituents to have input and to communicate any concerns that they have.
T. Helton commented that she is in favor of reducing bureaucracy. There is enough structure in place such that constituents could go to UGC or GC if there are issues. The Senate does not need to get involved in overseeing this table. It has been brought forth now because it is the end of the pilot year. Perhaps the Senate could review it in five years.

T. Ting asked for a vote of senators to formally endorse the governance table. The endorsement carried with one “no” vote.

Old Business

Resolution 41-21 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 5, 6, & 7 -- Clarification of Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Application Procedures [2nd reading]

A motion to consider Resolution 41-21 was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by T. Helton. No discussion was presented. The motion carried with unanimous support.

Resolution 41-23 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 2 -- Modifications in Personnel Review Procedures [2nd reading]

A motion to consider Resolution 41-23 was made by S. Miller and was seconded by R. Garmil.

J. Martin indicated a Point of Order. This resolution had been tabled and needs to be removed from the table in order to be considered. A motion to remove Resolution 41-23 from the table was made by W. Kline and was seconded by P. Wassenberg. The motion carried with one “no” vote.

A motion to consider Resolution 41-24 was made by D. Ballard and was seconded by D. Bussell.

W. Kline asked his fellow Senators to indicate specifically the number of people with whom senators have spoken and who do not support this resolution. W. Kline indicated that he knows of only four people, who have communicated to him via e-mail and not come to speak with him personally.

J. Villegas indicated an approximate number of six people from his college.

J. Martin indicated six or seven people from his building.

T. Helton reported one additional person beyond the emails (which were circulated).

Y. Zhang and X. Li reported several people.

R. Garmil reported 8 or 9 against and the only pros were at this (the senate) table.

J. Case-Pease reported 3 against, and 0 in support.

K. Jamison reported 2 who said no first hand knowledge documentation.

K. Moranski, speaking for L. Pardie, L. Pardie asked her to communicate that she felt that T. Helton made a clear argument that there’s no way to get rid of first-hand knowledge, that the resolution represented a “middle way” to make direct knowledge transparent that the departmental level. L. Pardie’s concern is in regards to this moving from one extreme to the other and to completely deny direct knowledge or to accept it completely without circumscription is not effective to personnel policy. She wanted us to be
reminded that we have a very robust process for personnel with multiple avenues for feedback. She would hope that we would not continue to accept the status quo, which is so open to competing interpretations.

D. Bussell asked if the Provost seems to be saying that she favors this modification.

K. Moranski replied, “Yes.”

C. Hoelscher commented that he is still undecided about this resolution but believes something should be done. Part of the discussion has been focused on whether or not there are alternatives. He wondered if senators wanted to discuss alternatives.

L. Fisher commented that she appreciated the changes in red that have to do with the clarification in the committee's responsibilities in terms of documenting its discussion. The attempts to deal with this issue have been an attempt to deal with two different problems. First, inconsistencies in the interpretation of documentation in the personnel file. The other, committees don't always write a letter that says what was talked about. There was some discussion about the need for policy that points to best practices. The current text does that. She is still on the fence too about the issue of direct first-hand knowledge, but also did not want to see the resolution asking departments to have a discussion about direct first-hand knowledge.

D. Bussell commented that it might be possible to consider this resolution by getting rid of the “first person” language and just make the resolution about proper documentation. That seems to be with the Provost is indicating as well. Can we make an amendment to make this change?

T. Ting agreed that a shift away from firsthand knowledge needs to be made and should instead focus on documentation either prior to deliberations or the letter that is generated afterwards.

D. Bussell commented that she is somewhat wary about the prior discussion regarding the number of persons against it who have contacted Senators. She questions how many of those people have read the resolution.

R. Garmil commented that the issues of documentation and the content of the discussion are two separate issues. He agrees that documentation is important. The question remains, should faculty members have the right to know the content of the basis of the personnel decision? In his opinion, they should. Faculty members should know when something negative is put into their file. They should have that knowledge before the discussion is held.

W. Kline suggested, due to the importance of the issues and the deep divisions surrounding them, that the Senate issue a direct plebiscite saying this has to be clarified- choice A) change nothing, choice b) direct firsthand knowledge, then submit it to the faculty to vote on it. Ten, what we do as a senate is to approve the plebiscite and then send it to the faculty.

T. Ting questioned this approach, saying many people have not been a part of the deliberative process and the vote could so easily be influenced by lack of understanding of the big picture.

P. Boltuc commented that this draft is close to what we want. The problem is that the resolution is trying to do 2 different things.

J. Martin agreed with P. Boltuc and added that the personnel process is not an objective process and we can't treat it as such.
P. Salela thanked P. Boltuc for his comments, which she agreed with. She commented that you can't predict the process of discovery and you also can't legislate ethics which is one thing that this resolution is trying to do. The greater concern is documenting wire decision was made and what it was based on.

C. Hoelscher agreed with these comments, it he suggested saying not formalizing whether or not first-hand direct knowledge should be part of the process. Rather, documenting comments made by persons in the committee. The resolution could distinguish between significant direct knowledge and lesser direct knowledge.

D. Bussell emphasized that due to the fact that we have junior faculty involved in this process, not documenting something means that due diligence has not occurred. This ignores completely the power dynamics that occurs in many departments particularly if they are smaller. She supports looking at transparency, but we have to clarify that transparency includes the decision-making process on the contents of letters. The current policy is an adequate. It has been disastrous in some cases and causes a great deal of stress. There is a clear mandate to address the problematic part of this.

D. Anthony reported that direct first-hand knowledge and documentation are related. What’s happening, people have the sense that they’re not supposed to talk about certain things but they do and because of that they don't document it. This resolution attempts to address the transparency issue by saying that it must be documented when it is brought up.

T. Ting called for the vote. In the event that the resolution fails, we are in essence asking PPC to address these issues by bringing forth another resolution. She asked Senators to please provide input to PPC. The motion was defeated with 5 “yes” votes, 14 “no” votes, and 5 abstentions (R. Bouray, S. Miller, E. Wilson, P. Wassenberg, and P. Boltuc).

Resolution 41-24 Modification to Academic Integrity Policy - Sections III & V [2nd reading]

A motion to consider Resolution 41-24 was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by S. Miller.

T. Ting introduced Hilary Frost Kumpf from AIC and pointed out amendments to the resolution from the 1st reading.

W. Kline suggested that there is some precedence for not spelling out all of the policies that have to be followed by committees. Rather, the Senate has entrusted that to the councils with approvals by the Senate. He indicated that bureaucracy would slow down the process of change required by the AIC in the future. He supports the initial resolution to remove the policies from the Senate bill and put that into the Council, but does not support the addition of procedures as indicated in lines 15-9.

R. Garmil asked a question regarding the first section of the new language where it talks about the unit had asking faculty to verify whether or not it was a first offense (lines 21-22). Will the Provost's office still keep track of these offenses?

T. Ting clarified, “Yes”.

L. Fisher asked for some background regarding the issues that the AIC is experiencing.

Hilary Frost Kumpf indicated that timing is the most common issue. The process of moving through the AI process is time consuming, especially related to waiting for student and faculty response. The point would be to get issues resolved in a timely fashion. Another issue is related to the time commitment for faculty involved in hearings.
T. Ting clarified that the problem has been that the AIC needs to be able to be responsive to complex situations. In order for the AIC to change procedures in the AI policy, the process of bringing resolution each time for any change has hampered the AIC committee’s ability to respond in a timely fashion. There also needs to be language in the procedures of the AIC to protect students’ rights to due process. At this point, the AIC is asking for the flexibility to modify the procedures of the AIC without coming to the Senate.

W. Kline indicated that given the spirit of the 1st draft of the resolution which was to remove procedures from the policy, he would like to propose that we vote on removing that language so we can vote on the original. W. Kline moved to strike the inserted text in red in the current resolution which reflected changes made to the document since the 1st reading. The motion was seconded by T. Helton. A friendly amendment was made to keep the lines 16-9. The motion was defeated with 7 “yes” votes, 11 “no” votes, and 4 abstentions (P. Salela, S. Miller, J. Case-Pease, & P. Boltuc)

The resolution passed with 2 “no” votes and 1 abstention (D. Ballard).

New Business

Resolution 41-25 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 2 & 13 -- Modification of Post-Tenure Review Committee Selection Procedures [1st reading]

A motion to consider Resolution 41-25 was made by D. Ballard and was seconded by E. Wilson.

D. Anthony introduced the resolution by indicating that existing language in policy does not accurately reflect who is involved in making decisions regarding the makeup of the post tenure review committee. Existing language within the faculty personnel policy places selection of Post-Tenure Review Committee members within the purview of the Campus Sabbatical and Awards Committee. This resolution aims to separate the appointment of members of the CSAC and Post-Tenure Review Committee.

No questions were presented.

A motion was made by S. Miller to extend the senate meeting an additional 15 minutes. The motion was seconded by (ui). The motion carried with 1 “No” vote.

Proposed Revisions to the Statutes, Article X, Section 2 --Academic Freedom (USC ST-72)

Discussion

T. Ting introduced the amendment to the USC statutes by explaining that there are some concerns raised amongst the Senates at the other campuses that the amended language is too broad. First, the amended language, read by T. Ting, drastically broadens the scope of academic freedom. Secondly, there is question as to why the Urbana Senate seemed to single out the international members of the academic staff, by saying that they should also enjoy the same freedoms. Third, there is an issue between academic staff and faculty. Specifically the existing statutes only talk about faculty and the Urbana Senate changed “faculty” to “all academic staff”. The definitions of these two terms are different in the statutes. T. Ting clarified that the UIS Senate is being asked to respond to the resolution regarding the amendments.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by R. Garmil and was seconded by everyone, but specifically W. Kline. The motion carried with unanimous support and the meeting was adjourned at 12:14 p.m.