MINUTES
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2010/2011
FRIDAY, May 6, 2011
10:00 A.M. – 1:00 P.M.
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “G”


Senator Absent: A. Sisneros.

Ex-Officio: L. Pardie


Approval of the Agenda
The meeting was called to order by Ting at 10:02 A.M. She asked for approval to add Resolution 41-10 to the agenda. Sheridan moved to add 41-10 and Martin seconded the motion.

Nominations for Chair
Wilson made a motion to open the chair nominations. Kline seconded the motion. Ting stated that she had been nominated for the chair position and called for other nominations. Boltuc made a motion to close nominations. Kline seconded the motion.

Election for Chair
Ballots and pencils were distributed to senators. Helton, as parliamentarian was asked to assist in the counting of the ballots. Ballots were collected and counted. The vote was: 25 affirmative votes, 0 nay votes, and 1 abstention. Ting was re-elected as senate chair.

Nominations for Vice-Chair
Sheridan made a motion to open the vice-chair nominations. Kline seconded the motion. Ting stated that Martin had been nominated and called for other nominations. Boltuc made a motion to close nominations. Fisher seconded the motion.

Election for Vice-Chair
Ballots and pencils were distributed to senators. Helton, as parliamentarian was asked to assist in the counting of the ballots. Ballots were collected and counted. The vote was: 25 affirmative votes, 0 nay votes, and 1 abstention. Martin was elected as vice-chair.

Nominations for USC Representative
Ballard made a motion to open the USC representative nominations. Kline seconded the motion. Ting stated that Switzer had been nominated and called for other nominations. Boltuc made a motion to close nominations. Fisher seconded the motion.

**Election for USC Representative**

Ballots and pencils were distributed to senators. Helton, as parliamentarian was asked to assist in the counting of the ballots. Ballots were collected and counted. The vote was: 25 affirmative votes, 0 nay votes, and 1 abstention. Switzer was elected as the USC representative.

**Approval of Minutes from Meetings of April 22, 2011**

Mulvey moved to approve the minutes from April 22, 2011, and Sheridan seconded the motion. The minutes from the 2010-2011 senate were discussed first. Martin asked that ARR be inserted on line 286 to clarify which subcommittee was being discussed. Fisher stated that Boltuc’s name had been incorrectly spelled on line 141.

Ting asked for corrections, modifications, and deletions for the second set of minutes from April 22, 2011. Boltuc asked that Thompson go back and listen to the recording and clarify his comments on lines 325-328. Fisher asserted that the word rebel should be changed to rabble on line 141. Garmil asked that EXS-L be corrected on line 28. Schuldt asked if it was appropriate for a non-senator to submit corrections. Giordano had some modifications to her comments on line 306. She asked that the word “now” be inserted before awarding and on line 335 emphasis on the Bologna compliant schools having approval was needed. Lastly, Giordano asked that line 362 read “schools that do not have a residency requirement are considered to be diploma mills.” Schoo corrected the spelling of her name on line 29.

Helton asked that the “that” in line 330 be clarified. Ting said that Thompson will go back to the tape. On line 357, the sentence needs to be reworded for clarification and the word to replace the word “of” on line 380. Garmil asked Thompson to listen to the tape for clarification of line 336. Helton also requested that the word “motioned” be changed to “moved” throughout the document. All were in favor of accepting the minutes with the proposed changes, corrections, and modifications.

**Reports**

**Chair**

Ting thanked everyone for their support and confidence in her work as senate chair. Speaking from her perspective, Ting said that she holds a belief that no one person should chair the senate or a senate standing committee for that matter for more than three years in a row. That said, Ting noted that she will chair the senate for a third year and does not wish to continue in the role after that time. However, Ting made clear that she will not be a lame duck chair and has very high standards and expectation for the work she does as chair of the campus senate and of the people she gets to work with. She looks forward to a very productive year.

**Provost – L. Pardie**

Pardie stated she would be happy to answer questions from the senators if there is any, but believed it in the best interest of time to move forward with the agenda. Ting informed senators that Interim Chancellor Berman would be present later in the meeting to talk about marketing and the IAC report.
Student Government Association – E. Wilson

Wilson reported that the first SGA meeting was May 1, 2011. At that time, Ballard was confirmed as external vice president. Also, the parliamentarian, secretary, and treasurer appointments were confirmed. SGA will be working toward increased communication between organizations in the upcoming year. They will also create an ad-hoc committee for programming and work on the Stars award program. Ting reminded Wilson that each senate standing committee has student representation for which the SGA is responsible for filling. She asked that Wilson visit the senate website to review membership and identify vacancies. Wilson reported that a couple of appointments had already been reaffirmed and she plans to finish appointments in the fall unless needed sooner.

Academic Technology Committee Annual Report – C. Lee

Ting asked the senators if they had any questions about the report. Fisher thanked Lee for the report. She asked whether the law requires that universities proactively educate people about file sharing laws. Lee asserted that some courses teach computer or cyber space ethics. He suggested that the senate could ask the ATC to recommend that ITS conduct training workshops. Fisher said that as a faculty member, this is not something that she knows much about. She wondered where faculty and students might access information about illegal file sharing. Lee said the committee would discuss her suggestions in the next meeting. He also mentioned that this is very complicated and involves legal services.

Bussell shared concerns related to Item J, under the recommendations. She asserted that often in times of emergency, cell and Internet reception are lost. Land lines are much more stable and reliable in times of crises. She asked if it is wise to discontinue all land lines in the dormitories. Martin stated that all of the phones on campus run through the campus Internet. Bouray reported that the student lounges will still have phones. Garmil also believed that students should have multiple options, above and beyond their own cell phones in times of emergency.

Ting said that she appreciates that ATC pointed out that Blackboard is not the place to disseminate confidential material and is glad to see eDocs has the capacity for private setting. Furthermore, this is something that faculty and staff need to know. Kline asked how Blackboard is secure enough to satisfy FERPA, but not secure enough for job searches. Lee said that there are technical issues as well as staffing issues. Talking about the technical issue, Lee said that when someone is browsing, someone might be able to eaves-drop on the communication if the connection unsecured. Lee said that HTTP connections are not secure, but HTTPS connections (which is what eDocs provides) are secure. In regard to the staffing issue, Blackboard has more content materials and more people will have access. For these reasons, ATC recommends using eDocs for secure communication.

Boltuc argued that even some recruitment information can contain confidential information and we should not be accessing this information in unsecure ways. Ting gave the example of the Vice President and Chancellor Search process as a confidential process where it would not have been appropriate to use Blackboard. She said that personnel materials should only be shared through eDocs. Ting thanked Lee for the report.

Committee on Committees
Ting noted that she had skipped one item on the agenda which needed approval. Faculty representative from EHS was needed for CARR. Kline stated that James Klein, Assistant Professor of Human Development Counseling was nominated. Ting asked the senators to endorse Klein for the CARR committee. All were in favor.

Committee on Diversity, Equal Rights, Opportunity and Access Annual Report – R. Kurtz

Ting stated that Kurtz was present to answer questions about the ROAD committee. Martin noted that as he was looking through the report, it appears as if the committee is unfocused. He shared concerns relative to the future directions of ROAD. Kurtz agreed with Martin’s concerns. She asserted that when the committee was created, UIS did not have a Diversity Center, an LGBTQ director, etc. From Kurtz’s understanding, the committee began addressing issues that are now the responsibility of people in those positions. She stated that ROAD has morphed into an oversight committee without a clear charge of being an oversight committee. She reported that there has been a lot of pushback and frustration amongst committee members. Her biggest recommendation for next year is that the senate and other stakeholders including VCSA Barnett, and AEO Brown, meet to clarify the charge of the committee.

Kurtz went on to state that this is an important committee and should not be disbanded. She believes there is a need for the senate to take an interest in issues related to diversity. The one specific action she recommended was that the charge be clarified so members feel more supported. Boltuc asserted that this is a very important committee and thanked Kurtz for her work. Ting asked if Kurtz was the only member present. Villegas was present and was an unofficial committee member, but now is an official member.

Martin also asserted that this is an important committee and should not be disbanded. Ting said that the best recommendation from report is to revisit the bylaws and clarify the charge. Kline asked if Kurtz is happier with the diversity of the committee for next year. She said that she is satisfied. Ting pointed out that the ROAD committee composition depends on the volunteer pool. It was noted that there were no faculty of color on the 2010-2011 committee. Ting stated that this is a reflection of those who volunteered. Kurtz said that each committee should be worried about the diversity of the slate. Ting asked how diversity is being considered and defined. She argued that if we are only assessing by racial/ethnic diversity, then we do not have the ability on campus to ensure that kind of purposeful recruitment. She said that this is something that the SEC will discuss next year. Kurtz agreed and noted that we also do not want to overburden faculty who are from minority groups.

Fisher expressed understanding of the concerns raised. She also wanted to express appreciation for the thoughtfulness of the committee. Fisher said that it would be great for the ROAD committee to lead on providing education to the campus about important diversity issues. Kurtz said that ROAD had been working on an FAQ regarding the new civil union laws, but was not allowed to make this public, per a discussion with HR. Sheridan noted that the information can be found on the website and they recognize that the law does not pass until June 1, 2011, but people won’t be able to opt in until the next open period in May of 2012. Kurtz said that people must make the changes this month in order to receive coverage.
Ting noted that Shen, who had been working on this issue, has resigned from the committee. She asked who is going to continue to work on the topic of domestic partnerships. Kurtz is working and will be following up with HR. She will pass along the information to the senate.

Referring to the second report on recruitment and retention, Garmil stated that he understood that this is new. He said that it looks to be focused on hiring practices. He suggested that it is also important to examine the impact of our practices and policies on students. Kurtz asserted that her comments in the report were perhaps elliptical. She said the concern is a perceived resistance to having different sets of policies. She said that different blind policies are not adequate to challenge the status quo. ROAD hopes for example that affirmative action will be more strongly implemented.

Helton also asked about the second report and referred to page two which talked about the support. Discussing the CPBC report presented at the previous senate meeting, Helton noted that we have more support on the UIS campus for student affairs than other universities. She asked how ROAD might view this and said that the money might have to be diverted from other initiatives. She did not think it reasonable to increase the funding in this financial climate. Kurtz said that the examples in the report were meant as illustrations. She said that it would be useful to have money set aside for diversity speakers, rather than have to be sought after. Ting thanked Kurtz and asked if the report had been circulated to all of the ROAD committee members before coming to the senate. Kurtz said that it had.

Ting announced that Interim Chancellor Berman was present to report on the FY 12 budget planning and campus initiatives. She asked to move to his report and then to the IAC report so that Berman could answer any questions that senators have regarding either report.

**Chancellor Report – H. Berman**

Chancellor Berman greeted the senators. In reflecting on his attendance at campus senate for 15 years, Berman asserted that the senate is the center of the forward movement of the campus. He thanked senators for their work and leadership. Berman stated that he and Ting had exchanged emails regarding the contents of his report for the senate. He believed it was timely to review where we currently stand in FY 12 as a whole. At the end of last semester, Berman gave a midyear update. He stated that this report was an update to the update.

Berman said that it is an accomplishment to have received the CPBC report, which is an important part of the planning process. According to Berman, the existence of that report and the CPBC was the product of a reaccreditation review in 1997. Prior to this, UIS did not have a routine and broadly representative planning and budgeting input process. The team visitors understood that ultimately, budgeting decisions are made by the administration; however, they viewed the input process as best practice. We were put on notice and given 3 years to create and implement a structure. The team returned in 2001 and they were satisfied. Berman noted the importance of receiving feedback from outside people to sharpen processes.

Turning to the FY12 budget, Berman referred to June of last year. He noted that in creating the FY 11 budget, the university assumed a conservative stance. We did not count on an increase in enrollment because had we bet on that and it didn’t materialize, we would have been in trouble.
As things played out, in Fall 2010, we experienced a 4.3% increase in headcount and a 5% FTE increase over the previous fall. At that time, decisions were made to retain that money centrally. Currently, the same questions are being asked regarding enrollment expectations. Specifically, is this the new base for budgeting not just for next year but into the future? Berman said the inclination currently is to do so. Applications are not at the level that we would like for them to be at this time, nor are deposits for freshmen. We hope we don’t need to go backwards. That is the enrollment and tuition side of the equation.

Berman stated that another important piece of the budget is the State of Illinois, which is very precarious. Last fall, President Hogan mandated that each of the three campuses plan for a potential 15% reduction in state allocations. For UIS this is $3 million on a $46 million operating budget. Berman stated that the fate of state appropriation is still unknown. A difference between now and December is the Governor’s recommendation about flat funding. Berman was unsure where the money for flat funding would come from, but asserted that flat funding would be good for us. However, the prospect of flat funding for higher education goes up and down like the DOW average. Berman went on to say that this week, despite Quinn’s recommendation, the Democratic leadership on the senate side recommended a reduction in higher education funding. He said in order to be safe, we must expect some kind of reduction of state appropriations.

Continuing his report, Berman introduced the top budget priorities for FY 12. The number one priority is to prepare for a significant reduction of state appropriations. Berman said that this was not mentioned in the CPBC report. He recommended that in future years, the CPBC should include a section called budget context. This section might have spoken to the fact that the university is still in jeopardy of losing funding. Berman said that even last year, looking forward to July 1, 2011, recurring funds were set aside in anticipation. This puts us in a stronger position to absorb a reduction that otherwise might be very problematic.

The second priority, Berman said, is a general faculty and staff salary program for next year. This is the next highest priority for the administration. Therefore, he agreed with the CPBC’s recommendation. While it is still too early to determine the magnitude of the program, the principle is there. Berman asserted that if fall enrollments hold, we should be in a position to accommodate the first (budget reduction), second (general salary program), and third (strategic investments to recruit and retain students) priorities. The strategic investments are congruent with the ones in the CPBC report. Their number two priority was to strengthen student recruitment, retention, and student services. Berman noted that the CPBC’s third priority was to enhance educational quality.

Berman posited that the first priority is to get students in the door. In order to accomplish this task, strategic investments need to be made in the areas of marketing and admissions/marketing. Raising the enrollment level is the way to promote financial sustainability. Berman said the second tier of investments are in academic quality and student life. Berman gave the example of faculty positions in the College of Business and Management to ensure successful reaccreditation. Additionally, in order to be a leading public liberal arts university, investments in the performing arts are necessary. Also important from Berman’s perspective, is investment in athletics which he has previously discussed. Athletics is important for the profile of UIS,
attracting students, and enhancing student life. The third area that Berman discussed was enhancing instructional capacity. Berman stated that the Master of Public Administration program has students around the country waiting to get in, which necessitates an increase in instructional capacity. As a matter of interest, Berman stated that those investments total 5 additional faculty and no other staff positions.

Berman again noted that we will not know how things are going to play out until June. He encouraged senators to pay attention to May 31, 2011 which is when the legislature is supposed to end the session. He said that if agreement is not reached by this date, things could get ugly as a majority is needed for any legislation to pass. If they conclude work in the end of May, UIS will make decisions about the budget in the next two or three weeks after.

Talking about the investments made this year, Berman reminded senators of the funds that had been retained. He argued that having these funds put us in a position to get a jump-start on marketing and admissions without having to make decisions about whether or not enrollments would be recurring. Berman noted the discussion in the CPBC’s report about the tracking of the impact of the investments. More specifically, how do we know if money is being well spent? In response to this question, Berman asked Wojcicki and Barnett to speak to the senate.

Wojcicki introduced himself to senators and said that his primary responsibilities include oversight of P.R. and marketing staff. He reported that two years ago, UIS conducted research in Central Illinois and DuPage county about people’s perception of UIS. In central Illinois, most people know we are here and most are happy we are here, although many were not sure what we offer. Speaking of the quality of what we offer, those sampled placed UIS on a scale somewhat below UIUC. However, most indicated they would like to know more about what we offer at UIS. Wojcicki said this led to an image campaign. According to Wojcicki, in order for an image campaign to be effective, it must be long term or it will not be effective. The focus was on students and academic quality. He reported that $200 thousand were allocated to billboards and television for the purpose of raising awareness of academic quality.

Wojcicki went on to say that in DuPage County, many people do not know about UIS. He asserted that we need to raise awareness in DuPage County and acknowledged that marketing and advertising in the suburbs is very expensive. Michelle Green, Director of Marketing, works with admissions to achieve goals. Wojcicki said we are also doing other things in public relations, separate from advertising. By raising awareness, the job of recruiters is much easier. A consultant, Tom Sarafin, was hired to create a P.R. plan for DuPage County. Over the next eighteen months, we will be in DuPage County doing things face to face with people. Looking ahead, Wojcicki stated that money is also needed for the website technology as this is the number one marketing tool. For example, becoming mobile enabled is increasingly important.

Ting said that in the CPBC report there is a continuation of $200 thousand to raise the profile of UIS and an additional $250 thousand to raise the profile in the Chicago suburbs. She asked if these are recurring funds. Wojcicki asserted that the numbers presented represent a dream sheet. He continued by saying that he had asked Greene to present these numbers to the CPBC with the understanding that if we had the money, this is where it would go. Ting clarified that the money for the mobile enabling was also a dream figure. Wojcicki said yes; however, we need to figure
out a way to make this a recurring priority. Ting asked if all three would be recurring. Berman said ultimately it would be. He said that the $250 thousand doesn’t have to be the amount allocated. Currently, Berman stated that these investments potentially have the greatest impact. Ultimately, the metric will be how many students we attract from DuPage County, but we won’t have this data for a while.

Wojcicki said that an axiom in marketing is that 50% of the money spent in advertising is wasted, but it is impossible to know which 50% it is. He went on to say that this year we have put a lot more money into WUIS. Specifically, we wanted to promote our graduate programs. Admission numbers for graduate programs are looking strong for the fall. Wojcicki said that he can’t claim a cause/effect; however, this supports the assertion that WUIS is the right target for potential graduate students. Ting asked if we have been embarking on this initiative for 2 years. Berman said this is year one of this strategic investment. Wojcicki noted that the money spent in DuPage County was for one billboard by the College of DuPage which cost approximately $50 thousand for a year. Berman reminded senators that this is a campaign which includes multiple partners. Berman, Barnett, and Giordano visited DuPage last summer.

Ting asked Barnett to talk about the admissions part. She thanked Wojcicki for his report. Barnett thanked senators for the opportunity to give an update. He said that half of the $100 thousand is going into using technology to market and advertise to students.

We are working with a company that assists in email. The company tracks emails that go out and it has the capacity to find out if the email has been opened and if through the email the UIS website has been visited by the potential student. As a result, Barnett said that we have all of the data of the potential student for follow-up. Additionally, we have hired a company to do phone calls. They talk with potential students about their college plans and what we need to do to encourage their attendance. Far more calls were made than could be made through the admissions staff and ambassadors alone. Other funds have been allocated to help the recruitment of students internationally and to modernize the literature that goes out to potential students. Our marketing now is very clear about who we are and what our brand is.

Helton asked Barnett why students choose to go somewhere else. He asserted that many factors exist. Some examples include: program offerings, where their friends are planning to go to college, and cost. Boltuc asked if there is an effort to recruit students for online degrees. Barnett said that other funds are directed toward the online recruitment.

Talking to Berman, Kline said that the rescission might be within the $3 million range. Berman said that was a high figure. Kline asked how much money had been set aside. Berman asserted that $920 thousand has been set aside in anticipation of the rescission. Kline was curious about the cutting priorities if indeed the worst case scenario emerged. Berman said that would be on the current planning horizon. The kind of situation that would drive that would be a reduction in state funding beyond the anticipated 15% and a drop in enrollment. Berman said that is the lower end of probability currently. Kline asked if we are still owed money by the state. Berman said that we are still owed money, which is a cash flow problem. Ting asked about the overall U of I reduction for FY 12. She clarified that the overall amount is $100 million. Berman said yes.
Speaking to the investment in the arts, Switzer expressed support for the investment in the arts. She asked if some of that investment will include faculty hires. Pardie reported that two positions, one in theater and one in music, are part of the investment.

**Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Annual Report – L. Fisher**

Switzer commended the members of the IAC in identifying issues and taking action. Referring to the three resignations, Switzer asked if the IAC anticipates that the hires will happen by fall. Fisher reported that she was updated on the searches last week and they should be filled by fall. Fisher asked Yoder to comment. Yoder stated that athletic director applications have been closed. He said the committee is beginning the review process today and will compile a list of possible candidates by next week. The process is definitely on track for fall, according to Yoder. Fisher agreed that the one position of business manager has already had one round of interviews.

Ting asked who had attended the NCAA gender equity forum. Fisher said Winand was the IAC representative at the forum. Martin thanked the committee for their work. He had a question about the budget, and what appeared to be a structural deficit. He asked Fisher if she could provide information about how long the deficit will continue and what plan is in place to address the deficit. Fisher clarified that two deficits exist: (1) general revenue funds, and (2) other self-supporting issues, like student fees and ticket sales. Fisher said the strategies for addressing the deficits are different. She referred to Berman’s earlier comments regarding increasing the base budget for athletics, under priority 3. This assumes that we are still on track for a tuition increase. Following up, Berman noted that the increase assumes flat funding, level enrollments, and will happen after the first two priorities mentioned previously. Priority one is preparation for a budget reduction and the second priority is a salary program.

Martin asserted that when the budget priority surveys are conducted, athletics does not appear on the list of top priorities. He believed it is important to change the perceptions or follow the list. More backing from the general campus community is needed in order to support this type of priority, from Martin’s perspective. Berman said that a structural deficit will continue on year after year without adding money. His comments related to the structural deficit on the state appropriations side. The anticipated $200 thousand will go a long way to addressing that. The other deficit, Berman noted, was not really a structural deficit, but a within year deficit and will be taken care of. Speaking to Martin’s point, Berman said that the input received from the CPBC is taken very seriously. He highlighted that the investment in faculty positions is much greater the investment in athletics.

Ting asked if the strategic investment for FY 12 will have to go on for some time until the structural deficit is addressed. Berman believes the deficit will diminish as this money is invested. Ting asked to hear from student senators. Ballard was part of the executive board working on student fees last year. They considered raising the fees because of the contributions to student life. Ballard said that the movement to the NCAA and investment in athletics attracts more students. SGA is highly supportive of athletics and needs to continue to support athletics. Tienken seconded Ballard’s comments and expressed concern about the dismal attendance at games. He believes that as a campus we need to encourage people to get involved. Ting asked what it means that students support athletics, but don’t attend games.
Wilson reported that the program committee is working on a stars awards program. Students will swipe into games and student events and be eligible to win prizes like t-shirts. It is her hope that eventually we won’t need a reward program. Bouray agreed that athletics is important to increase the UIS image and pride. Addressing the original question about fees, Mulvey stated that everyone hates fees, but this was the only way to support athletics at this time and have been necessary.

Bussell asked what impediments exist regarding attendance at games. Bouray believed that low attendance is partly due to the quality of teams and general attitudes toward the teams. Kline asked whether students have voiced an interest in creating a closer connection between academics and athletics. For example, offering a sports management major or other degree programs that relate more closely to athletics. Tienken had not heard any students talk about the issue raised by Kline. He thinks the issue is systemic and related to a lack of tradition and role modeling. Additionally, there is no mention of games in classes.

Referring to comments made by Martin, Yoder asserted that he is more familiar with the history of athletics than most. He encouraged senators not to let the history frame the future. Initiatives like the faculty recognition program and the faculty partner program are targeted at shifting perceptions and beliefs.

Giordano asserted that interest in programs is tracked through the admissions office. She said that sports management is requested, and mostly coming from student athletes. Fisher commented that the lack of tradition and disconnect is being discussed in the IAC. Martin agreed with the comments made by Yoder and appreciates the efforts to move forward. Martin also gave credit to the administration for making the budget more transparent.

Ting informed senators that Berman will be retiring on July 1, 2011. This was his last senate meeting after 34 years of service. Berman was gifted with a card and a bottle of wine, on behalf of the campus senate.

Committee on Library Annual Report – R. Karri
Ting informed senators that Karri was present to answer any questions about the report. Helton noted the 20 resignations and 2 lay-offs since 2008, mentioned in the report. She discussed the difficulty of working with library personnel who come and go. Karri reported service to the Committee on Library for the past four or five years. He has been the chair of the committee for the past three years. Karri asserted that a poor working atmosphere was evident during the last Dean’s evaluation. He asserted that there is a high level of apathy across the campus for this issue. His belief is that we won’t survive as a library if things remain the same. He reported that people have come to him in tears, and are resigning not because they want to leave, but because the atmosphere is horrible. Karri does not believe that we are an institution that needs a college of the library, as we do not offer any degree programs in library studies. We do, however, need a good functioning library, according to Karri. He likened the library to IT in this new electronic world. Karri believes we need a place that is pleasant.

Bussell asked what is undermining morale so horribly. She asserted that if something is driving people out of the jobs, senators need to have a sense of what is happening. Switzer said that if a
report was coming to the senate wherein 20 people were leaving PA&A, there would be serious concern.

Karri noted the change that has happened in the library over time. He believes that some structural changes are needed. Pardie said that the administration is keenly aware of the issues in the library and has made an investment to turn things around. She agreed with Karri’s assessment of the changes that have happened across time. She continued by discussing the disconnect between the existing model which was implemented quite some time ago, and current personnel policies. She also noted the climate change in the job market. Pardie said that as an institution we have been hobbled by resources relative to salary competitiveness. From her perspective, this is a very complex issue. In spite of all of the budgetary strife within the library, the library is doing some really wonderful things. They are staying current despite cuts. Additionally, the Friends of Brookens Library help connect UIS to the community. It is important to remember that there have been generational turn-over in faculty, which is not easily navigated. The same holds true in the library. Pardie reminded everyone that climate is shared by everyone.

Karri asserted that other demands are being made of APs and questions exist as to how to allocate existing resources within the library. He said that currently, the library is functioning as a library, but not as a college and something needs to be done.

Salela reported that she was drawn here because of the structure. UIUC and UIC both have library colleges. She asserted that UIS was ahead of the curve. Part of the attraction was relative to the faculty position, but also because there was a history at this institution of building instructional programs. She was a coordinator of an instructional program at her previous institution and brought knowledge of assessment of information literacy. Currently, our model is being promoted in academia because librarians are no longer the gatekeepers for information access. Salela said that faculty in the library have tried to create credit bearing courses, but there has not been an investment or emphasis placed on programmatic development. She talked about how her predecessors spent an enormous amount of time, effort, and intellectual commitment in working with the senate committees getting information literacy into the baccalaureate. Ting stated that it is still in the baccalaureate. Salela expressed confusion about what will happen with further erosion of the model as she is the only tenured faculty member. She said the library lost two more faculty this year, two visiting are left and the third year of their contract ends next year. No one has said what will happen when the contract expires.

Kline wished to register strong dissent that the Dean is saying that the turnover has not impacted outcomes desired by the library. He argued that the experience of patrons is what matters. He said that he is pleased by the databases, but not by the services. As the institution is placing increased demands on faculty to conduct research, Kline finds the fact that he has not had a research librarian in three years, abysmal.

Ting noted that the library has experienced longstanding issues that go beyond the last two or three years. She asserted that issues and concerns were present when she joined the faculty. Many issues are at play, according to Ting. She argued that this is not entirely an issue of leadership, but also overall climate and collegiality within the library. She will prioritize library concerns, as well as the ROAD concerns on the senate agenda for next year.
Committee on Sustainability Annual Report – M. Klingshirn

Martin expressed support and thanks for glass recycling. Ting thanked Klingshirn for a terrific job.

Graduate Council Annual Report – S. LaFollette

Helton thanked LaFollette for creating a report that is in a bullet format and is parsimonious.

Ting wanted to make clear that the Graduate Student Handbook needs to be ready for fall 2012.

LaFollette informed the senate that there are 100 items for inclusion. The items have been divided into categories. People will be working on this over the summer. Cornell asserted that there are drafts of 9 of the 11 categories. She also noted that a volunteer will be working on the final 2 categories over the summer and will merge the document to create a single voice. Ting suggested to GC that they find a way to be mindful of working with the senate schedule more effectively. Martin asked if there is a date for the CTL review. Lafollette said that this will be first on the agenda for fall.

Personnel Policies Committee Annual Report – D. Anthony

Switzer noted that occasionally a perfect storm of members come together on a committee and this is what has happened in the PPC. Switzer spoke to the meaningful and thoughtful work from the PPC. She commended Anthony on her work as chair. Fisher seconded Switzer’s comments.

Fisher was glad to see information about additional training workshops, which she believes are a great idea. Anthony confirmed that the trainings will be occurring in the fall. Ting asked if all faculty go through the training. Anthony noted that historically, faculty who are applying for reappointment go through training, but not those sitting on personnel committees. The goal will be to reach those who are making personnel decisions.

Old Business

Resolution 41-1 Modification of Faculty Awards Process [2nd reading]

Sheridan moved to discuss resolution 41-1 and Helton seconded the motion. No questions were asked. A vote yielded unanimous support.

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

Ballard moved to discuss resolution 41-2 and Kline seconded the motion. No questions were asked. A vote yielded unanimous support.

Resolution 41-3 Suspension of the Academic Politics Concentration and the Practical Politics Concentration in the Political Science Master’s Degree [2nd reading]

Sheridan moved to discuss resolution 41-3 and Switzer seconded the motion. Martin asked Pierce son if the department was in support of the resolution. Pierce son said that the department was in favor and clarified that it was coming forward so late in the semester because of his work, not due to a delay from Graduate Council. All were in favor of supporting the resolution and the motion carried.

Resolution 41-4 Creation of the Graduate Certificate in Practical Politics [2nd reading]

Kline moved to discuss resolution 41-4 and Switzer seconded the motion. No questions were asked. A vote yielded unanimous support.
Resolution 41-5 Graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Systems in the Department of Environmental Studies [2nd reading]
Garmil moved to discuss resolution 41-5 and Kline seconded the motion. Helton expressed excitement about this resolution. No questions were asked. A vote yielded unanimous support.

Resolution 41-6 Graduate Closure Guidelines (Replace UA Bill 20-3) [2nd reading]
Helton moved to discuss resolution 41-6 and Schoo seconded the motion. Ting noted that the word “closure” had been changed to “capstone” throughout the document for consistency. No questions were asked. A vote yielded unanimous support.

Resolution 41-7 Applications from EHEA 3-year Undergraduate Degrees Will Be Reviewed Using the Bologna Framework [2nd reading]
Ballard moved to discuss resolution 41-7 and Villegas seconded the motion. No questions were asked. A vote yielded unanimous support.

Resolution 41-8 Minimum Requirements for Accepting Undergraduate Degrees Granted from Degree Consolidating Institutions [2nd reading]
Fisher moved to discuss resolution 41-8 and Ruez seconded the motion. Helton noted previous concerns about the residence hours and asked for a recapitulation. Kline asserted that the debate was regarding the rationale behind the 30 hours of residency. He made a point that there are national institutions approved by CHIA and this may need to be changed later. Sheridan said another piece was to the stringency of 30 hours. Martin said that 30 hours is less than our own residency requirement. Garmil asserted that we are trying to recognize schools that do work that we do not do. A vote yielded 1 nay vote, and 24 affirmative votes.

Resolution 41-9 Undergraduate or Graduate Degree from an Accredited Institution is a Minimum Requirement for Admissions to Graduate Degrees at UIS [2nd reading]
Wilson moved to discuss resolution 41-9 and Li seconded the motion. Schuldt noted that this is the resolution with the 12 credit hours. Ting noted a personal view that 12 hours is not sufficient. Kline expressed a worry about focusing on the accreditation language. He asked about international institutions and how we know whether or not these are accredited. Giordano said that there are resources that allow admissions to check whether an institution is accredited by the requisite ministry of education.

Martin confirmed that these will be minimum requirements for what gets the application to the department. Giordano agreed with Martin’s understanding. Boltuc asked why 12 credit hours were chosen by GC. LaFollette said that initially, 12 credit hours was arbitrary, but based on the number of credit hours that can be transferred into the university. She performed a brief google search for other institutions earlier in the week. Of the top ten hits that accepted non-accredited degrees, LaFollette noted that none of the them required more than 15 hours, all admitted students conditionally, and most admitted students at a higher GPA than the university standard. Additionally, all of the schools allowed transfer of the previously taken courses and some required students to begin as non-degree seeking students so that students could prove themselves able to succeed.

Boltuc spoke in favor of the resolution. He argued that admissions is a gatekeeper, but ultimately decisions need to happen at the department or college level. He believes this will help students.
and increase enrollments. Helton asked Ting to further clarify her stance. Ting said that she is fine with the first part of the either/or, but is uncomfortable with the conditional admit part. She asked what happens if a student has a GPA that is below 2.75 from an unaccredited institution. Helton said that it does not matter because the prerogative lies with the department to then make decisions regarding who is admitted into a degree program. She wants to have that ability.

Cornell informed senators that the resolution is not talking about direct admission from an unaccredited undergraduate program to graduate school. We are talking about someone who has graduated from an undergraduate program, been accepted into an accredited graduate program, taken 12 credit hours, and then wishes to transfer to UIS.

Martin supports the idea that graduate faculty decide about admissions, but expressed concern about the perception of other institutions. That said, Martin expressed favor for the resolution. Ting agreed with Martin and wanted to know more about what other Illinois public institutions do with the conditional admissions component. Kline asked if students can be conditionally admitted and then take the 12 credit hours. Helton noted that students can take the 12 credit hours as a non-degree seeking student and potentially transfer in that way. Giordano clarified that students are not allowed to use credits taken here for admissions. According to the catalog, only undergraduate GPA can be used in the decision making process currently. The resolution passed. Two nay votes and 2 abstentions were noted.

Resolution 41-10 Proposed Topics and Campus Representation for a University-wide Dialogue

Kline moved to discuss resolution 41-10 and Garmil seconded the motion. Ting informed senators that she had sent a copy. She said this resolution is based on the memo that went to the USC. Ting said that unfortunately, our memo was largely ignored. As a result, this resolution is important to bring our voice to the topic. Martin told senators that there is a non-debatable motion coming soon. Wassemberg moved to suspend the rules and adopt on the first reading. Boltuc seconded the motion. All were in favor of suspending the rules.

Ting said that the USC chair is supposed to put together a subcommittee to work on the agenda for the summit. She does not believe that UIUC wants to talk about where we are going, but wants to continue to talk about organizational issues. UIS is in a solid position because we have been discussing this issue for some time. Martin agreed with Ting. Sheridan asked about UIC’s response. Martin said they voted in favor of holding a summit.

Referring to line 27, Helton asked for clarification about the language utilized. Specifically, she was unsure about sunset policies and dashboard indicators. Ting provided an explanation of the language selection. She said that the sunset policies are referring to programs at the other campuses that are not doing well that may be phased out. Ting noted that Berman spoke about these in a report earlier in the year. She believes that having a dialogue is really important. With this resolution, UIS will hopefully get the attention of USC members.

Martin stated that the USC did have a discussion about articulation agreements. Several members from UIC were very interested in the discussion. He believes that this is of high importance to
some members. Ting spoke about the CIC membership. As U of I, we should also receive the
benefits of membership. She said that before Ikenberry retired, a VPAA served on the CIC.
Complaints emerged from the Urbana campus, so the Urbana Provost was appointed by
Ikenberry to serve on CIC. When that happened, UIC was extended a guest membership to the
CIC. Due to some policy changes that have come through the CIC, guest memberships have now
been abolished. As a result, Chicago lost their guest membership. Different discussions are
happening about how to secure some of the membership benefits. According to Ting, Hogan has
stated that he believes that all campuses should receive the membership benefits.

Helton asked that the phrase, dashboard indicators be changed. Wassenberg asserted that this is
standard administrative language. Helton argued that there are dangers to writing in
administrative language when the target audience is faculty. Martin suggested using the phrase
parenthetically.

Bussell asked about the opening for us, within this resolution. Ting said the opening is in the
intercampus articulations. Garmil had an editorial change. He noted that the BOT does not meet
until June 9, 2011, which meant that Chancellor Koch is still considered a designee. Garmil
believed the agenda items were important; however, he thought they were somewhat specific for
an overall dialogue. He also suggested adding another “Therefore” to talk about the vision of the
dialogue. Ting pointed to lines 19 and 20. Garmil noted that the spirit was present, but wanted to
strengthen the document. Fisher and Helton agreed with Garmil. Fisher wondered if an insertion
of a vision of how the three campuses can cooperate be highlighted.

Ting suggested adding language that the summit will not be limited to these topics. She stated
that the problem is that this is not on the USC radar and is not getting any traction. Fisher agreed
with Ting, and said that perhaps that was what was lacking. She believed adding a statement
about faculty input would clarify and strengthen. Bussell suggested changing the language
slightly to say, “include such topics as.”

Boltuc stated that there is a benefit to the way it is currently written. He cautioned senators
against creating language that is too weak. Referring to the 4th “Whereas,” Garmil moved to
amend the document by moving this to the 1st “Therefore” which would read, “therefore be it
resolved that campus senate at the University of Illinois at Springfield endorse a university wide
dialogue that focuses on issues where cooperation across all campuses will help advance the
entire university.” Fisher seconded the amendment.

Garmil said that he is really concerned about this after reading about the UIUC senate meeting,
where President Hogan was ambushed regarding these issues. Sheridan stated that she believes
there is a wide-spread sense of governance on the UIUC campus. Helton made a motion to vote
on the amendment. Mulvey seconded the motion. Twelve senators voted in favor, and 7 opposed.

Helton proposed a friendly amendment to insert “to add for university competiveness” at the end
of number 2. Ting accepted the friendly amendment. Wilson suggested removing the “at” from
University of Illinois at Springfield. Ballard stated that by law we are still considered “at.” Ting
said that is a complicated issue. Villegas asked for clarification on line 45 regarding the word
“consideration.” Ting offered that this will allow the campus delegation to work together with President Hogan and the BOT will decide the final agenda.

Ballard, noting the time, called the question. Sheridan seconded the motion. All were in favor of supporting the resolution.

**New Business**

None

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 P.M.