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Senators Absent: A. Agarwal, H. Thompson

Ex-Officio: L. Pardie


The meeting was called to order by Chair Fisher at 10:03 a.m.

Approval of the Agenda
Motion to approve the agenda by Switzer; Salela seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Approval of Minutes
Salela said line 213-214 should say “Salela asked if the resolution was mandating that administration establish a deadline for the report.” There was also a correction to a typographical error on line 178. The minutes were approved unanimously as amended.

Announcements
There were no announcements.

Reports

Chair – L. Fisher
The SEC met on January 25 and discussed proposed revisions to the student disciplinary policy with Dean of Students, Jim Korte and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Tim Barnett. Feedback for the policy has been received by SEC and SGA. Suggestions have been incorporated and the policy will go back to the Student Discipline Committee and then presented to the Senate.

The SEC also discussed this year’s sabbatical awards process. There was a memo linked to today’s agenda that included information about the history of award rates on campus. Chair said she shared the memo so that there can be a shared understanding at the campus level of the value of sabbaticals and how the process works. For a variety of reasons, we had an unusually low rate of sabbatical awards at the campus level this year, which led to consternation and questions from a number of departments. The Chair invited suggestions about how the Senate should launch a campus discussion that improves understanding of the sabbatical process. Two different departments came to the SEC in December with
questions about the sabbatical awards process. The SEC in turn asked the Provost’s office for
information about the number of sabbatical applications and awards from previous years. The Chair
added information about the percentage of awards, citing the percentage of denials this year, as compared
to previous years. She also noted as significant the flexibility that has been exercised in past years with
sabbatical awards, and that virtually all sabbaticals that had been approved by departments had been
approved at the campus level. The Chair said she thinks that sabbaticals are the key piece of faculty
development that the institution invests in to maintain the skills, sanity, and excellence of the tenured
faculty. According to the UI statutes, after six years of service, tenured and tenure track faculty are
eligible to apply for a sabbatical for one semester at full pay. This allows faculty to concentrate on special
projects. The special projects are defined very broadly in the Statutes and include scholarship, curriculum
development, and general renewal. The Statutes also make clear that this is not only for the benefit of the
individual faculty member, but also to increase the value of the faculty member to the institution. The
Chair said that from that perspective, the declining rate of sabbatical awards becomes an institutional
danger sign. The process should be competitive, and faculty expect to be held to a high standard, but we
need a process that ensures that we are successfully developing our faculty and that we have a very clear
shared understanding of how the process works and what the expectations are. We also need a clear
understanding of the role of the campus level committee. In the past, the Committee has concentrated on
screening and ranking those applications which have already been approved by departments and colleges.
This year, for a variety of diverse reasons, the Committee recommended a smaller proportion of
sabbatical applications than has been the case in the past. The Chair said she thought that CSAC was not
aware of the flexibility that past committees and Provosts have taken to go up to twelve awards, if there
were twelve eligible applications.

Bussell asked if the main issue was making sure the CSAC committee was working in alignment with the
Statutes and if there was an advantage or need to address the process more clearly in the personnel
policies. Chair said she thought that all concerned had acted very thoughtfully and consistently, but
thought there were signs of a cultural shift towards an assumption that this is a competitive process and
that means that some applications will be rejected. Martin asked the Provost to comment on what
happened with the process this year. The Provost said it was important not to think of this as a problem
with one committee, and also important to review the Personnel Policies closely so as to understand what
is written about sabbaticals and how they are awarded. There is no doubt that these are important
opportunities for faculty, but faculty should also be thinking carefully about what needs to be included in
the sabbatical application, and what kind of information needs to be given. The Provost continued by
stating that the process needs to be kept succinct and do-able, but we also need to think carefully about
the information that needs to be included to allow the Committee to feel like it’s doing its work. It is a
good time to revisit the issues and consider the process from start to finish. Boltuc said it is important to
avoid institutional inconsistencies. If there were faculty who followed certain written official forms and
did not get the sabbatical because of that, there is potential for litigation. He recommended amending this
year’s decisions. Borland said it seems the practices of committees, and not just this particular
committee, tend to be evolving without any official change in policy, and the process should be
transparent and consistent with past practice. Jason Pierceson agreed that we should reconsider the
process this year. He expressed concern that the college of Public Affairs and Administration did not have
a voice in the deliberations on CSAC. Due to this procedural violation, he advocated reconsidering this
year’s decisions with a PAA representative involved.

The Chair said there are a number of different kinds of issues, including the fact that our campus
application process differs a little from the process that is outlined on the VPA webpage. That website
says not to attach a CV, and our campus process says do attach a CV. This can be confusing to faculty.
The chair said we need absolute clarity about how the process works. She sees it as a danger sign when
there is a sudden shift. She concurred with the suggestions that we could still revisit this this year. There
is tremendous flexibility surrounding this in the Provost’s office. Dell said the decision should be
revisited this year. She agreed with Boltuc that the directions were unclear. She expressed absolute respect to the process and the Committee that considered applications, and advocated for a broader discussion. Switzer concurred that this issue should be revisited this year. She asked if this was similar to a tenure recommendation where the Provost or Chancellor can override the committee recommendation. The Provost said it is a recommendation but she is not inclined to overturn a recommendation from a faculty committee without very good cause. The Provost sits on CSAC as an ex-officio so she hears their deliberations. She said she had no reason to override the decision of a committee that did not act outside the scope of its purview, or violate the procedures. Transue said mistakes could be made that were not egregious or outside of the purview, and revisiting the decision would not be a blow to the Committee. He continued by saying that in the past, the screening has happened at the department or college level and the campus level committee has exercised judgment but has tread very lightly. Transue said that since it is the department or college that bears the cost and makes the sacrifices to cover a sabbatical that is where the meat of the process should take place.

Dean Ermatinger said the actual policy says normally eight, so it should be kept in mind that there is a limit and there are reasons for the limit. Not only a financial cost but a cost for departments with advising and committee work and so forth. He said he has not rejected sabbatical proposals even when he should have. His philosophy has been that he will rank them and he will give lower rankings to those that he believes are not fully meritorious. He said he had twelve or thirteen that he ranked this year and he did not believe that all of them should have been moved forward. However, he is uncomfortable being a sole judge, even though the policy says the dean shall review each application and forward those which he or she is recommending with his or her assessment to the Campus Sabbatical and Awards Committee. Ermatinger said he has not withheld any applications in the three or four years he has been here. He has forwarded them all to CSAC with a ranking. He said he does not know what the practice had been before, but the percentage of rejections may be due to the large number of applications that he has moved forward. Anthony cited portions of the Personnel Policy that she said support the notion that screening should take place at the college and department level.

The Chair said one issue about the specific way the Committee chose to proceed this year was they did not individually rank the proposals. They worked very deliberately and consistently, but they only had two rankings – recommended and not recommended. She said it has been suggested that ranking those proposals that were not recommended may be a way to revisit the process this year. Bailey, Chair of the History Department, cited policy that said normally the number of sabbaticals awarded any year will be eight or determined by a ratio of one sabbatical leave to each twenty full time faculty members. She said while this number has been spoken of as a limit, it could also be taken as a minimum. She said she was encouraged to hear Senators suggesting that this issue was too important to the institution to allow this decision to stand this year without further review. She asked for swift and effective action from the Senate. Given the changing demographic of the Faculty, Bailey suggested this is a time for an expansion rather than a contraction of the sabbatical program. Switzer asked if the number of sabbaticals awarded could go up to ten based on the number of current full time faculty. Fisher said it could be ten or twelve, and there is some flexibility. CSAC did not have it in their minds that there was a firm limit. Switzer said UIS is moving into an era when we have a huge cohort of faculty that are moving into that time for sabbatical. By not awarding sabbaticals at the upper limit, there is a cost in faculty morale. Faculty work hard towards tenure and invest greatly in the institution. The sabbatical award is reciprocation where the university invests in faculty. Switzer said that not giving the maximum awards possible will make it difficult to retain quality faculty and adversely impact morale.

Boltuc said this brings up the issue of whether the Senate has the authority to override decisions of other faculty governance bodies. He said it was thoughtful for administration to not overdo their role. The Chair said the Senate does have a role in setting the personnel policies, but the specific proposal review process is outside the Senate and this is outlined in the Statutes. Bussell agreed with Switzer that this kind of
bottleneck will cause problems for the institution and agreed that the issue should be revisited as soon as possible, especially in light of the apparent departure in the decision making process. The Provost said she thought there were fears driving some of the statements being made and very sweeping statements being made that impugn the work of the Committee. She did not want to let that stand. She said this broader conversation is important so that people are focused as they write their sabbatical proposals. One of the sweeping statements that has been made is that faculty take great care in writing their proposals, but that is not always the case. In terms of policy, if we don’t want CSAC to rank these proposals then we shouldn’t be convening them. If faculty want the screening to occur at the department and the college levels, then that is something to think about in terms of changing the policy. Provost continued by saying that sabbaticals are very important for faculty and they represent something to the institution. It means there will be adjuncts teaching courses while the person is on sabbatical. It means that someone else will be advising the students. It is a serious commitment and the writing of the sabbatical application should be taken seriously. One of the ways that committees struggle is when they can’t find the kind of detail they need to give that application serious consideration. The Provost said she wanted to make sure the Senate was not denigrating a committee of their peers who made these decisions. The implications of asking the Provost to override these decisions are vast. She asked the Senate to think very carefully about this and also the message that will be sent to all faculty about what it means to serve on various committees. That their decisions, even when made in good faith and without being in violation of policy, that they will be held accountable publicly for the decisions they have made. It could have very chilling effects on who will be willing to serve on these committees.

Martin made an appeal to the Provost and the Chancellor, saying that these various levels of approval are not rubber stamps, and the Chancellor and the Provost are levels of approval too. These levels are supposed to be checked at each level so that errors don’t occur. Martin said it was important for the Chancellor and the Provost to understand that the overwhelming sentiment among faculty of all stripes is that something wrong happened with five applications. Transue said it seems that the missing element is the ranking from the Committee. He was not suggesting that the Senate publicly revisit the Committee’s decision, just that the policy asks for a ranking. This is a procedural matter, and it is not egregious, and it does not impugn the Committee. He suggested the Committee could change their dichotomous into a thirteen category ranking. Borland said she did not hear anyone say that the Provost should overturn the Committee’s decision, just that the Senate was asking for more information from the Committee. She had not been aware that there was no CPAA representation on the Committee due to a recusal and that presented a procedural problem. Borland did not believe that anyone was making accusations that the Committee had ulterior motives. The Chair said the issue of recusal of the CPAA representative was a difficult issue to address as there was an objection to having the process move forward without the CPAA representative. When the Provost tried to replace the CPAA representative, there was an objection to that. It is difficult when the Policy does not provide instructions about what to do. The PPC is working right now on what to do when someone recuses themself.

Hadley-Ives said there should be some changes to the language in both the Statutes and the application so that it is clear what information needs to be included with the proposal. Pierceson challenged assertions that it was not possible to replace the CPAA representative on CSAC. He said he wanted to know who objected to replacing the CPAA representative, the basis for the objection, and why that stalled the process of representation. Representation from the College is a sacred principle and for it to be dismissed so quickly is illegitimate. Busssel moved to collect a list of questions to guide the Senate and the PPC in this matter. Ruez seconded. The motion passed. Boltuc asked if the Senate should ask CSAC to produce a ranking of this year’s applications. The Provost said it was too late to reconvene the committee, so that by default what is being suggested is that the Provost make a decision apart from the committee. Borland made a motion for the Provost and Chancellor to exercise their power to revisit the applications not recommended for approval. She provided the following rationale: 1) there was not CPAA representation on CSAC; 2) the applications for sabbatical were not ranked as seemingly required by the personnel.
policy; 3) faculty questions across the campus about the process of the Committee’s recommendations; and 4) that there is not sufficient time to have the Committee revisit those decisions. Switzer seconded.

Martin said he felt that this sentiment had already been expressed to the Provost and because of statutory separation of powers he would be voting against this motion. The Chair said this would not be a binding recommendation but simply putting on paper what has been said. Dean Ermatinger said he sees this as opening up a potential can of worms across the entire campus on various committees and various actions that the faculty take. We are asking the Provost to revisit a decision that faculty have made. Ermatinger cautioned faculty to not take this lightly. He continued by stating that we do not ask faculty to do work and then ignore them. We asked this committee for their input and now we are saying we don’t like the input you gave us and now we are going to go to someone else. Chair called for a vote. The motion passed with 12 aye votes, 6 nay votes and 8 abstentions. Abstaining were Villegas, Owusu-Ansah, Ahmad, Bouray, Hollins, Mulvey and Tienken.

Provoat Report – L. Pardie

With regard to the tuition increase, it is always a difficult decision to increase tuition. Affordability is a large proportion of access, and in an effort to ensure that UIS is ensuring access, particularly to the residents of Illinois, the hope is that we can always keep the increase in tuition minimal. The BOT has a policy, enacted a few years ago, linking increases in tuition to cost of living increases. It is also the case that we must do everything we can to preserve quality at the University of Illinois through all three campuses. The increase was a very modest 1.7%, which happens to be the smallest percentage increase since AY 2001/2002. There was also an increase in the library IT fee here at UIS. This looked like a large percentage increase because our fees are so small. The library IT fee on our campus was implemented to ensure that we had academic technologies for teaching. In consultation with representatives of SGA, as well as other folks on campus, the Library Dean asked for an increase to be sure that we could keep pace with the need for access to electronic resources, which are increasingly critically important and expensive. The students also had some things that they wanted out of the Library, which were also bundled into the increase. An unidentified student asked what, in particular, was added to the library. The Provost said the expenses included library membership in OCLC and license that support the link resolver and their electronic resource management service. Without those services, the students wouldn’t have access to the Library’s electronic resources and they wouldn’t be able to track down resources at other libraries. The library also maintains licenses on citation management tools, like Ref Works and Easy Bib, that are used by UIS students and faculty. Without the additional support from the new fees, the Library would have been forced to cancel some of those products. The average yearly increases on those licenses and memberships has been about 7.9%. The Library is also one of the largest computer labs on campus. It has ninety-seven work stations that need to maintain some of the specialized software available in the library. There were also some student requested improvements, such as an e-book and e-reader lending program, an expansion in the DVD collection that students were asking for in relation to courses, and also one module of a language learning program. The student asked if the University has looked into opening a twenty-four hour computer lab in the near future since fees do keep increasing. Bouray, President of SGA said they met with the Dean of the Library and the subject of a twenty-four hour lab came up. This is being considered, but as of right now the funds are not available.

Student Government Association-- R. Bouray

Bouray said two resolutions were passed at the last SGA meeting. One was encouraging the expansion of emergency poles on campus and the other was adding a new International Student Senator position to SGA. The UIS nickname/mascot task force will be made up of eighteen members, including eight students and will have its first meeting on Monday Feb 4. A few members of SGA attended the annual dinner of downtown Springfield which was a great way to increase the presence of UIS in the community. SGA was able to set up a meeting with the Mayor on a date TBA to discuss what is happening on campus. SGA is also implementing paperless meetings. They will be using the i-pad cart from IT services so SGA members and audience can view meeting materials on i-pads.
BOT Report – K. Jamison

The tuition increase was covered in the BOT meeting, as was reported by the Provost. There was also a presentation by Christophe Pierre, and a discussion of underrepresented students and the increases on each campus. UIS has some significant increases. African-American students have declined at all campuses except UIS. VP/Comptroller Walter Knorr said that Pell Grants are safe for another year. He also said the University has billed 85% of its FY 2013 appropriation and has received 11% to date. There was also some discussion about cross-disciplinary and cross-campus collaboration in teaching and research, which is something that enhances classes and opportunities for students and faculty. This is something that hasn’t been solidified in any particular way, but is being discussed. Joyce Tolliver from the Urbana campus was the presenter and she welcomes ideas.

Committee on Committees – K. Jamison

Pamela Salela and Jorge Villegas have volunteered to serve on the Election Committee. Dell made a motion to approve the slate of Salela and Villegas for the Election Committee. Kline seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Jamison also reported that Rosina Neginsky has agreed to be the sabbatical replacement for Lan Dong.

Financial Aid – T. Barnett

Barnett said the Financial Aid Office worked with two different consulting groups one year ago and asked them to look at two things. The first group looked at what our competitors are doing in terms of providing scholarships. The second consulting group focused on data provided through the Financial Aid Office to determine what scholarships would attract freshman, transfers and international students to UIS. The first report indicated that many students were not aware of UIS, and if they were it would cost us about $1500 to bring that student to UIS. The second consulting report provided information in terms of increasing scholarship dollar amounts to attract freshmen. The Chancellor put in more than $200,000 into additional scholarships for both Capital Honors and for Lincoln Scholarships. Barnett and Dr. Joseph, Director of Financial Assistance, provided handouts with the range of scholarships that are now being offered. The information is also available on the financial aid website. Barnett said the increase in scholarship dollar amounts had a positive impact on freshmen enrollment last year.

Kline made a motion to extend the meeting for thirty minutes. R. Barnett seconded. The motion passed. Barnett said that the increased scholarship amounts are also contributing to increases for Fall 2013 enrollment. For the Fall 2013, UIS is ahead by thirty-one deposits from this time last year and both applications and admits are up. This is not a trend across the state. SIU-Carbondale is down 1700 students from Fall 2012, and down over 2500 students from a year ago. UIS was down in enrollment this spring. It appears that transfer students are leaving after one or two semesters. UIS has a 94% retention rate from Fall to Spring for freshmen. Total UIS enrollment is down about 235 students from Fall. Dell noted the decrease in Federal Work Study students and asked if there was an explanation. Joseph said we promote FWS, but it is a matter of students being focused on academics and not being pressured to work by families. Transue asked if work study students could be research assistants. Joseph said yes, if they are eligible and complete the application. Barnett said transfer student merit scholarships are increasing due to the increased competition for transfer students. Senator Barnett said we could have 25 – 30% more transfer students receiving scholarships, but the students need to be fully admitted and students files are not always complete. He said this usually happens because students have not submitted all transcripts. Barnett said David Racine’s staff was currently working on an extensive research project that is almost finished, but indications suggest there are three categories of transfer students. One group is serious about getting a UIS degree, a smaller group of students come to UIS with the intention of going somewhere else after a semester or two, and a third group that comes to UIS with the intention of earning a degree, but for whatever reason they are dissatisfied with their experience here and they end up leaving and graduating from another university.
Old Business
Resolution 42-13, Creation of a Minor in Liberty Studies [2nd Reading]

The Chair said several Senators had received emails from colleagues who couldn’t be here today and asked others to bring their comments forward. The Chair said she received questions about the relationship of the minor to the Academy of Capitalism and Limited Government and a potential tie to a political advocacy organization. Kline, in a point of clarification, said that he had received only one email regarding this minor. Kline said there is a procedure for applying for grants at UI and all grants that he has received have followed established procedures to the letter. He said he has never asked for money for a minor, although he did ask for course development money because he thought he could get it. There was an association that funded the kind of work that he has done and enjoyed for the last twenty years so he applied for a grant. Kline followed the same procedure in applying for this grant from the Academy of Capitalism as he has followed for any grant. As a political organization, given their attachment to the UI Foundation and their status as a 509 A-3 supporting organization, they are not allowed to give money to political causes. They are fully within their rights to fund academic endeavors at the University of Illinois.

Martin said that several years ago he and Peter Boltuc co-authored a report on the involvement on this campus with the Academy of Capitalism and Limited Government and found, through extensive examination, that none of the issues that occurred on the Urbana campus have occurred here. Barnett said he would not comment on the funding issues but he found the subject matter of the curriculum could drive people to take a different approach to the way things are going and part of higher education is getting people to look at the other side of the coin. He asked if there were other courses already offered that could be included in the minor. Hadley-Ives said one of the strategies of these minors is to find faculty who have courses they like to teach and if there is a common interest on a subject, create a minor where those faculty can justify offering those courses on a regular basis. There are many faculty on this campus that have an interest in freedom and liberty in whatever discipline they are in, and in particular we would like to include a Marxist or leftist or European continental philosophy and liberty.

Salela asked about the structure. Since LIS is an independent option, she did not see a precedent for creating concrete degrees. Salela asked why this minor should be housed in LIS since it seems to be about Political Philosophy. She noted that four of the nine courses that are within the options are in Philosophy. Hadley-Ives said LIS has a tradition of encouraging students to create their own focused degrees or a general Liberal Arts degree. He said these focused degrees are generally informal; however, there are a few reasons for creating minors. The first is a marketing angle, as listing this in the catalog may attract students to our campus. Another reason is service to faculty. If faculty have courses they like to teach that are part of an official minor, they are justified in offering the courses on a regular basis. The third is giving the department more intellectual substance. Bussell asked how the department would add to or provide flexibility to the minor. Kline said it was within the purview of the department to sign petitions for substitute courses, and there was room for accepting new courses into the minor if somebody has a course that they think addresses these issues.

Michael Eiselman, a guest, said his wife was a non-traditional student who graduated from Sangamon State University, and that a lot of SSU people are concerned about the direction this school is going in. Having the Koch brothers funding a minor is not going to help with recruiting because institutionally, UIS would be moving on the wrong side of history. People are interested in how to change society but not in the favor of people like the Koch brothers. Eiselman continued by saying that adding this minor sponsored by the universally reviled Koch brothers, would bring the reputation of UIS into question. Fisher said one faculty member noted that there are not a lot of Liberty Studies Programs around the country and asked if this was a field in which we wanted to be national leaders, if that means having a reputation for aligning us with a particular conservative political philosophy. Kline said he did not know how to fight hyperbole and suggested that Senators look at the curriculum as proposed. One of the reasons
this did not go into the Political Science department is because we thought it would be very creative to
have a humanities background to a public policy focus. There is not one policy course in there. There is a
background study of different theories of liberty from different perspectives that then talk about how
those different theories of liberty affect three important areas of our lives: economics, formal authority,
and culture. It is not a policy; it is a humanities investigation into theoretical edifices.

Martin asked how expected revenues and how expected expenses will balance out. Transue moved to
extend the meeting for fifteen minutes; Boltuc seconded; the motion passed. The Provost said there was
no concern expressed about a negative effect this minor may have on resources. Martin asked for a
ballpark figure on what it will cost UIS to add a new minor. The Provost said she did not have a definitive
figure, but she had not heard any requests for equipment or those sorts of things, so it’s a minimal
investment in marketing. She added that this minor might be of tremendous interest to students from other
countries and the return on that investment would be great. Boltuc said he would be very strongly
opposed to censoring this program for being potentially on the political right. Pierceson said he was
struggling with the fact that this minor is connected to a movement in the University of Illinois system the
last couple of years to put ideology in the curriculum. The seminar coming up this weekend that is
connected directly or indirectly to this minor is not neutral politically. They take a negative liberty
approach. Pierceson said he is worried that the intent of the minor is really part of a larger effort in the
academy to put a particular type of interpretation of liberty in the curriculum. He said he was not
suggesting that was the motive about this particular minor, but he had too many questions about its
connection to that larger movement. He said he was not asking the Senate to vote down this minor, but to
think about the implications. Switzer made a motion to postpone further discussion to the next senate
meeting. Ruez seconded. The motion passed with Atkinson, Bussell, and Boltuc abstaining. The motion
carried.

Adjournment
Barnett moved to adjourn; McCaughan seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Meeting
adjourned at 12:44 P.M.