CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2012/2013
Friday, March 1, 2013
10:00 A.M. – Noon
UHB 2008


Ex-Officio: L. Pardie.


The meeting was called to order by Chair Fisher at 10:07 a.m.

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

Approval of Minutes
Motion to approve by Kline; Li seconded. The minutes were approved with no corrections.

Announcements
None

Reports

Chair – L. Fisher
The nomination period for this year’s Senate election has begun. The Chair had previously posted a memo concerning clarification of faculty electorate, based on language contained in the Senate Constitution. The Chair said Senate rules limit the electorate to full-time appointments, and also identifies a range of faculty titles including Center Director and Research Associate. Historically, the interpretation has been that this language is inclusive of non-tenure track faculty, including instructor and other titles. This is why we have many non-tenure track faculty serving on our Senate standing committees. In fact, many committees would have staffing problems without non-tenure track faculty. In recent years, the eligibility list has been compiled by nomination but the actual list of persons eligible to vote and/or run has not been appended to the nomination memo. This year the eligibility list was included with the memo. While every effort has been made to make this process as transparent as possible, the Chair asked the Senate if this particular body wanted to recommend any amendments to the Constitution, either clarifying language or making changes to the way we represent faculty. One question has been raised about the definition of faculty, which is abstract in many documents and could include more titles. It has also been asked why part-time faculty are not included in the Senate electorate. The Chair said a discussion of
faculty electorate would not be appropriate while this year’s nomination period was open and welcomed suggestions as to whether this issue should be addressed by the current Senate or left to the next Senate in the Fall.

The Chair said the Campus Planning and Budget Committee will be sending out a survey seeking suggestions for UIS budget priorities for the next few years.

Kline announced the History Symposium taking place on campus and encouraged all to attend.

**Provost Report – L. Pardie**

The deadline for MAP grants is today, March 1, and the Provost encouraged Senators to remind students that it is very important to complete the FAFSA forms today if they want to be considered for MAP grants.

The Provost said she was cautiously optimistic about admissions numbers for Fall. Freshmen admits are up considerably, as are active deposits for Fall 2013. Transfer applications and admits are also up and graduate applications and admits are up.

Kline asked about the status of State appropriations to UIS. The Provost said she would know more next week and would provide an update at that time. Chair Fisher asked about the end result of the sabbatical reconsideration process. The Provost said there were thirteen applications and twelve were approved. Those applications will go forward to the Board of Trustees next week.

**Senates Conference – J. Villegas**

Villegas said much of the meeting was concerned with UIC and the health system. A significant percentage of University resources are tied to the health system, so whatever happens with the health system has an impact on the whole university. There was also a very collegial debate about the new minor in Liberty Studies and the consensus was that this was a UIS campus decision and the USC would respect that. Boltuc said it was important that Matt Wheeler, chair of UIUC campus, was strongly against USC taking jurisdiction over campus decisions. The understanding is that unless something directly affects the other campuses, the USC shouldn’t take an opposing position.

Chair Fisher said a very useful degree of flexibility has been added to the catalog process so that if the Senate approves a new degree program and completes all necessary governance steps by May 1 it can be added to the on-line addendum for the following Fall. She also said current language states that Senates Conference must approve new degree programs but that is not really what happens. Items do have to go through USC but they review items to see if they affect other campuses or are to be forwarded directly to the Board of Trustees. Kline asked if there was any discussion of unions. Villegas said USC approved a resolution stating that every campus has a right to go through the unionization process but an individual campus could not unilaterally change University Statutes.

**Student Government Association – S. Ahmad for R. Bouray**

SGA adopted a logo for student government at the last meeting. Three resolutions were also introduced at the last meeting. The first was on the topic of increasing parking efficiency, the second would require prospective SGA candidates to collect signatures in order to be placed on the ballot for upcoming elections, and the third concerned creating a paid position to manage social media and SGA website.

Ahmad and two other SGA members recently attended an IBHE student advisory committee meeting. Topics included lobbying for increased MAP funding and textbook affordability. UIS SGA is hoping to host an IHSE SAC conference in May.
Old Business

Resolution 42-14, Clarification of Personnel Committee Operating Procedures – Recusal and Abstention [2nd reading].

There have been some minor changes from the first reading. Deborah Anthony, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, described the resolution as an attempt to define the terms recusal and abstention, and determine when they apply in the context of Personnel Committee processes. Disqualification was also included for those rare circumstances that would not be covered by recusal or abstention. After a brief discussion, the motion was approved unanimously with no abstentions.

Resolution 42-15 Clarification of Sabbatical Leave Report Requirements [2nd reading]

This resolution establishes a deadline in the personnel calendar for sabbatical reports. Anthony said there were some questions raised at the first reading about the part of the amendment that refers to the year following the sabbatical, and whether that referred to the academic or calendar year. After a brief discussion, Bussell moved that the language be changed to “each recipient shall make a presentation on the sabbatical to her/his colleagues in the academic year following the sabbatical and submit a report to her/his Personnel file by the deadline established in the Academic Personnel Calendar.” Boltuc seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously. The Resolution as amended was unanimously approved.

New Business

Resolution 42-17 Modification of Tenure and Promotion Application Rebuttal Procedures [1st reading]

Anthony said it is generally understood and known that during the personnel review process, in the event of a negative recommendation or some sort of critical comments at any level, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal or provide additional information to the file that could be considered at later levels. The policies provide for rebuttal at the Dean’s and College Committee’s recommendation, but do not allow it explicitly at the Tenure Review Committee level or at the Campus Promotion Committee recommendation, although it has become accepted practice at the latter two levels. The Personnel Policies Committee could see no reason why it shouldn’t be allowed at the Tenure Review or Promotion Committee level and thought it should be explicitly provided for as there has been some confusion about whether it can be done.

Kline said it appeared that the amendment only allowed for rebuttal if the candidate perceived some sort of procedural error. He asked if the language could be changed to include protestations about the content as well as the procedure. After a brief discussion about syntax, Dell made a motion to amend lines 56 and 88 to read “and/or the TRC offering clarification, and/or stating any disagreement, or allegations of procedural error or discrimination.” Kline seconded the motion. The motion carried with two abstentions.

The Chair said she received an inquiry via email from a faculty member who expressed concern about the clarity of the resolution as worded. Kline asked about parliamentary procedures concerning emails. Since the Chair is not supposed to engage substantively in the debate, Kline wondered if the name of the faculty member who sent the email should be read into the record to ensure the email was not just the personal opinion of the Chair. The Chair said she was not reading an email she was just summarizing an opinion shared with her by a faculty member. Salela said anyone sending an email to the Senate Chair needs to know that it becomes public information. Transue said there was not a good mechanism for this situation.

There was additional discussion about the Resolution and the rebuttal procedures in general. The Resolution will go back to the PPC for rewording and come back for a second reading.
Resolution 42-18 Creation and Approval of a Bachelor of Science in Information Systems Security in the Computer Science Department [1st reading]

Ted Mims and Lucas Vespa were present from the Computer Science Department, as well as Harsh Bapat, Chair of the Undergraduate Council. Bapat said more and more personal information is being stored virtually and there is a tremendous need for people who are trained in protecting the systems that store this information. The Computer Science Department has put together a very solid program that will provide students with training for these types of jobs not only in the private sector, but in government as well. Bapat asked the Senate to support the proposal and resolution before them. There was general agreement on the merits and substance of the proposal. Vespa and Mims responded to questions about staffing, recruitment, and female representation in both student body and faculty. Several Senators expressed an appreciation for the thoughtfulness and thoroughness of the proposal.

Resolution 42-19 Promotion for Clinical and Research Professors [1st reading]

Anthony said this resolution was designed to create a promotional track for clinical and research professors. We do have some long term clinical and research faculty here at UIS and this resolution will help with retention and recognize the achievement of these faculty and the value that they bring to the university. UIS is the only one of the three UI campuses that does not allow for promotion of clinical faculty. The process is set up to be similar in many respects to the process for tenure and tenure track faculty and also mirrors the current personnel review process. There was extended discussion about the impact this resolution may have on tenure and tenure track faculty. Chair said this gives the Senate an opportunity to think broadly about institutional priorities and about faculty appointments and what that means. The Provost said UIS currently has 166 tenure and tenure track faculty and 48 in other categories. Boltuc said this may set a bad precedent and could lead to a situation where tenure was a rarity. The Provost said it was important to realize that we need a diverse model to deliver the curriculum and to hire good clinical faculty. By having a diverse mix of faculty on campus we enable our tenure stream faculty to enrich their careers and have even more value to the institution. It should be clear that we place a tremendous value on our tenure system faculty; the curriculum is under the control of our tenure system faculty; educational policy is under the control of tenure system faculty. Dell said she shared Boltuc’s concern that this may lead to a shift away from a tenure track institution. Switzer agreed with Boltuc and Dell, but said tenure was a separate issue and allowing clinical faculty to get promoted and get raises would not lead to a two-tiered system.

Adjournment

Borland moved to adjourn; Dell seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 12:14 p.m.