CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2012/2013
FRIDAY, October 26, 2012
10:00 A.M. – Noon
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM H


Ex-Officio: L. Pardie


The Senate was called to order at 10:03 am.

Chair Fisher welcomed Jill Stoops, representing Atkinson, and Teresa Szabo, on behalf of Raymond Barnett.

Chair proposed insertion of USC report from J. Villegas into the agenda between items D and E. There were no objections and the addition of this informational item was approved unanimously.

Approval of the day’s Agenda

A motion was made by Mulvey and seconded by Borland to approve the amended agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes from the meeting of October 12, 2012

Motion by Switzer and seconded by Bussell to approve the minutes. Two corrections were made to the attendance list, and Stoops identified a typographical error on line 56. The minutes were approved unanimously with the recommended corrections.

Announcements

- Switzer – The new StARS website is up and running, and early registration is open. The symposium will be held April 11 & 12, 2013.

- Ahmad – Next Sunday November 4, there will be a campus event called “tie a yellow ribbon” to commemorate veteran’s day. Everyone is encouraged to participate with SGA and the Chancellor.
• Szabo – Thanked faculty for working around scheduling conflicts to allow students to attend the recent scholarship luncheon, where donors and students get a chance to meet. There were over 280 attendees.

**Reports:**

**Chair – L. Fisher**

Upcoming events – Provost Pardie and Aaron Shures have been preparing a presentation on the budget for the November 9<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting. Also upcoming, VCSA Dr. Barnett has been invited to talk with Senators about new packaging choices in financial aid. Finally, The BOT has proposed an amendment to the statutes to review the chancellor titles and change from Vice-President and Chancellor to Chancellor and Vice-President, and USC will forward the amendment to Senates for discussion and comment.

Fisher asserted that space exists on the agenda over the next several meetings, giving the senate an opportunity to address other issues. Senators are invited to suggest items of business that should be taken up by the Senate as a whole.

The USC adopted a new committee structure that is intended to increase communication between the USC and the BOT. Villegas is on the subcommittee for health affairs; Fisher is on the subcommittee for academic affairs as well as the statutes and governance subcommittee; and Peter Boltuc is chair of the budget subcommittee.

**Provost – L. Pardie**

The Wepner symposium was held last week. It was a wonderful event with outstanding speakers. The Provost also attended the scholarship luncheon and was very impressed with the students. Pardie also expressed deep appreciation to those faculty members who are participating in preparations for the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting here at UIS.

**Committee on Committees – K. Jamison**

Chair mentioned that we still have several vacancies on committees. Jamison reported that Te-Wei Wang (MIS) has agreed to serve as chair of the Committee on Diversity, Equal Rights, Opportunity, and Access. Fisher also noted that SEC has started posting an agenda for their meetings on the Senate webpage. The agenda is linked to the meeting date.

**University Senates Conference Report – J. Villegas**

Villegas highlighted some points from the report. Especially interesting were the discussions of large trends such as funding issues and diversity. The conference also spent a good deal of time discussing the Chicago campus. This is important as a large portion of total University funding is devoted to the health center. There was also discussion of issues related to shared governance and collective bargaining. Villegas encouraged senators to read the report, especially information concerning UI Labs.

Boltuc invited feedback from senators on UI Labs so that the UIS delegation can present opinions from the entire campus. Villegas explained that UI Labs will be a research center centered mostly in Chicago and will be independent of the University. There will be an agreement between UI Labs and the University. Any research that cannot be done by the University may be done at UI Labs. One consideration is the issue of academic freedom, and making sound decisions free from financial manipulation by industry. Bussell and Transue asked questions about the mission of UI Labs and the level of opportunity for UIS to participate. Villegas responded that there is no specific structure yet for UI
Labs. He and Fisher suggested inviting Vice-President Schook to a meeting to explain and answer questions.

Ahmad asked about student representation on the USC. Fisher responded that student representation would require a change in the statutes. She said that currently, the USC is at the top of the shared governance structure. Martin noted that there is student representation on BOT, though no faculty.

**Student Government Association – A. Mulvey**
SGA went to a conference in Chicago last weekend and came back with a lot of good ideas. SGA plans on voting on a resolution concerning library assessment fees at the next meeting. Yesterday the e-board from the service fees committee met and they will forward their decision to Dr. Barnett by Monday. There was good turnout for “Chimichangas with the Chancellor” and it is hoped the next event will be cheesecake with the Chancellor.

**Graduate Council – Advice to Admissions Office: Second MA with Same Title.**
Fisher explained that the GC has recommended that it is possible to have two Masters Degrees with the same title if the degrees are substantively different. GC would like the decision to be made by the graduate department rather than the admissions office. Stoops read a statement from L. Atkinson from the Admissions office expressing concern about the recommendation.

Fisher stated that duplicate degrees from UIS would not be acceptable, per the GC report. Bussell, Boltuc, Kline, and Li all expressed support for the Graduate Council’s decision and believe that decisions should rest within the department rather than admissions. Fisher pointed out that this item was for the information of the Senate and did not necessarily require a response. Bussell, citing Atkinson’s concern, questioned the disposition of the item. Hua Chen, representing Graduate Council, explained that the admissions office had requested Graduate Council to develop a policy. Our sister campuses have similar policies, which is what this is based on. The Graduate Council considers this their final position. Stoops suggested she could get some clarification from Atkinson on what the admission and registration issues she sees might be. Fisher noted that administrative issues arising out of the implementation of this policy are a separate issue. Cornell noted that when admissions came to Graduate Council with this question it was understood that this is a rare occurrence.

On Fisher’s suggestion that the senate could endorse this proposal, Martin responded that he would not participate in such a vote as it would infringe on the independence of the GC and UGC. Fisher said the Senate does not ordinarily make a response to reports and she was suggesting simply applauding the report and not changing it in any way. Boltuc said that this raises a broader issue for the Senate, namely what jurisdiction the Senate holds over the various committees, which is not on the agenda for today. Fisher agreed and withdrew her suggestion for endorsement and reiterated that the structure of the Senate is such that this proposal came as a report and if there are questions they can be sent to Graduate Council. The Senate regards this as the final action but there may be questions arising from implementation of this policy on the administrative end. Boltuc asked that the minutes reflect that it is the Senates understanding that Graduate Council has the final word on this decision.

**Undergraduate Advising Task Force: Implementation Team Progress Report – K. Moranski**

Fisher explained that the undergraduate advising task force was convened by the Campus Senate in the fall of 2010; it gave a final report in April of 2011 with several recommendations. A subset of that initial task force continued to act as an implementation team. The goal of this process was to make undergraduate advising efficient and effective. Moranski said college Deans began dealing with these
recommendations at the college level. Last year an effort was made to align the college plans and the UATF recommendations to create a coherent process for moving forward with changes to advising. This is a long and detailed report and there are no quick and easy fixes at a high level. These are issues that need to be addressed with individual students and individual advisors. UIS has been addressing student concerns and improving the advisement of students. Some of the initiatives have gotten bogged down in technological issues. We are working through complications that arose when trying to use Banner to send letters to students and advising reports to departments. Student satisfaction with advising also continues to be assessed. A student satisfaction survey is being conducted this fall. Moranski urged senators to encourage their students to complete this survey.

Over the last two years UIS has implemented Starfish, an early alert system that allows faculty to connect with students and other faculty more easily and document the way they go about advising. We have had a number of faculty development workshops on using Starfish, and there are some very exciting departmental pilot programs. There is great potential to improve communication among faculty and professional advisors and also between faculty and students regarding advising matters. The UATF recommended additional staff, in particular professional advising staff and an advising director. There are at present two searches for three advisors underway and a search for an advising director is beginning. We are also moving forward with an academic success center that will coordinate services that have previously been spread around campus. This will take some time to implement, but it should help advising as well as graduation and retention rates.

Fisher said she would like the Senate to think about this discussion in governance terms. In Senate Executive Committee the suggestion was made that some of these issues could be taken up in CARR or other senate committees. Fisher then invited questions for Moranski. Boltuc said that based on conversations he has had with colleagues from his college, the need for advanced advising seems to come largely from very intricate general education curriculum. One of the goals of the current general education curriculum was to enhance diversity issues. If we are struggling to staff programs such as African American Studies and Women and Gender Studies then maybe we are failing in that goal. Boltuc continued by saying that advising has always been a part of faculty duties and he would rather see resources devoted to hiring additional faculty rather than an advising director. He said it is appropriate for the senate to look at this issue as it has arisen out of governance decisions to expand the general education curriculum.

Fisher said Boltuc had raised some important points, but there was a full agenda, and the senate could identify points that go beyond the current report. She wanted to keep the discussion focused on the current report. Martin, in a point of clarification, said that at lower division we are bound by IAI, and that is not something we control at this time. Martin agreed that assessment is important and noted that the General Education Council (GECO) has had assessment on their agenda for a long time. Lastly, Martin suggested that simplification of the general education curriculum is under discussion in GECO. Fisher disagreed that advising issues are arising out of the complexity of our general education curriculum. She spoke of the increasing complexity of our student body since 2001. She agreed that budgetary allocation in times of financial restraint is something the senate should discuss.

Bussell agreed that the issue is what our students need, and asked about the coordination between the advising center and the departments. Moranski responded that UATF recommended a team approach, and that should work on a variety of levels, including between the advising center and faculty. Last year the decision was made to move sophomore advising out of the advising center and into the colleges in an effort to improve retention. This would allow the departments to advise students on the requirements of the major at an earlier level. The complication arises out of those student not having completed all of their general education requirements. There is especially an issue with transfer students. Moranski said we
should continue working on the transition from the advising center to the department, making sure that the department has all the information needed to advise the student. It is the sophomore and junior year that we lose most of our students, so that is the area where we need to work on advising. Bussell said the main issue for her department is determining the initial point of contact for transfer students. The initial entry point can be chaotic. Once they are in the department and have been assigned an advisor, the process works. Borland agreed that transition is key. She also asked if the advising center was using Starfish, as it is a great tool and would help with transition into the department. Borland also asked how faculty would be evaluated is terms of advising. Moranski responded that there may be differences among the colleges in how they go about assessing, evaluating and documenting advising. While there is a campus wide effort to improve advising this is a ground up process and the different colleges and departments are encouraged to find what works best for them. Borland asked how we would know when faculty are not advising as they should. Moranski said we are still working through this and we do not at present have one single instrument for evaluating faculty advising. We are letting faculty work on evaluation processes.

Pardie said this discussion is helpful and the various points of view can only make what we do better. She said it comes down to whether faculty are willing to give feedback to colleagues when they are not doing what the department or college expects. These are hard conversations to have, but emphasized departmental responsibility and power to work collegially with each other. There is much to be said for faculty retaining ownership of this and leaving as much flexibility as we can for different departments and different disciplines to figure out what works best for them.

There was additional discussion by Martin and Boltuc about resource allocation and whether funds should be spent on financial aid, advising, or additional faculty and academic programs. Pardie wanted to highlight how well UIS does with retention and graduation rates, as compared to other institutions. Although UIS is doing well, we can always make improvements. Moranski agreed and noted the importance of retaining sophomore and junior level students. Each student who stays, allows increased funding for programming and faculty.

Fisher suggested the Senate seek advice on this report by forwarding the report to Committee on Admissions, Recruitment and Retention (CARR) and the Committee on Assessment of Student Learning (CASL).

Moranski said UIS will be coming up for re-accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission in 2017-18 and we have chosen the open pathway to re-accreditation and what that means in part is that we needed to identify a quality initiative. An assessment of general education has been the project that we are identifying as being central to the campus at this point. We will be participating in the Higher Learning Commission’s assessment academy.

Fisher asked how the assessment of general education issue was chosen, given that at our last accreditation review the Higher Learning Commission report was complimentary about our general education and pointed more to faculty development and campus climate as areas to work on. Moranski said we have not identified that choice officially at this point but remember that it was 2007 when they came and there was no data to assess as general education was just beginning. Given the new criteria that the Higher Learning Commission has posted since that time we know that assessment of student learning outcomes is going to be a huge issue in the upcoming review cycle. Martin noted that this was also an issue with the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

Fisher thanked Moranski and the whole implementation team for their efforts.
Old Business

Resolution 42-6, Clarification of Personnel Operating Procedures [second reading]
There was a second reading of resolution 42-6, clarification of personnel operating procedures. This item was unmodified from last discussion. Agarwal moved to consider the resolution; Dell seconded. There were no objections to considering the motion. Fisher provided an overview of the resolution. She stated that this will provide departments and colleges an opportunity to allow non-tenure track faculty to participate in promotion decisions, as necessary. She provided some examples and noted the importance for small departments to have adequate representation in deliberations. After a brief reiteration of what the resolution entails, the resolution passed. There was one nay vote with Villegas, Owusu-Ansah, and Stoops abstaining.

Resolution 42-7, Doctoral Closure Guidelines [second reading]
Fisher asked for a motion to consider resolution 42-7. Villegas moved; McCaughan seconded. There were no objections to considering the motion. Fisher introduced Chen, representing the GC, and Transue and Ruez, who teach in the doctoral program. W. Miller was unable to attend. Fisher noted that there were some corrections to this document from the first reading but no substantive changes. Ruez, LaFollette, and Fisher worked on the document to address issues raised by Ruez during the first reading. Fisher identified the corrections and asked for questions or comments about the resolution. There were none. The resolution passed unanimously with no abstentions.

New Business
None

Adjournment
Borland moved to adjourn; Bussell seconded. No objections. Meeting was adjourned at 11:52 a.m.