CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2013/2014
Friday, August 30, 2013
10:00 A.M. – Noon
PAC G


Senators Absent: J. Transue.

Ex-Officio: L. Pardie.

Guests: N. Kahn, C. Cornell, A. Spies, D. Anthony, D. Brown, K. Moranski, B. Geiger, one unidentified guest (printed name and signature illegible.)

L. Fisher called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and welcomed new and returning senators.

Approval of the Agenda
Salela moved to approve the agenda; Ruez seconded; the agenda was approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from May 3, 2013 were reviewed. An amendment to line 57 was proposed by Killam to correct a typographical error. Dell moved to approve the minutes as amended; Li seconded. The minutes were approved.

Announcements
The Chair congratulated Senator Barnett on the birth of his newest family member, Olivia Marie. Salela said the library is setting up orientations for students both on ground and online. More information is available on the Library home page.

Chair Report – L. Fisher
Fisher said it was an honor for her to serve a second year as Chair and to work with the continuing members of the Senate Executive Committee: Vice-Chair Kathy Jamison, Parliamentarian John Transue, Secretary Holly Thompson, as well as new Student Government Association President Aaron Mulvey. Fisher announced that Jorge Villegas from UIS had been elected Chair of the University Senates Conference at their meeting on June 18. Peter Boltuc will be serving a second year as chair of the USC budget committee. Fisher is the third UIS representative to the USC.

The Chair thanked Salela for raising the issue of archiving senate records in the library at the end of last year, and thanked Brian Moore from the senate office for his efforts over the summer to bring the records up to date, and establish a timely transfer of senate records to the official university archives. Fisher invited senators to make suggestions about items of business that the SEC or Senate might consider in the
The Chair also mentioned recent speeches by President Obama that have focused on the Higher Education Scorecard and student loan debt, leading her to want to learn more about student loan debt here at UIS. In closing, the Chair welcomed Senators to the new year and asked that Senators email her in the event that they will be absent from a meeting. According to Senate by-laws, faculty Senators who miss three meetings in a semester will have their seats declared as vacant. There are special arrangements for student, CSAC, and AP Senators. Proxies for faculty Senators are not allowed under the by-laws. The Open Meetings Act allows for participation by electronic means only if rules are in place beforehand, and still requires a quorum be physically present. Currently, we have no such language allowing Senators to participate electronically.

**Provost Report – L. Pardie**

The Provost provided a Fall enrollment update, indicating that undergraduate head count was on a par with last year at this time, with undergraduate credit hours up slightly. Graduate head count was up by about 95 students, with credit hours being about 1000 ahead of where they were last year. Freshmen head count is at 330, an 18% increase. Transfer registrations for online students are up by about 6%, while on-ground transfer registrations are down by about 4.5%. Overall, we are up in head count and credit hours by about 2%. These are not final numbers as the census date has not passed but it looks very promising. Last year, the VCAA ran an internal and external search for an Associate Vice-Chancellor for Graduate Education and Research. The search was unsuccessful. The Provost said the position has been split somewhat and an internal search is now underway for an Associate Vice-Chancellor for Graduate Education. Ranjan Karri is chairing the search committee. The position has been posted and will be open for applications for about another week. A successful search was conducted for a new Assistant Director.
in the office of Research Administration, formerly the Grants and Contracts Coordinator. The new title of Assistant Director of Pre-Award Grants, Contracts and Research Administration more closely reflects the duties that the person in that position has been asked to perform. Kathleen Furr will be coming to UIS from Doha, Qatar, where she has been working for the Texas A&M University. We are hoping she will be on board by October 31.

Provost reported that we are moving forward with plans to administratively reorganize several academic support units into a consolidated Center for Academic Success. The goals are to make academic support services more visible on campus and to promote those services for all of the students at UIS. The reorganization will capitalize on synergies among those units involved; including, the Center for Undergraduate Advising, the Center for Teaching and Learning, a new Testing and Learning Center, the Intensive English Program, and Experiential and Service Learning. We also hope to include the part of International Programs that has to do with study abroad. We would like to have all of these programs located in the Brookens building and capitalize on synergies among those units and also make the most cost effective use of our existing administrative resources in delivering those services. AVC Karen Moranski and Dean James Ermatinger have been looking at various models over the past year and have developed an organizational plan for the center. Feedback has been solicited from unit staff as well as University Administration and the Senate Executive Committee.

Other activities Academic Affairs will be working on this year include assembling an internal team that will be working on gathering data on an on-going basis for the Higher Learning Commission Accreditation process. Work is continuing with the New Academic Task-Force. Programs selected last year are in the development stage and the task-force will begin to identify the next set of programs that we might be well advised to implement. As was mentioned at Convocation, we have completed and submitted a strategic planning initiative outlining our priority areas for the next three years. It was gratifying to look back at our last strategic plan in 2006 and realize how many of the goals from that plan have been achieved. Our mission continues to be to provide an intellectually rich, collaborative, and intimate learning environment for students, faculty, and staff, while serving local, state, regional, and national and international communities. Our vision continues to be that of a premier public university offering innovative high quality liberal arts education, public affairs activities and special programs dedicated to academic excellence, enriching individual lives and making a difference in the world. We offer a teaching focused academic experience, an abundance of opportunities for faculty, staff and students to collaborate in the service of educational goals. We offer what has become known as a right-sized supportive community, and we have a special emphasis on public affairs and global citizenship. If we are to continue to make progress relative to our strategic plan, we need to focus on three fundamental things: enrollment growth, talent acquisition, and facilities. The strategic planning update is available for viewing on the UIS website, listed in the A-Z index.

Kline added that last semester the ESL program worked with the Saudi mission in Washington, D.C. because Saudi students are not allowed to go to programs or Universities that are not on an approved list. The ESL program and UIS are now on the approved list and we have our first six Saudi students. Martin asked how many of the new graduate students enrolled were Computer Science students. The Provost said as of last Monday there were 86 new graduate students and 65 new online graduate students in Computer Science.

**Student Government Association – A. Mulvey**

Student government has been hard at work over the summer, with members meeting multiple times to discuss a variety of issues. The first meeting of the semester was this past Sunday, and a resolution was passed to have monthly town hall meetings. The first town hall was this past Monday and was well
attended. Many students picked up candidate packets for the upcoming SGA election. The recent involvement expo went well and Mulvey thanked everyone for their help at that event.

**BOT Meeting Report – K. Jamison, J. Villegas**

Villegas said the July meeting involved a retreat that was mostly concerned with the Health System. The Health System is important to the University as a whole because of the resources involved in that particular enterprise. There are changes coming to the structure of that particular unit. The meeting itself is covered in the report attached to the senate agenda. Villegas offered to answer any particular questions about the meeting. Fisher announced that UIS student Jamaal Hollins was seated as a student member to the BOT at the July meeting.

**New Business**

**Resolution 43-1 Proposed Revisions to the Statutes [1st Reading]**

This proposal is to amend the statutes to allow for amendments to the statutes to come not only from a UI Senate, but also from the Senates Conference. Fisher said the USC has done this before, so there is a precedent for the USC proposing amendments, but it is not spelled out as a process in the Statutes. The language identifies a process that would be similar to when one of the three campuses proposes a change, where it would come from the USC and then through the three campuses and back to USC. Kline said he was concerned that if there wasn’t a process for the USC proposing an amendment to the Statutes that they did it anyway and secondly that though the process for a USC proposed amendment is exactly the same as if a particular campus made a proposal, the perception is not the same. Since the USC is a representative body composed of members from all three campuses the perception is that a proposal coming from the USC has already been agreed on by the three campuses. So while it looks like something coming from the USC represents all three campuses that may not always be the case. Kline said he does not think that this necessarily presents a conflict, but he does not think that this is a good way to propose statutes.

Martin said the proposal seems extraneous but he is open to hearing a scenario where this might happen. Boltuc said there are two ways of viewing USC. One is as a body composed of representatives of the three campuses, but they also have a role in working directly with the central administration where there is a certain level of access and understanding that is not directly available to the senators. Boltuc said he shares some of the concerns and reservations about this proposal, but any resolution from USC would still have to come to the individual senates for approval. He recommended the Senate support the proposal since UIS or any campus can always vote against any USC proposal. There may be pragmatic reasons of benefit to the whole university for a proposal to be generated within the USC. Predmore asked what the situation was in which things did proceed in this manner. Fisher apologized for not having details but she would email senators with the specifics. Fisher said one of the key issues here is a shift in emphasis where the USC would be in some cases viewing itself as a senate, but it is important to remember that its position in the governance system is different than the senates. The USC does have a responsibility to look at university-wide issues and to encourage communication between the three senates, but the senates themselves are the statutory legislative bodies. Kline said it is possible that good things could come from this, but it is also possible for the opposite to happen. Since the USC is dominated by UIUC, it may be easier for UIUC to generate a proposal from within the USC than from within their own senate. He was not suggesting they bear ill will, but the proposal as is, lacks checks on the USC. Martin said whenever a change in statutes is proposed Senators should consider how it would affect things if in the minority.

**Resolution 43-2 Clarification of Post-Tenure review Appeal Procedures [1st reading]**

Deborah Anthony, Chair of PPC, said this is related to resolution 41-25 that was passed in 2011, involving a shift in how the Post Tenure Review Committees were structured. This resolution involves removing one sentence from line 42 and 43 that may be interpreted to suggest that there is an appeal of
sabbatical decisions. This resolution moves that sentence to article 13 where it discusses tenure review appeals.

**Resolution 43-3 Modification of Procedures for Filling Campus-Level Committee Vacancies [1st reading]**

Anthony said this resolution creates a policy that addresses what should be done when there are vacancies on campus level Personnel Committees during the academic year. The policy is vague and somewhat confusing. The PPC added some clearer timelines in terms of what would be an appropriate time frame to hold an election, which would be more than three weeks before work is set to begin. The resolution also makes allowances for special circumstances where the SEC, in consultation with the Provost, would suggest two eligible faculty and the representative would be chosen by lot. The new policy also states that if there are fewer than three days before work is set to begin, there would be no replacement. Kline asked if there would be a situation such as a medical leave where a replacement could be named. Anthony said it is important to have consistency on the committee membership because of the large importance of the duties that they are taking on, and having a replacement could be problematic because you would end up with a new person joining the committee after deliberations have taken place. Fisher said this is just for Campus Personnel Committees whose work is usually conducted over a relatively brief time frame. After additional discussion, Anthony said she would go through the resolution to see if language could be clarified as to what committees are affected and when the actual committee work commences, as determined by the academic calendar.

**Resolution 43-4 Modification of Personnel Committee Operating Procedures – Voting Members Defined [1st reading]**

Anthony said this is related to an issue that could potentially come up in a small department when one or more of its faculty members are on sabbatical or some other type of leave, which could raise quorum problems. The policy states that deliberation and voting can only occur when a majority of all committee members are present. We are simply stating here that faculty who are on sabbatical or other leave need not count as a voting committee member so departments can conduct their reviews without being prohibited from doing so because of a lack of quorum. There was some discussion as to whether a person on sabbatical or other leave could choose to participate on a committee. The Provost said the committee may want to revisit this and make a distinction between paid and unpaid leave. Thompson said the emphasis in this resolution was on clarifying that if someone is going to be voting it is important that they be engaged in the entire process. There was agreement that the PPC would look at this resolution again before a second reading.

**Resolution 43-5 Clarification of Tenure Rollback Procedures [1st reading]**

Anthony said this is not a substantive change in the process or procedures but an attempt to clarify what has already been going on. There has been some confusion, specifically in terms of when somebody requests a tenure rollback, if they are also able to roll back the dates of their reviews. This resolution clarifies that a rollback may postpone the date of all scheduled reappointment reviews as well as the tenure review date.

**Resolution 43-6 Clarification of Procedures for Application Narrative Modification [1st reading]**

Anthony said this was also a clarification of something that has been existing practice, specifically in that a two year or four year tenure review narrative. Once the Narrative is submitted, no changes or alterations can be made to the Narrative itself. Anything that needs to be edited or clarified has to be done separately in the form of a memo, so that there is consistency in the document.

**Adjournment**

Kline moved to adjourn; Li seconded; the meeting adjourned at 11:40 A.M.