MINUTES
CAMPUSSenate Meeting
AY 2011-2012
FRIDAY, November 4, 2011
10:00 A.M. – 12:18 P.M.
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “G”


Senators Absent: W. Kline, P. Boltuc, D. Ruez, S. Miller

Ex-Officio: Lynn Pardie


Approval of the Agenda
The meeting was called to order by T. Ting at 10:00 a.m. A motion to approve the agenda made by J. Villegas and seconded by X. Li carried unanimously.

Approval of the Minutes
A motion to approve the minutes from the October 21, 2011 Senate meeting was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by C. Switzer. The motion to approve the minutes carried unanimously. Minor corrections were indicated by T. Helton and D. Schuldt.

Announcements
T. Ting announced that the week of November 7-11 is the 4th Annual Sustainability Week to include many activities dedicated to Sustainability education. On November 7th, there will be an electronic recycling event in Parking Lot E. On November 8th, there will be a viewing and discussion regarding the film, Green Fire: Aldo Leopold and a Land Ethic for Our Time in Brookens Auditorium at 7 pm.

T. Ting announced Chancellor Koch made a personal contribution of $25,000 to kickoff the Access Illinois student scholarship initiative. She inquired as to whether or not senators would endorse the SEC looking into ways that UIS Senate might also contribute to this initiative by endorsing or encouraging campus community giving. One approach would be to have a letter sent from the UIS Senate to the campus community identifying a goal of $2500 and encouraging members of the campus community to contribute. It is more about raising awareness and encouraging participation however. The Senate endorsed the idea of exploring with the development office.

R. Garmil announced there will be two more performances of I hate Hamlet by the UIS Theatre group tonight and tomorrow night.

D. Bussell announced a significant endowment was made by a former student to English department.

P. Salela announced that the library is conducting a series of drop-in workshops for students both at the library and online. She encouraged faculty to have their students check into it and perhaps to give class credit for attendance.
J. Villega reminded Senators to complete the Climate Survey and to remind students to complete the survey as well.

D. Schuldt announced that the Center for State Policy and Leadership is hosting two faculty research forums for faculty who received funding from the Center for their research to present their research findings. These will be held November 17th and 29th at 1:30 in PAC G.

Provost Pardie announced a faculty workshop on student perceptions of teaching at UIS to be held November 18, 1:00-2:30 in UHB 2034.

Reports

Chair - T. Ting

T. Ting reported that the Chancellor has announced the membership of the search committee for the VCAA & Provost position. Professor Mike Miller chairs the search committee. The committee includes Tom Ambrose (AP), Harsh Bapat (faculty), Tim Barnett (administrator), Karen Brewer (CS), Beverly Bunch (faculty), Tammy Craig (AP), Clarice Ford (administrator), Jay Gilliam (faculty), James Hall (faculty), Kemau Kemayo (faculty), Michael Miller (faculty), Ted Mims (faculty), Sheryl Murray (CS), Laurel Newman (faculty), Jeremy Nelson (graduate student), Carolyn Peck (faculty), Aaron Shures (administrator), Karen Swan (faculty), Jorge Villegas (faculty), Pinky Wassenberg (Dean), Shonda White (undergraduate student).

Provost – L. Pardie

The Provost’s office is tracking the registration report. While it is still very early, so far registration numbers are looking good. She encouraged faculty to have discussions with their department to ensure the availability of faculty to answer questions from potential transfer students and prospective applicants. It is important that we are doing everything that we can be doing to ensure registrations.

L. Fisher asked if there has been a specific percentage of the budget to be set aside in the event there will be budget rescissions in the remainder of the academic year.

L. Pardie responded that no set percentage has been identified and that there will likely be several scenarios identified by U of I administrators and several plans to respond to each of the scenarios. She clarified that reserves were produced and left-over from last year, as the amount projected to be cut in the funding from the State were not as deep as anticipated.

Student Government Association - E. Wilson

E. Wilson reported a successful Lobby Day at the State Capital. The SGA was able to speak with several Senators. At Lobby Day, E. Wilson was able to speak with the UIUC SGA president, who is very receptive to the idea of a university-wide SGA dialogue. No topics for the agenda have been identified. Finally, the SGA has planned an event, Chocolate with the Chancellor, to be held Sunday evening beginning at 9:30.

Old Business

Resolution 41-19 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 10 – Modification of Scholar in Residence

Title [2nd reading]
A motion to consider Resolution 41-19 was made by J. Martin and was seconded by D. Ballard. There was no discussion and the Resolution carried with unanimous support.

**Resolution 41-20 Definitions of Majors, Minors, and Concentrations at the Undergraduate Level [2nd reading]**

A motion to consider Resolution 41-20 was made by J. Villegas and was seconded by T. Helton. A motion for a friendly amendment was made by R. Garmil and was seconded by J. Villegas. The amendment includes the following language; whereas the Bylaws of the Senate give the Undergraduate Council is charged with reviewing, evaluating and facilitating development of academic standards for undergraduate programs. The Resolution carried with unanimous support.

**New Business**

**Resolution 41-21 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 5, 6 & 7 - Clarification of Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Application Procedures [1st reading]**

A motion to consider Resolution 41-21 was made by X. Li and was seconded by C. Switzer.

D. Anthony explained that this resolution came about due to inconsistencies in policy the exact procedures for faculty applying for reappointment, both at tenure and reappointment. This resolution clarifies that faculty must submit materials to the department, into the personnel file, and to the Dean. Failure to submit to the Dean is not grounds for waiving the right to apply for promotion. Further, the resolution clarifies that the materials need to go to the chair of the committee. These changes apply to all three levels of review.

**Resolution 41-22 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 3 & 9 (Appendix 10) - Clarification of Faculty Advising Responsibilities [1st reading]**

A motion to consider Resolution 41-22 was made by T. Helton and was seconded by R. Garmil.

D. Anthony explains the resolution is in response to the Undergraduate Advising Task Force which recommended changes in how advising is done at UIS. Changes proposed in this resolution clarify and strengthen the language in the Faculty Personnel Policy we have now and recognize the importance of advising to the success of students. This resolution incorporates suggestions and recommendations for faculty to document their advising tasks in the process of performance/reappointment/tenure/promotion review.

T. Ting reminded Senators that the Task Forces’ report indicated a need for language which clarifies faculty responsibilities for advising. This resolution is a direct response to those recommendations.

K. Moranski added that another recommendation of the Task Force was the development of an instrument for students to use in evaluation of advising. The task force is continuing to work on developing the instrument and it should be ready for the Senate to review in the upcoming weeks.

J. Villegas asked if it would be appropriate to wait, or table, the discussion on this resolution until we have a clear understanding of what the student evaluation of advising form will look like. In that way, the resolution might include all pertinent information and language regarding the process of advising, as recommended by the task force.
J. Martin and T. Helton agreed that more discussion is needed regarding the content of the evaluation of advising should occur prior to setting forth recommendations regarding the process of advising in policy.

K. Moranski commented that there needs to be agreement about the standards of advising, but that maintaining the status quo is no longer an option. There also needs to be agreement on recommendations for quantitative and qualitative measures of advising performance and effectiveness.

Resolution 41-23 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 2 - Modifications in Personnel Review Procedures [1st reading]

A motion to consider Resolution 41-23 was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by X. Li.

R. Garmil commented that he believes this resolution contradicts language in current policy regarding the personnel file including issues of anonymity, the opportunity for candidates to review the file and asked how things were moved, and others. He believes this is the wrong solution to concerns about first-hand knowledge and retribution.

D. Bussell commented that first-person knowledge is part of the process and can’t be ignored. The problem, in her view, is that this is operating covertly in that there is no explanation in the letter produced by a committee as to the basis of their decision.

J. Martin is concerned that this resolution does nothing to incentivize good practices by committees.

X. Li supports this resolution because it addresses inconsistencies in practice. He supports faculty documenting problems in the personnel file.

T. Helton commented that she is unlikely to document some small thing. However, if a committee is sitting together, they may be likely to talk about their observations, and could say something positive. She believes it is not fair to ask junior faculty to vote on tenure decisions. But because we do that, they deserve extra protections such as not being asked to put something in writing in a file. She also agrees that first-hand knowledge is at the essence of what occurs in personnel committee. She questions the extent of the rationale which should be set forth in the letter produced by a committee regarding their vote and recommendations.

Y. Zhang commented that personnel committees could create documentation as a committee, rather than an individual. This might occur because an individual might hesitate to put their name on negative comments compared to doing this as a group.

K. Sheridan commented that there are too many issues presented in this resolution, making it difficult to vote on. She does not support this resolution. As long as a resolution puts forth language regarding the use of first-hand knowledge, then it must also include language which allows for a candidate to have adequate time to respond to negative perspectives or experiences of faculty.

R. Garmil asked Y. Zhang to clarify if his recommended committee letter would occur prior to the personnel committee review. Y. Zhang clarified that yes it could occur before-hand, but then there might be concern regarding having such documentation removed from the file.

After discussion, it was clarified that there is a process by which any employee can have something removed from their personnel file.

L. Pardie verified this to be true, but that there are very narrow circumstances under which that can occur.
D. Bussell commented it would be beneficial to provide departments with some support regarding how to approach the provision of formative supports for faculty throughout their years in working towards tenure.

A. Sisneros recommended that perhaps direct first-hand knowledge be limited to years 2 and 4 of the reappointment process.

J. Case-Pease is not overtly against first-hand knowledge, she is against it not being documented. There is no reason why it can’t be documented. If in a position to review other faculty, there should be time to consider the whole context of a faculty’s performance and this must include having both first-hand knowledge as well as the candidate’s response to the issue.

Resolution 41-24 Modification to Academic Integrity Policy - Sections III & V [1st reading]

J. Martin moved to table discussion of Resolution 41-24. This motion was seconded by X. Li. The motion carried with 16 yes votes and 1 abstention (D. Bussell). J. Martin moved to extend the meeting for an additional 30 minutes. The motion was seconded by X. Li. A friendly amendment was made by L. Fisher to adjust the time extension to 15 minutes instead of 30 minutes. J. Martin accepted the friendly amendment and the motion carried with 21 yes votes.

Discussion

C. Switzer explained that she is on the USC ad hoc committee for enrollment management and that it would be very helpful to know the senators’ feedback regarding the recommendations set forth in the enrollment management and services report.

P. Salela commented that more focus might be given to diversity, not just in recruitment efforts but in developing a culturally desirable climate. Such a climate would include diversifying the faculty and also making highly visible those courses that we offer that are reflective of the university’s diversity.

J. Villegas commented that the first time he read the report, the recommendations related to diversity seemed predominantly to focus on the Chicago campus.

C. Switzer replied that President Hogan, in a discussion with the USC, made it clear that the Chicago area is not the only campus that he is concerned about in terms of diversity, and that he is just as concerned about the other two campuses.

T. Ting commented that some focus was given to Chicago in the report due to the fact that it is the area that is highly recruited by other colleges and universities looking to diversify their own campuses.

L. Fisher asked to whom do the recommendations of this report go? Who has responsibility for implementing the recommendations?

T. Ting clarified the recommendations go to the Board of Trustees and the responsibility for implementation falls on the president and the vice president for academic affairs.

L. Pardie added that efforts regarding diversifying all three campuses are complicated by questions regarding appropriations from the State of Illinois.
C. Switzer asked Senators to comment specifically on recommendation 17 regarding capitalizing on the University’s brand and recommendation 18 is in regards to consolidating marketing efforts. She asked Senators for their perceptions as to whether or not these recommendations are harmful or a beneficial to UIS.

J. Villegas commented that we need to present ourselves as one university, three campuses. Therefore, he strongly supports the recommendations related to branding and marketing.

L. Fisher agreed that a unified voice is likely to strengthen our position and our financial position at UIS. She suggested ensuring that our distinctive message is heard, especially the perspective of students.

T. Helton was concerned about the recommendation to fill UIS to capacity. She wonders what the details of such a plan would entail. She is concerned that the changes might result in students coming here as a second choice.

T. Ting commented that we do have the capacity to grow.

K. Moranski added that we have already been getting the students that Urbana didn’t want for approximately 10 years. These students are known as UIUC redirects and about 10% of our student body comes to UIS in this way. They do very well at UIS. T. Ting commented that the redirects program has not been working to its best extent possible for UIS to get qualified students. More collaboration between campuses can greatly improve that.

T. Barnett commented that centralizing the processing of student applications might be harmful because we could lose the opportunity to process applications specifically for UIS in a timely manner because of the possibility that greater attention might go to UIUC and UIC applications first. It is critical that we turn around applications in a very short period of time. If the process is centralized, we need to make sure UIS does not get left out.

R. Garmil commented that we should also address on-line and non-traditional students in the enrollment management efforts.

**Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made by J. Martin and was seconded by C. Switzer. The motion carried with unanimous support and the meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.