MINUTES
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2011-2012
FRIDAY, October 7, 2011
10:00 A.M. – 12:15 P.M.
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “H”


Ex-Officio: Lynn Pardie

Guests: Deborah Anthony, Marcel Yoder, Aleta Carlberg, Kate Richardson, Barbara Hayler, Cecilia Cornell, Karen Moranski, Rachel Wells, Jay Gilliam, Shawna Nazarian, Megan Waldschmidt, Kim Pate, Ed Wojcicki, Gloria Amos

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

Approval of the Minutes
A motion by Switzer and seconded by Fisher to consider the minutes from the September 23, 2011 Senate meeting was made. The motion to approve the minutes carried unanimously. Salela inquired about the possibility of electronically linking documents handed out in Senate meetings on the Senate website. Ting clarified that reports from Vice Chancellors are not necessarily available beforehand and that there is a concern that the content of the documents may be taken out of context by readers who are not present at the senate meeting. Pardie indicated that it would be possible if the reports included text to contextualize the documents’ content. The turnaround time for something like that would be long. Two minor corrections were indicated by Salela. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Announcements
Wassenberg commented that the Senate very much appreciated the invitation by the Chancellor to attend the Jazz performance at the Lincoln Center. It was a wonderful opportunity both to hear great music as well as to spend time with colleagues.

Reports
Chair- T. Ting

Ting announced that President Hogan will be in Springfield on October 28 for a meeting with IBHE as well as for a Foundation Day at UIS. He would like to meet with the Senate; however, there is no Senate meeting scheduled for that day. One option put forth was to switch the Senate meeting from October 21 to October 28. Another option was to start the Senate meeting earlier. A decision was made to keep the Senate meeting on October 21 at its regularly scheduled time and to schedule a special meeting with President Hogan on October 28.
Ting announced the names of the 16 (out of 20 nominations) faculty members that the SEC put forth to the Chancellor to serve on the VCAA and Provost Search Committee. The 16 names included Harsh Bapat, Beverly Bunch, Jay Gilliam, James Hall, Tena Helton, Kamau Kemayo, Mike Miller, Ted Mims, Don Morris, Laurel Newman, Carolyn Peck, Baker Siddiquee, Peter Shapinsky, Karen Swan, Jon Transue, and Jorge Villegas. It is anticipated that the committee will comprise of 10 faculty members; however, the Chancellor reserves the right to make any final adjustment to the number and makeup of the search committee.

Ting announced that the external review of enrollment management initiated by President Hogan last year has been completed and the final report has been released. The purpose of the review was to identify ways to increase diversity as well as ways to enroll students with higher ACT scores and to attract more nonresident students, more transfer students, and ways to approach a common application. The reviewers also examined branding for University of Illinois to enhance recruitment across all three campuses. Ting announced that she would forward that report to senators. Further, the current dashboard indicators have been released, although this is still a working document. These will be forwarded to senators as well. The USC has put together an ad hoc committee to review the final enrollment management report. The UIS representatives for this committee include Carrie Switzer and Harsh Bapat.

Ting announced that the new ODS Director, Sarah Weaver, started this past week. Vice Chancellor Barnett has also moved forward with the search for the Director of Admissions. Two faculty members serving on the DOA search committee are Kate Sheridan and Shuang-Yueh Pui.

Fisher asked for clarification regarding the ad hoc committee on enrollment management.

Switzer clarified that the USC wanted two members from each of the three campuses on the committee to talk about the enrollment management report as well as the recommendations that are made in the report.

**Provost – L. Pardie**

Pardie did not have a report but wanted to comment on the dashboard indicators. She reiterated that it is a working document, and that there are a couple of errors in the report regarding UIS. She has provided feedback on that. Further, additional indicators are being added. The IBHE peer group for all three campuses was developed last year using statistical analyses. Additional information about the peer group institutions can be found on the campus website.

**Student Government Association - E. Wilson**

Wilson reported that the SGA representatives attended the IBHE-SAC meeting last weekend which included a discussion of performance-based funding. The SGA is developing a memo to send to IBHE regarding student concerns with performance-based funding. Four students have been nominated for the Provost Search committee. The SGA is currently working to prepare for the U of I lobby day on October 26.

Ting asked for additional information on the student position regarding performance-based funding.

Wilson clarified that they are concerned because UIS has a large number of transfer students which may affect funding, potentially resulting in higher student tuition and fees.

Fisher asked for the composition of the Provost search committee.
Ting clarified that the committee will include 19 members including 10 faculty members, 2 students (1 undergrad, 1 grad), 2 AP, 2 civil service, 2 administrators and VC Barnett. However, the Chancellor reserves the right to make any final adjustment.

C. Switzer requested a copy of the memo that the SGA is preparing for the USC to review.

Li sought clarification regarding the performance-based funding. Ting clarified that the changes in state funding take into consideration institutional level metrics and not individual faculty performance per se.

Martin added that what performance-based funding is about is not yet clear and that UIS wants to be involved to influence those decisions about what metrics will be used.

Pardie indicated that the administration is also tracking this very closely.

**Athletic Director - Kim Pate**

Pate reported that she was thankful for the opportunity to introduce herself to senators and to report on her vision and goals for UIS athletics. During her first two months at UIS, Pate has spent time meeting with various constituencies to better understand the culture and the priorities for athletics at UIS. Her goal is to build consensus and to have transparency in the decisions regarding athletics. She has also met with people in the community. She has conducted workshops to orient student athletes to campus as well as to the Springfield community. She has finalized goals for the upcoming year including gaining an understanding of the budget and the fiscal position of the athletic department to make sure that the goals moving forward are sustainable. Along with the IAC and an external consultant she will be working to develop a five-year strategic plan. She will also be working to develop internal operating systems such as policy and procedures, a business and finance compliance manual, and a revision to the student athlete handbook.

Additionally, she aims to reinvigorate the booster club and the marketing strategy. Part of the game of the booster club is to connect with the community. A final goal is to assess the organizational structure and roles and responsibilities of personnel.

Martin asked for clarification regarding Director Pate’s definition of competitiveness.

Pate clarified that competitive means winning as well as having programs that are successful.

**BOT Report- C. Switzer**

Fisher asked what the UIS priorities are that were mentioned in the BOT report.

Switzer clarified that the dashboard indicators include student access and enrollment, student outcomes, tuition and financial aid, faculty and scholarship, and financial indicators.

Martin added that not every campus has the same indicators.

Fisher commented that the University is looking at its performance at the same time that IBHE is looking at performance-based funding. She asked if this was perceived as an opportunity to present a message regarding what might be included in performance-based funding.

Ting indicated that the review of performance indicators was coming from the Board of Trustees and that perhaps President Hogan could speak to this further when he visits.
Pardie indicated that looking at dashboard indicators is a process and that there are many ways of looking at different institutions. She clarified that dashboard indicators are rather abstract and that campus level decision-making requires more detailed information. The senators discussed whether or not dashboard indicators were seen as a measure of performance of individual colleges and universities and whether or not factors included in rankings such as U.S. News & World Report should be included. Pardie commented that there will be plenty of opportunities for input into this process by colleges and universities.

Kline asked as to whether or not UIS students and faculty will have an opportunity to present UIS to the Board of Trustees.

Ting clarified that the BOT meeting on December 2 will be hosted by UIS and at that point we will have the opportunity to make reports and have student involvement.

**Old Business**

**Resolution 41-15 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 9 -- Request for Reallocation of Faculty Duties [2nd reading]**

A motion by Garmil and seconded by Wilson to consider Resolution 41-15 was made. No questions or discussion. The resolution passed unanimously.

**Resolution 41-16 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 5 & 7 -- Campus Service for Terminal Contract Faculty [2nd reading]**

A motion by Ballard and seconded by Salela to consider Resolution 41-16 was made. No questions or discussion. The resolution passed unanimously.

**Resolution 41-17 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 2 -- Clarification of Personnel Committee Operating Procedures [2nd reading]**

A motion by Kline and seconded by Bussell to consider Resolution 41-17 was made. Ting reported that she had not received any language regarding potential changes to this resolution as discussed at the last Senate meeting. Bussell indicated that she would like to see further discussion on this resolution.

Helton read her opinion regarding the resolution from her typed notes. She indicated a belief that the policy as set forth in this resolution is ambiguous at best. She will not support this resolution as it currently stands.

Fisher broadly agreed with T. Helton’s comments. She commented that it may be that current policy is not specific enough or that they are not being consistently and actively followed. It is critical that personnel committee letters are transparent and well documented.

Anthony clarified that the committee’s goal was to clarify policy so that personnel committee letters regarding faculty decisions were well-documented.

Garmil commented that he felt the policy is clear in regards to what information can be used in decisions regarding promotion and tenure. He can see both positions, he would rather see something put in place
where personnel committees have preliminary meetings to make decisions about whether or not something needs to be documented.

Bussell commented that personal knowledge is part of the process. The letter that comes out of personnel committees goes into the personnel file, so the issue is that that document needs to be transparent.

Helton commented that we have a multilayered process and that we might be quibbling about what is meant by documentation- we are talking about documentation going into the personnel file as well as the fact that the personnel committee letter is documentation as well. Documentation that is unclear means that the candidate doesn't have anything to respond to and that that is an issue that should be taken up in policy.

Martin commented it is important to protect the individual. He is trying to figure out the best way to ensure this. He needs more time to think about how to achieve this.

Kline commented that there is federal law to protect retaliatory action against whistleblowers. The sentence in the resolution that reads, “deliberations shall be based solely upon applicable criteria” can be interpreted to mean that the deliberations and the voting need not be based on the same criteria.

Garmil clarified that he is really only concerned with the tenure application at year six. At the 2 and 4 year review, there may be more room for a wide variety of discussion.

Anthony stated that there is a need for clarification because the policy is being interpreted in varying ways across campus and that policy needs to be clearer to support consistency in personnel decisions.

Salela commented that deliberations in personnel committees also focus on material in the file. So there is an additional question as to whether or not the documentation is suspect.

Kline added that other senates also have judicial bodies charged with interpreting language and that this resolution may be trying to do too much by both stating policy and interpreting policy by statute.

Fisher commented that departments and personnel committees have a responsibility to better understand policy to ensure better consistency in its application to personnel decisions. We may not want to change by statute something that may be an issue of practice.

Wassenberg clarified that, at the college level, Deans usually e-mail the chair of the PPC and the Provost for an authoritative interpretation of personnel policies.

Ting clarified the need for clear policy regarding personnel deliberations and added that even an authoritative interpretation of policies will vary according to whoever is currently the chair of the PPC and Provost. She reminded senators of the nature of last year's resolution regarding the use of first-hand direct knowledge in tenure and reappointment decisions and that the previous resolution was voted down. She wondered if it’s even appropriate to bring back last year's resolution should the current resolution be voted down.

Kline pointed out that this was the second resolution in the current Senate that was voted down based in part because of a previous Senate’s decision to vote down a resolution. Because this current body has different membership, it may be beneficial to revisit the previous resolution from last year.

Case Pease likened the resolution to her experience in EAP. She mentioned the idea of progressive discipline which allowed for communication of issues that needed to be addressed at the time that those
issues arose. She wondered if the personnel decision-making process could include something to that
effect.

Wassenberg also could empathize with both positions, but in her opinion the worst thing to do would be
to continue with the language that is currently in the policy because it is being differentially interpreted.

Fisher agreed with Garmil regarding the importance of providing faculty with feedback at the two and
four year review periods. She commented on the importance of consistently applying policy particularly
in the instance of non-reappointment.

Pardie clarified that the issue is about whether or not personal knowledge can be discussed at the
department level during the review process. She also reminded senators that it is a multi step process, and
that the purpose of a personnel committee letter is to provide the candidate with an opportunity to clarify.

Ting called for a vote on Resolution 41-17. The resolution was defeated with 5 yes votes, 11 no votes,
and 6 abstentions (Wassenberg, Sisneros, Schuldt, Simo, Bouray, and Wilson).

Sisneros recommended a workshop focusing specifically on the use of direct knowledge and
documentation and personnel process.

Ting asked the PPC to review the resolution from last year and to bring forth a new resolution that takes
into account feedback from last year's senators.

Helton commented that the current resolution had clear language compared to last year's resolution and
was easier to vote on for that reason.

Kline recommended that the PPC bring forth a new resolution with mild modifications and then allow
senators to discuss it at the first reading.

Ting moved senate to executive session for the next item. The motion was seconded by J. Martin.

Adjournment

A motion made by Bussell and seconded by Wilson to adjourn carried with unanimous support and the
meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.