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Senators Absent: J. Ermatinger.

Ex-Officio: L. Pardie.


L. Fisher called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

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

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from August 30, 2013 were reviewed. McDermott moved to approve the minutes; Dell seconded. Several minor corrections that the Chair had received prior to the meeting were made without objection. Martin wanted the discussion on Resolution 43-1 to reflect his skepticism that the USC could be trusted with this power. The Chair said the recording would be consulted. No other corrections being proposed, the minutes were approved as amended.

Announcements
The Chair said Chancellor Koch has invited Senators to her house for an annual reception for Senate members and guests this evening at 4:30 pm.

Salela said Mango, the new language software tool, has been purchased by the Library and is an active link in the database list.

Chair Report – L. Fisher
Fisher said she and Villegas attended yesterday’s BOT meeting in Urbana. There were not a huge number of voting items on the agenda, but a lot of interesting reports. Fisher was the delegated UIS observer for this meeting. The minutes, as well as any associated reports and documents, are available online. The Chair said any Senator interested in serving as a BOT observer should let her know. The BOT Observer is expected to prepare and file a report of the meeting.

The Chair highlighted two items from the most recent meeting, the first being that VP for Research, Larry Schook, said he plans to spend a day at UIS before the next board meeting, which is in Springfield on
Thursday, November 14. Schook will be here on Wednesday, November 13 and he expressed interest in meeting with faculty and groups on campus to talk about research agendas. He is involved with UI Labs, the new public/private partnership venture, and is eager to get interested faculty from all three campuses involved in some of the projects he is coordinating. The big voting item at the BOT meeting was the approval of this year’s operating budget. VP Pierre gave a budget presentation that is available on the Board’s web page. Overall, the UI is in a solid fiscal condition, and this enabled us to have a meaningful salary program this year. The goal of the budget was to hold down student costs. Direct State appropriations are below 1997 levels, and if adjusted for inflation are below 1966 levels. There is a power-point presentation on the budget available on the BOT website.

Martin said the meaningful salary program came at the expense of department budgets. Helton asked if there was a list of UI Labs projects. Fisher said there was a presentation at yesterday’s board meeting, and she would forward a link to VP Schook’s presentation. Fisher said UI Labs was one of Schook’s projects, but it is not the whole of his activities as a VP. Fisher encouraged faculty to make Schook aware of the importance of undergraduate research or student research in general here at UIS, even if it does not relate to UI Labs. Boltuc said it does not appear that Springfield has had any representation in meetings with VP Schook, and he suggested we promote more involvement from our campus. Pardie said UIS has advanced some campus research priorities and initiatives and we have had some faculty representation working with Dr. Schook’s office, as well as administrative representation. Helton said Dr. Schook had visited UIS several years ago and expressed a desire to work together across all three campuses, but noted the difficulty when we don’t know what everybody else is doing. Helton suggested that a list of research activities across the entire University could promote collaboration.

**Provost Report – L. Pardie**

Jane Treadwell has been chairing a task-force that will be looking at ways to make scholarship on all three campuses more accessible to the public. This could help in identifying areas where we could collaborate with other campuses. Also on the horizon is legislation that suggests that all faculty working for public universities need to make research findings public. There are a lot of implications with regard to copyright and publishing in journals, etc., and the task force will also be considering the impact of that legislation.

The Provost offered congratulations to Dr. Lemke, who recently received a substantial grant from the National Science Foundation for work at Emiquon.

UIS was able to report an increase in our on-campus enrollment, with increases in our online enrollment as well. At this time it looks like the three campuses of the University of Illinois are the only public universities in the state to report increases. The competition for students in Illinois continues to be very intense, with universities in all of our contiguous states also recruiting heavily in Illinois. While we are doing many things right in attracting students, we have to continue to let students know about the quality of education that we offer. We have retained our position as the top regional public university in the state of Illinois, per the U.S. News and World Report rankings. We are fourth best in the Midwest, down from second, in the last rankings. This has to do in part with the way U.S. N&WR is doing the variable around graduation rates. We are looking into that to make sure we understand what those changes are.

Responding to an inquiry from Senator Martin at last meeting, the Provost reported that not quite 26% of our new graduate students are international students. Almost 29% of new graduate students are enrolled in Computer Science, followed closely by Public Administration and Management Information Systems.

The Chair asked about the status of the open access discussions. The Provost said the process was just beginning. The Chair responded the USC will be working on this and trying to find ways to make sure
that standing governance bodies get a chance to learn about the issue and weigh in on this very early in
the process. Kline asked if this would apply to any research conducted on University time, specifically a
book, as publishers would not be interested in work that was available open access. Villegas said that the
University task force was still looking into the matter, and nothing had been decided definitively. He
encouraged anyone with an interest in the matter to offer input on how this might impact faculty. There
was some additional discussion about how faculty might be better informed about open access.

Martin asked the Provost what the most recent retention rate was for first year to second year. The
Provost said retention rate was up several percentage points, and equally important was our graduation
rate. The retention rate for both full and part-time students was about 74%.

Agarwal and Li both commented on the transportation difficulties and safety issues faced by international
students. Mulvey said the SGA is also looking at the transportation issue.

**Student Government Association – A. Mulvey**

Mulvey said interest was very high for the upcoming election, with twenty-three persons running for 11
open positions. Three resolutions concerning SGA by-laws, constitution, and committees were passed at
the last SGA meeting. Ed Wojcicki met with SGA to discuss ideas about building the UIS relationship
with the Springfield community.

**Report on the August Meeting of University Senates Conference – L. Fisher**

The report from Fisher has not been posted, but should be available soon. Fisher said the USC was having
a retreat this coming week at the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum. Villegas said the most important
issue discussed at the August USC meeting was open access.

**Annual Report, General Education Council – S. Schnebly**

Schnebly said the details are within the report, but he wanted to highlight how GECO spent the majority
of their time and effort this past year. He thanked outgoing members Donna Bussell, Pinky Wassenberg,
Harsh Bapat and Peter Shapinsky. They did a wonderful job on the committee and they will be missed.
GECO reviewed a large number of new course proposals, with a vast majority being approved. Schnebly
said as last year’s chair, his primary effort and energy was focused on taking a look at some of the policy
related issues that affect Gen Ed on campus, including trying to clarify and simplify some of the ECCE
criteria. The issue of assessment has been and will continue to be a focus of the committee. The
committee also sees foreign language as an important component of the undergraduate Gen Ed experience
and as a group looked into creating a larger space within the Gen Ed curriculum for foreign language.

Martin said he would like to emphasize, with regard to assessment, that every minor on this campus is
assessed every seven years, but we have never done an assessment of Gen Ed. There is no evidence to
support the statement that ECCE does what it’s supposed to do, and this is a current hole that we should
be concerned with. Helton said there are parts of Gen Ed that have been assessed, in particular,
composition. Fisher said it is important to put this initiative high on our priority list, but also on how to
get it done without putting strain on already overburdened offices. The Provost said that as part of the
Higher Learning Commission reaccreditation there is a different pathway. One of the requirements now
for all institutions is something called a quality initiative. There has been discussion about creating a
quality initiative project specific to the assessment of General Education. The Provost said she
appreciated the work of GECO, and the emphasis being placed on our need to demonstrate learning
outcomes.

Dell asked who would be deciding what issues would be addressed in the quality initiative. The Provost
said Gen Ed makes sense for UIS because it touches all departments and is a foundational component of
our curriculum. There is a steering team working on the assessment issue for the HLC. Harsh Bapat, Tim Barnett, Aleta Carlberg, Laura Dorman, Ann McCaughan, Aaron Shures, Missy Thibodeaux-Thompson, Van Vieregge, and Jorge Villegas are all part of the steering group, and we will be reaching out to get others involved. Dell asked who was currently serving as chair of GECO. Martin responded that there is no chair at present. He requested that the SEC take seriously the appointment of people to committees, as there are three people with no experience serving on this committee.

**Legal Studies Program Review, B.A. and M.A.**

The Chair provided an overview of the Senate’s role in the Program Review process, explaining that the reviews come as informational items from either Graduate or Undergraduate Council. The Senate does not offer advice, but receiving and discussing these items is a valuable opportunity for the Senate to learn about the rigorous program review process and program revision that comes out of the review process. Villegas, speaking on behalf of UGC, said they saw no problems with the program, and were impressed with how much Legal Studies faculty accomplished with limited resources. Elizabeth Kosmetatou, representing Grad Council, said the program was invited to discuss the review and representatives of LES were responsive to questions from GC. The program is successful to the point that it is being studied by other universities. The program no longer awards a paralegal degree, but targets students who are interested in public policy. Demand is high so it is necessary to build a stable faculty. Kosmetatou said the GC recommendation was that the program continues to work on maintaining a distinction between their undergraduate and graduate programs.

Kathryn Eisenhart, former chair of LES, said that enrollment in the Master’s degree continues to increase, and they do not turn away qualified applicants. At the undergraduate level, some concentrations have been eliminated, and have been replaced by advising sheets that guide students to electives that are appropriate for a particular area of study. The department thinks there is merit in having a unitary Bachelor’s degree. Responding to a question from Boltuc, Eisenhart said they do not have large percentages of minority students, although within the last two years the numbers had increased. Also in response to Boltuc, Eisenhart said if a student has to be turned away because of late completion of paperwork or other reasons, they are encouraged to enroll in the next semester. The department can serve a cohort of 20 with current faculty. There has been limited enrollment of international students, partly because fluency in reading and writing English is so important. Deborah Anthony said there are two exchange students in the program this semester, both from Queen’s University in Belfast. Transue said the focus on the study of law as an academic subject is common in Europe, but rare in the US. He believes this is a comparative advantage for UIS if we want to grow in the international area.

Martin asked if the department could provide an estimate of the number of faculty hours required to generate these reports. Eisenhart said it took her all summer as she was writing a B.A. and M.A. review, and the workload was the equivalent of two new preps, and at least a half-time staff person. There was additional discussion about what was state mandated and how these reviews guide our budget decisions. The Provost commended the department for keeping their curriculum current and maintaining standards while working with a complex mix of student populations. Martin said UIS is the only campus within the UI system that requires this of us. According to the Provost, there has been some discussion about looking at the kinds of things that go into program reviews, but one of the outcomes that may not be apparent in this process is that it culminates in a Memorandum of Understanding that is signed by the parties who have been part of this program review process. This allows for a shared understanding of what the goals are for the next program review and gives the program a chance to take an in-depth look at what is actually happening in a broader context.
Old Business

Martin moved to table Resolution 43-1 until after other items had been considered; Villegas seconded; the motion was approved.

Resolution 43-2 Clarification of Post-Tenure review Appeal Procedures [2nd reading]

Martin clarified that the language was unchanged from 1st reading. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Resolution 43-3 Modification of Procedures for Filling Campus-Level Committee Vacancies [2nd reading]

Deborah Anthony, Chair of PPC, said there was one minor change from 1st reading. Language was added as a result of discussion at the last Senate meeting to clarify that the date the committee starts work is the date the committee is convened, according to the academic calendar. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Resolution 43-5 Clarification of Tenure Rollback Procedures [2nd reading]

Unchanged from 1st reading, the resolution passed unanimously.

Resolution 43-6 Clarification of Procedures for Application Narrative Modification [2nd reading]

Unchanged from the 1st reading, the resolution passed unanimously.

Resolution 43-1 Proposed Revision to the Statutes [2nd reading]

Martin offered an amendment that strikes lines 4 & 5 and replaces them with “Proposes the following amendments to USC ST-79/OT-296: 1. Revise the first paragraph of section 8b as follows: b. Initiation by the University Senates Conference by a vote of a majority of all members present and voting at a regular or special meeting may propose amendments to Article II Section 2 of these Statutes. The secretary of the conference shall notify the secretary of the campus senates and the secretary of the Board of Trustees of the text of the proposed amendment promptly after the meeting at which it is introduced. The proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the senates for action; the conference may append its comments.” Barnett seconded the motion.

Fisher clarified that Article II section 2 covers the composition and conduct of the University Senates Conference. There was discussion concerning USC’s previous introduction of proposed revisions to the statutes even though they did not have authority to do so. Resolution 43-1 would give USC the same authority to introduce changes as that held by the individual campus senates. Martin’s resolution would limit the scope of 43-1 so that the USC could only introduce changes concerning USC makeup and conduct.

Several Senators questioned the need for 43-1, and there was discussion about the role of USC within the governance process. As the discussion continued until 12:00, Boltuc moved to extend the meeting for ten minutes; Helton seconded; the motion passed with three nay votes.

Martin called the question on the amendment to 43-1; Kline seconded. The motion passed with 18 in favor, 3 opposed. Discussion on the amendment was closed. The motion passed with 16 in favor, 2 opposed, and five abstentions: Villegas, Li, Ruez, Agarwal and Weinstein. Martin proposed further amending 43-1 to say UIS Senate does not approve this change to the statutes without the change to the language proposed within this resolution. Boltuc seconded. After a brief discussion Martin withdrew the amendment. Martin moved to return 43-1 to SEC for editorial revision; Karri seconded. After a brief discussion, the motion passed with 16 in favor, 6 opposed, and Barnett and Piskin abstaining.
Helton moved to adjourn; Salela seconded; the meeting adjourned at 12:16 P.M.