

# ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Minutes

February 14, 2008

9:00 a.m. Brookens 204D

Members present: Jerry Burkhart, Barb Cass, Bryan Leonard, Lori Giordano, Tyler Taneka, Tammy Craig, Dick Schuldt, and Kathy Roegge. Missing was Becky Grosboll.

Also attending were Aaron Shures, Patty Sims, Marcellus Leonard, Lisa Whelpy, Jamie McGill, Jim Korte, Helen Bey, Roger Jehlicka and Wes Weisenburn.

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 9:04am
- 2) Approval of Agenda – Dick Schuldt moved and Barb Cass seconded the approval of the Agenda. Motion carried.
- 3) Approval of Minutes
- 4) Grievance Procedure Examination – Guest Marcellus Leonard – Jerry introduced Marcellus to the group talking about the UIS grievance procedure and our interest in the process. He noted that there will be two more speakers invited, Barbara Ferrea and Vera Mainz, who will address the same issue. Jerry started with a question - Who author the current grievance policy – Campus Senate. Marcellus stated that his office was created four years ago. Prior to that time there was an off-campus ombudsman who heard complaints. Marcellus walked the group through the present policy. It is intended to bring resolution to the complaining parties. The ombudsman office only will help mediate the issue; they are not there for revenge or to give advice. They facilitate talking in two ways- first they try to solve the problem informally by talking to the person bringing the grievance. They make no recommendations and they cannot be party to any lawsuit. If the complaint feels they need to go farther the ombudsman office cannot be part of that process. The second way is mediation. If talking has not helped a third party or mediator who has been trained to listen, caucus and help to bring the matter to resolution are called in. These mediators are from the UIS campus, AP mediation is conducted by AP and faculty by other faculty. Mediators from outside can be brought in but that is more expensive. There is also an informal and formal hearing process. You can choose what level you want to start at, but Marcellus must concur. Informal – the hearing officer comes and listens to the conflict, then makes a recommendation about what they would recommend if it was a formal hearing. Then the parties will decide if they want to try the recommendation. Not a binding agreement. Formal - a quasi-judicial process, where the outside hearing officer will listen and submit a “verdict” which will then be presented to the Provost and Chancellor. They can accept or not the recommendation.

There is no real teeth to our grievance policy. Any employee with less than fifty percent appointment or Academic hourly can't file a grievance about pay, support or staff, about the adoption of any UIS policy/procedure you disagree with, actions taken to meet state/municipal ordinations, issues because of the grievance process, or cannot be helped with bad evaluations or nonprocedural issues.

It is very important to follow the procedure when there is an issue. The Office will receive complaints about discrimination or sexual harassment complaints but they also must go to Maggie Noa office. While the ombuds office is not a legal office and will not put things in writing that can be used as evidence but they will give an overview of the process

and recommendation handed down. Thus far there has never been a formal hearing because of the intent of the individuals wanting revenge not resolution.

Barb complimented Marcellus about the way that he has handled the policy and the grievances the office has received. Jerry talked about the UIUC campus and their process that is handled by their local APAC. Jerry then asked Marcellus what changes he would recommend. He suggested that there needs to be more review in cases of complaints of harassment giving the employee a chance to show that they have been harassed or the supervisor to show evidence of incompetence. He does make a report to the Provost about any activity the office has encountered. He tries to identify areas or “hotbeds of conflict” where there may be problems. Marcellus is getting ready to go on sabbatical then will be retiring in a couple years. Responding to a question about when the office would receive a complaint about poor evaluation, he replied the ombuds office cannot mediate between a supervisor and employee about a bad evaluation; it would be outside of the procedure. When asked if he thought more teeth should be put in the grievance process Marcellus responded that he did feel the policy need to be looked at and more aggressive procedures be incorporated into the policy. Before ending he did encourage employees in taking advantage of any opportunity to write back and get it put on record somewhere.

#### 5) Old Business

- a. Campus Closure Policy/Bursar’s Hours Statement – We discussed the closure of the campus on Friday – how did it go this time? Lori reported that she had received a positive comment about how the policy was implemented. Jerry concurred that the closure was handled better in this instant. There was one question from an AP about how it should be noted on the timesheet. Their supervisor told them because of leaving one hour they needed to take leave for four hours. There is still some confusion about the leave procedure. CSAC is still discussing the bursar statement.
- b. Covey Training – Deb Koua is heading up the schedule, she has received response from 30 people. The trainer wants at least 10 – 15 participants. Response has been good.
- c. Professional Development – Deadline is Feb 15. has received applications for about \$10,000, only have \$8,000.
- d. March 20 General Meeting – Will still have March 13 regular meeting. At the general meeting the Provost will present, there are no specific topic to focus on, but will ask him to talk about salary equity. At the last UPPAC meeting it was suggested that each campus compile a list of university-wide issues, narrow it down to two or three and present these to Pres. White in the next face-to-face meeting. Each campus will submit a list then UPPAC will pick top two. This meeting would be a good time to gather some issues from UIS. Other topics for the meeting will be grievance policy and compensation. Refreshments will be provided, members will volunteer goodies. Clay would like to display the webpage behind the speakers during the general meeting. Committee thought this would be good idea.

#### 6) New Business

- a. UPPAC – There was a video conference a week ago. At the previous meeting we looked at what we wanted to do such as encouraging the president to use the committee as it was designed to be used. Also decided to go back to the three campuses and find out what their concerns are, compile the lists and come up with a document with recommendations/suggestions that can be presented to President

White. Jerry charged the members to think about what issues and give feedback about what items should be submitted.

Campus reports: Champaign is still experiencing resignations from CAP (thinking about changing name back to APAC) Provost has created a AP task force to find out what is on their minds and what issues are important to them. Do not have APs on their senate but do have voting AP on committees. Chicago has three voting reps. Licensing fees are to be decided by each campus. They are also working on their CAPE awards.

Chicago – doing a survey on campus APs. They had three Cape award recipients. UPPAC members are now attending the BOT meeting.

- b. Cape Award – April 15, 4pm –It will be in the PAC restaurant. The committee will start sending out announcements.
- c. Academic Integrity Policy – Karen Moranski and Jim Korte from the committee talked to the members about draft of the policy. They have been working since the fall semester to develop this policy for the campus. The Capital Scholars honors program had such a policy but it was not campus wide. A sub-committee of the Campus Senate was created chaired by Pat Langley. There presently are only a brief policy on campus but the committee has now created a more comprehensive policy to deal with this issue and a council has been created to also deal with the issue. This policy places the process of dealing with violations of academic integrity in the Academic Affairs area. The policy defines both faculty and student responsibilities, violations and puts forth a process for dealing with these violations including resolution. It also has a set of outcomes that can come out of the academic integrity hearing panel process. There is an appeal process for students included in the policy. An AP rep will be needed to serve on the council. Questions were asked about why the AP is an ex-officio member, the issue of reusing the same work for two courses, who can bring a charge and other issues. All agree that we need to do a better education of students about academic integrity.
- d. Faculty/Staff Giving Campaign – Lisa Whelpley, Aaron Shures talked to the committee about the campaign and its kickoff in March. They talked about what they are doing to celebrate the rich heritage of employee giving. Theme is “Oh the places we’ll go” – will look at what has happened in the past and where we will go in the future. Increased staff participation is desired but any gifts/amount will count; the campaign consists of peer to peer solicitation with staff providing materials to their co-workers. They handed out a flyer about the event on Feb. 29, celebrating the campaign.
- e. HR Evaluation Forms – Tyler Tanaka – Committee wants input from APAC and APs about some type of upward evaluation. They are looking for 5 questions you would like asked about supervisors. It will all be handled anonymously; HR is considering doing this type of survey. Wes commented about the HR committee that looks at the performance evaluation yearly, they are trying to be very aggressive in changing training for supervisors and also employees. He emphasized that the issue of retaliation is addressed in the training; it is not to be a part of the evaluation.

## 7) Committee Updates

- a. CSAC - no report
- b. Campus Senate - Lori Giordano- two meetings:  
First meeting was cut and dried – talking about the retreat the Executive Committee had where admission standards were discussed and committee on recruiting

and retention was created. They talked about the board meeting and global campus. Thus far 15 students are enrolled in the global campus nursing. Harry talked about how the state budget continues to be a concern and ongoing faculty searches. He reported on the sexual assault, still ongoing, and the need for more rape training. Student government reps reported concerns about rising cost of tuition. A concern was expressed by a faculty that they were unable to freely express themselves on the committee and had been asked not to be on the committee again, not by an administrator but by a faculty, it was found out later not to be true.

Second meeting was a Town hall meeting to talk about academic integrity and the policy that was being created. There was more talk about admission standards and forming a committee to discuss recruiting and retention of students. This committee will have broad scope and address first year programming support and mentoring. Enrollment has decreased, can be mostly contributed to continuing students plus only a 85% retention rate and numbers are down in continuing and transfer students. Budget looking down and there is concern about the state budget. Harry reported he is beginning a committee on student retention made up of student and academic affairs. Jim Korte gave a report on what the campus is doing to address concerns about safety on campus. Have begun looking at joining COPLAC (?). Student govt. rep. reported the students are looking at the + and – grading system and the sexual assault. Rest of the meeting was about the intercollegiate athletic report. The senate is trying to address some concerns from the other report. They recommended things we should be doing on campus such as no special admission procedures for athletes. There is concern about the money being funneled to this issue and about the waivers athletes receive. It is felt there will be too much emphasis on winning, and our brand if we join the NCAA2. Concern was also expressed about monitoring the athletes and their behavior as representation of UIS. The meeting was very contentious and angry.

c. APPAC Website – The committee will meet and have it ready to show at the general meeting.

8) Public Comments

9) Adjournment – Barb moved and Tammy seconded, motion carried.

Next meeting –March 13, 9:00 a.m. Brookens 204D