

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, April 26, 2010, 4:00 P.M.
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of March 29, 2010

Motion XXXXI-93: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Kalter, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of March 29, 2010. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Distributed Communications:

04.14.10.01 From Susan Kalter, Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Vice Presidential Commentary Surveys

Senator Kalter: You have in front of you three surveys that the committee constructed for the three of our vice presidents. I am going to hand out the fourth one, which is still in progress. Given that we have just hired a new Vice President for University Advancement, we thought, as a committee, that it might be a good idea to wait for her to arrive and show this to her, let her know what the process is like and ask her if she has anything else that she would like us to ask. As with all of the other surveys, I put in highlight names that are eventually going to be removed. We were just trying to make sure that we covered all of our bases. You will also notice in number four of this survey that I just handed out that there are several things in dark. That means a different thing than what it meant on the other pieces. Ted Mason did the first draft of this. These are questions that he formulated after reading the job description of the University Advancement VP, but I felt that the ones that are highlighted may not be answerable by a large group of people. So this is to indicate that this one is really still in development. I was hoping that the President would be here to help us work through some of the things that do and do not need to be on this survey.

All of the vice presidents were involved in the process, so they have sort of tacitly approved each of theirs. I think I said in my last email that if you see anything wrong, let me know. The other two things that we wanted to talk about with respect to these, and I will talk about the three, which are pretty much complete. We have to decide who is going to deploy the surveys, who is going to see the surveys and when and how to send them out. I thought that was more appropriate for us as a committee than for my committee to decide. I had some recommendations that we either farm them out to four different committees and have those committees send them or that the Executive Committee would do that. I think Cynthia had some concerns about how much work it would be to do that.

Senator Holland: We may want to consider, in order not to get survey overload, putting this on bi-annual basis, kind of rotating them.

Senator Kalter: I think that Finance and Planning for students might be the one that they have the least radar for. The Provost and Student Affairs are ones where people have comments all of the time. In budget years like we have had, Finance and Planning might become one that people always want to comment on. The other option besides doing it every two years is to send out one email and have people click on whatever survey they want. All four surveys would be in one email every year. I don't really have a preference.

Senator Holland: There are a lot of surveys on campus.

Senator Fazel: Especially during the end of the spring semester. I understand that we would like to have a whole year before we evaluate people. At the same time, this is the time of year that too many things come up at the same time. The chances that everyone is going to look at all four instruments and respond to them are very small. What if we do it later in the fall semester?

Senator Kalter: I would not necessarily recommend fall, but I definitely wouldn't recommend this week. I think that it may be better to have them the week after spring break.

Senator Fazel: I think that would be better.

Senator Holland: Do you want to wait until after ASPT season?

Senator Kalter: When is the end of the ASPT season?

Senator Holland: The final letters are going out about now. A lot of the original letters go out in January and February, but then there are all of the appeal processes.

Senator Kalter: I think that we should avoid the presidential commentary period.

Senator Stewart: After two pages, you start getting numb. That's the general rule of surveys.

Senator Holland: It should be written somewhere on it "page 1 of 2" and it should have maybe ten questions with the radio buttons on the first page. The second page is maybe two open-ended questions.

Senator Kalter: We designed this to be a scroll down. Maybe I was trying to make sure that we had an even number of questions for each vice president and that it would be between 10 and 14 questions so you basically see it in a screen.

Senator Holland: With that in mind, what do you think would be the optimal time? The presidential survey goes out the first week we get back for three weeks, so you are into mid February by the time that that's done.

Senator Fazel: Maybe before spring break?

Senator Stewart: The last week of February and the first week of March.

Senator Fazel: And if people want to do it during spring break, then they can. Then maybe a follow-up reminder after spring break.

Senator Holland: If we send it March 1st, the week while we are here, and then send them a reminder after spring break.

Senator Kalter: If it's not working, we can adjust it.

Senator Holland: I would suggest we do two a year. I would not do University Advancement next year.

Senator Kalter: What should we pair with that one?

Senator Fazel: The Provost is the most important one for faculty. Even in terms of finances, everybody sees that in terms of the Provost's Office. Not many people know that the snow is removed and the grass is mown through the Vice President of Finance and Planning. We are not just sending this to faculty, but I'm thinking getting feedback from faculty annually on what the Provost's Office does is important. Vice President Adams for students I think is really important. The other two could be done every two or three years.

Senator Holland: Are we going to send the Student Affairs one to faculty members?

Senator Fazel: If faculty are short on time, they will probably not even try to do this. If we send all of them, they could choose the one that they really have something to say about, but give everyone the option to do the evaluations every year. Students would probably do the evaluations every year for Student Affairs, but not necessarily from Finance and Planning and University Advancement.

Senator Holland: I am just afraid if we give them too much, they won't get the education part by reading down and seeing what units report to the various VPs.

Senator Kalter: If we don't send them all out the first year, people will ask how come xyz wasn't on the Provost survey. Doesn't she do that? So it might be that we need to in the first year send out the first three. Nobody is going to confuse University Advancement for anything except that Mail Services got put over there. Maybe we should send out the first three next year see how much response we get and whether the responses really vary. Then we can kind of gauge after that.

Senator Bonnell: What were the first three?

Senator Kalter: Provost, Finance and Planning and Student Affairs.

Senator Fazel: I have a question about the Provost's survey. Item 4, question 1, Provost Everts is open to student concerns. I would also like to see "to faculty concerns." The other one is about faculty attraction and retention. For example, the midyear raises are specifically targeted to faculty retention. That is something that people love to see that you are doing this and the President is doing it. If the question is there, I think people will know that this is for faculty retention. Then there is another one that I don't know how to address. This is what I hear from faculty. When we do the evaluations, whether it's the evaluation of the chair, which goes to the dean or the evaluation of the dean, which goes to the Provost, the feeling that a lot of people have is it doesn't matter what they say. It doesn't matter if we are happy with our dean because once administrators have a position, it's like a life-time position and nothing happens. People give up. I don't know how to include it in here as a survey question that people could comment on.

Senator Kalter: Isn't appointing effective administrators?

Senator Fazel: That's appointing; that's at the beginning. Five years down the road, is it a good idea to keep this administrator in place?

Provost Everts: Appoints and evaluates?

Senator Fazel: It's more your reaction to what faculty say about administrators that are working under your leadership. "Responsive to faculty comments about administrators"?

Senator Bonnell: It's tough, though, because people fill out forms for administrators and you get them and you get to do whatever you want to with them.

Provost Everts: Yes, and I wouldn't make any of them public.

Senator Bonnell: Yes, so how does anyone know what's going on?

Senator Fazel: For example, if people say this dean is killing our college and the dean is still there three or four or five years and nothing happens.

Provost Everts: It's a difficult situation because, in essence, we are talking about personnel matters, which I cannot talk about.

Senator Holland: But on occasions there are some obvious changes that happen. The Provost is open to faculty comments about administrators, but is also responsive. You can be open to them and still not be responsive.

Senator Kalter: So "open and responsive"?

Senator Fazel: How about "open to concerns and responsive to feedback"?

Ms. James: Do you want to include staff?

Senator Kalter: Thank you for reminding me; we should add “student, faculty and staff” everywhere. Look at the one in Dan’s piece. It’s highlighted. ‘Vice President Layzell promotes excellent customer service and is responsive, courteous and competent ...with the individuals and departments he serves.’ That’s kind of what you are getting at, but I wouldn’t consider the Provost to have customers in the same way that certain offices under Dan have.

Senator Fazel: I really like this statement except for the customer. We could say the same thing: “Promotes excellent service that is responsive”.

Senator Bonnell: The piece that is related to this is Mark Walbert. When he is talking about customers, Telecom, which you supervise, that’s the same element. That’s not actually represented in number 4.

Senator Kalter: We were trying to separate, to a certain extent, the offices underneath each Vice President and the Vice Presidents themselves. So the function of number two is to allow people to see what that person is in charge of. So I am not sure if customer or client works with the Provost because the Provost should be seen as the academic leader of the university, not as having clients.

Senator Bonnell: I understand what you are saying, but the technology split between what the Provost does and what Dan Layzell does...I don’t even understand that split. What happens if this changes such as with the CIO? I don’t know who would supervise that position. I don’t know how that would fit in the future.

Senator Kalter: If it happens, we will change it. These are all direct reports. In order to inform the campus, we say, ‘by the way, the Registrar is under the Provost, not under Steve Adams’, etc. If we get a CIO that reports directly to Sheri, we would put that in here basically changing the Walbert AVP, but it would depend on whether Dan still has a direct report. If he still has a direct report from technology, we are going to leave that in even though that person might work with the Provost’s Office.

Senator Bonnell: When you say we would change it, that’s comes back to the people who...Is it going to be Exec or is it going to be committees x, y and z that changes this, whether it be a CIO or something else? It seems like it would be easier for Exec to manage this because it would be easier to figure it out, but there might be other alternatives.

Senator Kalter: I have in my memo, in the second to last paragraph, we should discuss with the President how this confidential information will be treated by the Senate—who on the Senate and its committees is entitled to see it and discuss the raw data and who is responsible for compiling it. It’s a little weird that the President’s survey is done by a committee of the Senate, which is two levels down from where it goes. Technically speaking, the Board of Trustee’s secretary should be in charge of that and nobody else should see it, but because we have a shared governance process, the committee I serve on does that. But we keep it absolutely confidential. Nobody but that committee and this committee is allowed to see that information.

I think this is more highly sensitive than the President’s because the Vice Presidents are closer to our jobs. With the Vice Presidents, I don’t really want many people knowing what people say about them. That is not good even to have the possibility of a leak. That’s why I wish the President were here because he could say this is only going to these people.

Somebody on the Senate should see it because it is us, as representatives of the university, collecting information that people might tell us anyway, but we should not be a direct part of the personnel process. We are offering it to the President for his consideration, so that is why I thought it would be better for Exec to do it. It’s easier to go into closed session and keep information private. The faculty Senate Secretary doesn’t have a job description, so it would be an easy thing to assign to that person. I am going to have to go to LILT and do the surveys anyway. I can set it up and get it running and bring it to this committee for the first several years and then whoever gets elected next after I leave will know that that is their responsibility.

Senator Bonnell: Could you include a student? It seems like there ought to be two people.

Senator Kalter: Maybe the Student Body President. I would suggest that we table this discussion until the next meeting.

Senator Holland: I think it would really help to have the President here. He will have a lot of good comments about what information he would like to see.

Senator Kalter: Send me any questions like the ones Farzaneh had.

04.14.10.02 *From Susan Kalter, Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Request to Revise Equitable Treatment of Students Policy (Dist. 2010-11 Academic Affairs Committee)*

Senator Kalter: We might want to talk next year about an advisory to students or a definite limit on the number of absences. Have them (Academic Affairs Committee) discuss it, though they may say that they don't want to add that at all. Also to clarify that RSOs are not university-sanctioned activities. It's just fun—an extra-curricular activity.

Senator Stewart: Our RSO is attached to the National Art Education Association. They go to state and national conferences to present.

Senator Kalter: Maybe we just need to have that clarified—which RSOs are...

Senator Stewart: Are professional.

Senator Kalter: That could open a huge can of worms.

04.21.10.01 *From Jan Murphy, Associate Provost: Request to Extend the Two-Term Limit on the Academic Planning Committee*

Senator Holland: We have a request from Jan Murphy to extend the two-term limit on the Academic Planning Committee.

Senator Kalter: Where is that?

Ms. James: It's in the bylaws.

Senator Holland: For instance, you are not supposed to serve on an Internal Committee for more than two consecutive years.

Senator Fazel: So we do make exceptions.

Senator Holland: It is in the best interest of the functioning of the Senate that we have institutional memory for each committee, so having at least one person there who has been there for two years really helps.

Senator Kalter: So we are giving the exception?

Senator Holland: I would vote in favor of it. Does the Executive Committee do that?

Ms. James: Yes.

Senator Holland: I guess we can, so we won't take this to the full Senate. All in favor of giving the exception?

The Executive Committee voted unanimously to grant the exception.

04.23.10.01 *From Ed Stewart, Executive Committee Member: Civil Service Salaries (Distributed at the 4/26/10 Executive Committee Meeting)*

Senator Stewart raised an issue regarding compression and inversion in civil service salaries"

Senator Fazel: Doesn't the faculty-staff address that also? The midyear raises?

Senator Kalter: Deb Smitley's office has always reported on all the APs and Civil Service. I guess she has reported on inversion.

Senator Holland: I know it's a pretty broad window, but that would not be good if they brought somebody in at the top who filled the same job description.

Ms. James: I would like Planning and Finance to look at this because in my job, I don't know how to receive a merit increase.

The Executive Committee considered itself in Executive Session to discuss specific pay increases.

Open Session Continued:

Senator Stewart: It almost seems like the tuition policy. We raise tuition when you come in and it stays the same the whole time you are here.

Senator Kalter: That's what happens to tenure-tracks. This is going to Finance and Planning?

Senator Fazel: Because we are talking about faculty and staff salaries that deal with inversion and compression, it seems logical to also include that.

Senator Holland: I thought that it was a negotiated raise.

Senator Fazel: Are you unionized?

Ms. James: I'm not.

Senator Holland: We were able to do an out of sequence raise. Is that acceptable?

Provost Everts: We can take a look at that, but I think that there are other issues here. In some cases, we are talking about unionized individuals and what that contract states, which sounds like part of this conversation. You would want to bring Vice President Layzell into that conversation.

Senator Fazel: We had a statement in last year's document in which we said we are asking the university leadership to look at salaries across the board, including negotiated employees to make sure that everybody is treated fairly and equitably. Someone on the committee raised the issue that if some of the staff are unionized, then it is not up to the Senate to say anything because they are already going through negotiations and that was why we actually removed that after discussion.

Senator Holland: If it is not negotiated, we could definitely...that's why civil service reps are on there. If it were purely union, there would not be a civil service rep on the Senate.

Academic Senate Calendar for 2010-11

Senator Fazel: I know it's too late to change this. I would like to know how the rest of you feel. If we could schedule the meetings so that we would not have a meeting during finals week.

Senator Stewart: I would love to do that.

Senator Fazel: This year (2010-11) we could have done it because you notice that we don't have a Senate meeting in August, so we could have pushed everything one week back and so we would not have a meeting during finals week. Cynthia says it's too late because she has already reserved the rooms. I would like for us to look into this for the next available one.

Senator Stewart: I thought there was rule that we had to meet at least once a month except for the summer.

Senator Kalter: Who makes that rule? We make that rule, so that means that we can un-make it.

Senator Fazel: As far back as I can remember, we have had a Senate meeting during exam week and it is a crazy time for everybody. What is the earliest one we could look into?

Ms. James: I have already reserved the rooms for 2011-12.

Senator Fazel: Is there a possibility to check to see if they are available the alternate week?

Senator Kalter: Rather than doing that...it's like how many meetings do we need and maybe we should pitch to the Rules Committee whether we do absolutely have to meet every single month. Then all we would have to do is just get rid of two meetings a year. You are talking about moving the dates when we meet. I am talking about eliminating the December and the May meeting.

Senator Fazel: If we move them, we could still have a meeting in December, but it won't be during finals week.

Senator Kalter: It's a lot more complicated for Cynthia because she would have to reconfigure every single week and make sure that there was nothing conflicting with it as opposed to keeping this meeting schedule and taking out one meeting each semester.

Ms. James: SGA meets on the alternate Wednesday, so we really couldn't do it.

Senator Fazel: So just drop the meeting during finals week.

Senator Stewart: Is it the Rules Committee that will look at this and they would have to eliminate the rule that says we have to meet every month and institute a new rule that says that we should never meet during finals week?

Senator Holland: I don't think it's bad to actually have it there. Maybe we could push the elections back a week.

Senator Fazel: If we don't have the meeting with the new faculty in the spring, we will have it in the fall. If we just drop the last meeting, we won't have that meeting in the spring.

Senator Kalter: Why do we have two weeks between the caucus (nominations) and the election (by the Senate)?

Senator Stewart: The Chair of the Senate requires that you are going to teach one class in your area, so you would probably have to get permission from your area to do that.

Senator Holland: We can let Rules ponder this.

NOTE: The conversation about the Senate meeting schedule continued by email after the meeting. The conclusion reached was that we would leave the Senate schedule as is because of certain constraints mentioned in the Executive Committee meeting. We will cancel a meeting that occurs during finals week if there is no urgent Senate business. The matter will not be referred to the Rules Committee.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate on May 5, 2010:

**Academic Senate Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, May 5, 2010
7:00 P.M.
OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

Call to Order by Student Body President/Senate Vice Chairperson

Seating of New Senate

Roll Call by Student Body President/Senate Vice Chairperson

Approval of Minutes of April 21, 2010

Election of the Senate Chairperson

Election of the Senate Secretary

Election of Faculty Members of Senate Executive Committee

Presentation: Educating Illinois (Deb Smitley, Associate VP of Finance and Planning)

Presentation: Accreditation Issues (Jan Murphy, Associate Provost)

Presentation: Foundation Board Report (Joe Armstrong, Foundation Board Faculty Representative)

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- *President Al Bowman*
- *Provost Sheri Everts*
- *Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams*
- *Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Layzell*

Information/Action Item:

Senate Meeting Schedule for 2010-2011

Advisory Item:

Academic Plan (Associate Provost Jan Murphy)

Communications

Adjournment

Motion XXXXI-94: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Academic Senate Agenda for May 5, 2010.

Senator Holland: Joe Armstrong will be added to the agenda to give a Foundation report.

The motion to approve the agenda, as amended, was unanimously approved.

Adjournment