FACULTY SENATE  
Tuesday, March 22, 2016  
3:30 – 5:15 pm  
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES


Officers Present: C. Bohannan, P. Snyder, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.


Guests: D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), M. Habashi (Lecturers Committee), C. Joyce (Office of the Ombudsperson), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), B. Nottingham–Spencer (Lecturers Committee), C. Sheerin (Lecturers Committee), L. Snetselaar (Office of the Provost), D. Thomas (International Programs), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Bohannan called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

II. Approvals
   A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Wilder moved and Professor Gallanis seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   B. Faculty Senate Minutes (February 16, 2016) (February 19, 2016) – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   C. Committee Appointments (Tom Vaughn, Chair, Committee on Committees)
      • Jessica Welburn (Sociology) to fill the unexpired term of Emily Wentzell (Anthropology) on the Faculty Senate, Spring 2016
      Professor Gallanis moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the appointment be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
III.   New Business

• University-wide Internationalization Plan  *(Downing Thomas, Associate Provost and Dean of International Programs)*

Associate Provost Thomas explained that work had begun on this plan last spring by an advisory council of faculty members and associate deans, as well as representatives from key offices such as Student Life, the Division of Continuing Education, and the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development. He stressed that he had wanted this plan to be a university-wide vision, not a plan for the International Programs Office only. The plan also aims to be truly strategic; it is not a laundry list and it is focused on strengths that the university already possesses. The plan should also be a living document, with some measure of mission to it. The document was reviewed by the Council of Deans and subsequently the Provost charged Associate Provost Thomas and the advisory council with developing plans for action items for the next three to five years.

Associate Provost Thomas expressed the opinion that the university is now at a good place regarding internationalization efforts. Over the past seven to eight years there has been continual growth in the number of international students on campus. There has also been an increase in the number of students and faculty who go abroad. Recently the university was recognized for being the nation’s top producer of Fulbright scholars, while the India Winterim program received the prestigious 2016 Institute of International Education (IIE) Andrew Heiskell Award for Innovation in International Education. Associate Provost Thomas stressed that the internationalization plan must be driven by the students and faculty of our institution.

Drawing the group’s attention to a list of bullet points illustrating the plan’s shared vision, Associate Provost Thomas noted that the university has not yet reached its goal of becoming “a destination school for students seeking a global education,” but that it was moving in that direction. A component of the student success aspect of the plan calls for “integrating curricula addressing global concepts and perspectives into majors.” While some faculty members are already doing this, Associate Provost Thomas observed that there does not seem to be a widespread concerted effort by the institution. Lastly he drew the group’s attention to a bullet point under the creation and discovery aspect, “recognizing and rewarding globalization in research for promotion and tenure,” and asked for feedback. He stressed that this was not a suggested requirement, but a proposed opportunity. In conclusion, Associate Provost Thomas indicated that he was presenting the plan to the colleges and to various other groups on campus for input.

Professor Lehan Mackin asked if the plan would include resources for faculty and students to develop overseas partnerships. Associate Provost Thomas responded that an explicit request for funding from the central administration had not been a part of the plan development, but that certainly resources would be needed to implement some aspects of the plan. Funding would likely come from International Programs, from the colleges, and from the university overall. There is also a private endowment of over $9 million available that is devoted to international activities by both faculty and students. Professor Segre expressed concern about the English language skills of some of the international students in her classroom and she asked about
resources available on campus to assist them. Associate Provost Thomas indicated that resources are available; it appears that these resources need to be more widely publicized. He added that in recent years the university has increased its TOEFL score threshold, in an effort to ensure that admitted students do possess the English language skills needed to succeed academically. Speaking and writing centers are located in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Pre-departure orientation sessions seek to prepare international students for the academic and cultural environment that they will encounter here. Professor Gallanis encouraged the use of gateway sites in various international locations, to facilitate both the recruitment of international students and the creation of international partnerships for the university. Associate Provost Thomas commented that there is some reticence to establish gateway sites, given the university’s experience with the Chicago Center that was closed some years back. He acknowledged that some of our peer institutions have set up gateway sites.

Following up on the comments about English language preparedness, Professor Tachau suggested that international students could attend a summer institute on campus to improve their English skills before enrolling in university courses. Associate Provost Thomas acknowledged that this was a good idea, but visa requirements and cost might be prohibitive. It is possible that a summer institute could take place in the students’ home countries. Returning to the plan’s suggestion that globalization in research be recognized and rewarded for promotion and tenure, President Bohannan asked to what extent faculty input had been solicited regarding this proposal. Associate Provost Thomas noted that this had been suggested by faculty members and that he welcomed additional feedback. President Bohannan cautioned against having such a standard centrally mandated.

Professor Macdonald asked if there is a catalog of current exchanges available at the university. Associate Provost Thomas responded that there is a catalog of formal agreements and exchanges available on line. Professor Macdonald further asked if the revenue brought in by international students was a key driver of the internalization plan. Associate Provost Thomas responded that recruitment of international students is only one component of the internationalization plan, the goal of which is to drive the three core missions of the university. President Bohannan suggested providing more opportunities for international students to meet members of the community. Associate Provost Thomas noted that there are various classes available to UI employees and local community members to learn more about the international student experience and therefore how better to welcome international students and scholars to our community.

- **Proposed Committee on Academic Values (Christina Bohannan and Tom Vaughn)**
  President Bohannan explained that the purpose of this committee was to have a group of faculty members who are at all times steeped in current issues related to tenure, shared governance, academic freedom, etc., in order to give guidance, perhaps on short notice, to the Senate officers and even to administrators, as well as to consult on policy. At a recent faculty governance conference, President Bohannan learned that several of our peer institutions are also considering the creation of such a committee on their campuses. Members of the committee would be appointed by the Faculty Senate president, both for reasons of timing (the deadline has
already passed for the Senate’s annual committee recruitment drive) and of flexibility, as members with particular expertise could be brought in quickly.

Professor Gallanis expressed concern about what seems to be incomplete awareness on campus of the scope of the First Amendment. President Bohannan concurred and indicated that this is why the composition of the proposed committee includes at least one faculty member from the College of Law. Professor Macfarland commented that the purpose of the committee seemed to be one of protecting the academic environment in which we work and he suggested that the committee consider another name for itself that reflects this purpose. Professor Plakans recommended that someone from the College of Education who specializes in higher education issues also be regularly appointed to the committee.

Professor Storrs noted that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has been dealing with issues of academic freedom and shared governance for decades and she suggested that this expertise be leveraged. President Bohannan responded that the committee members would certainly need to be well-versed in AAUP policy. She added, however, that there is value in having a committee like this that is embedded in the university’s shared governance structure, especially since the Faculty Senate officers are frequently called upon to deal with matters of academic freedom, etc. Professor Tachau observed that an AAUP chapter came into existence on this campus in 1916, long before the Faculty Senate. She noted that the two entities later functioned as a right hand and a left hand, with the Faculty Senate as the official shared governance body and the AAUP being an independent voice of the faculty, in a collaborative relationship. In order to institutionalize this relationship, she suggested that a member of the UI AAUP’s executive committee always serve on this committee. Professor Nikolas urged that the Senate take up discussion of these important academic freedom and related issues more frequently at meetings.

Professor Gillan cautioned against making the membership requirements too specific, because of the committee’s need for flexibility. Professor Daack-Hirsch suggested that the committee have a core group of longer-serving members, but then also have seats reserved for new members who could be quickly brought on board if campus events require it. Professor Macdonald expressed the opinion that the committee should be reactive, preparing statements and position papers as necessary to provide guidance to the campus. He did not find it appropriate for the committee to be proactive. President Bohannan noted that there may be instances when a proactive stand is necessary, such as when providing guidance on policy. Professor Campo urged that a wide variety of perhaps conflicting views be represented on the committee; this will ensure that any guidance that is eventually provided will have anticipated similar conflicts within the university community. Professor Durham expressed the view that the AAUP’s long history of dealing with these issues be regularly considered by the committee. Professor Murry concurred that the AAUP voice should be heard.

President Bohannan posed the question whether it was appropriate for the official shared governance academic values committee to mandate the inclusion of an AAUP representative. The different roles of the two entities should be considered. Professor Gallanis observed that the committee would likely work closely with the AAUP anyway and he commented that he saw the
advantage of flexibility in the committee’s official description. Past President Thomas noted that committee appointments would need to be approved by the Senate, anyway. Professor Macfarland commented that there might be confusion if this committee and the AAUP issue contradictory statements. Professor Gillan commented that he did not foresee a problem if the two groups ultimately have differing opinions.

Professor Storrs recognized the logistical difficulties related to mandating too many slots on the committee, but she questioned whether the formation of this committee was an effort to supplant the AAUP on campus. She stressed that the AAUP would be a valuable resource for the committee. President Bohannan stated that no attempt was being made to sideline the AAUP. She personally consults AAUP guidelines and policies regularly. Her concerns relate to placing too many membership restrictions on the committee, along with an acknowledgment that faculty governance and the AAUP have different roles on campus. It is to the faculty governance group that administrators turn regarding a variety of issues affecting faculty and it is the duty of faculty governance to represent all faculty on campus. AAUP, however, has loyalty to its own members. Professor Tachau commented that the AAUP considers its constituency to be the faculty in general, along with academic values, the structure of tenure, the structure of academic freedom, etc. She suggested that the charge of the committee be revised to read To inform themselves and remain current on the principles and history related to core academic values in higher education... She noted that AAUP members are already fulfilling this duty and are a valuable resource. She recommended that the committee membership consist of seven members, with one member from the College of Law and one member from the AAUP, while flexibility would be key in choosing the other five members. Professor Kwitek viewed the relationship between UI faculty governance and the AAUP as somewhat similar to that between local and federal government. She suggested that the AAUP be listed as an important resource for this local faculty governance committee.

Observing that there was considerable disagreement on this topic, several senators suggested that the proposal be revised and deferred for consideration at the next Senate meeting. Professor Prussing commented that events of the past year were no doubt impacting discussion today. She urged that the revised proposal emphasize collaborative and consultative processes among all relevant groups so that the widest number of viewpoints can be considered and represented.

Professor Campo moved and Professor Prussing seconded that the proposed Committee on Academic Values be tabled and revised for consideration at the next Faculty Senate meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed.

- Instructional Faculty Policy (Christina Bohannan)

President Bohannan reminded the group that much work over the past months has gone into the creation and revision of this policy. She thanked Associate Provost for Faculty Kevin Kregel, Assistant Provost Diane Finnerty, and the members of the Lecturers Committee for their contributions to this effort. President Bohannan noted that the policy has the support of the Council of Deans, the Office of the Provost, the Lecturers Committee, the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, and the Faculty Council. She indicated that all of the suggestions for
 revision made at the last Senate meeting were incorporated into this latest version. Various issues related to implementation will be worked out in the coming months, while a policy document regarding promotion guidelines and procedures is in preparation. It will not be a part of the Operations Manual, but will reside on the Office of the Provost’s website.

Professor Gillan praised the policy and thanked all those involved in the creation and revision of the policy for their efforts. Professor Tachau suggested one minor revision in line 14 (section 10.11 a. Definitions), *Instructional faculty are typically occupy full-time positions...* Professor Storrs expressed appreciation for the work done on the policy, but noted that several lecturers had spoken to her about aspects of the policy that they found disappointing. For example, there still seems to be a great deal of discretion retained by the departments regarding termination. She hoped that the planned five-year review of the policy would lead to improvements. President Bohannan noted that colleges still need to create their own instructional faculty policies, which can be more protective, and she hoped that instructional faculty would be involved in those efforts. Professor Gillan observed that the policy now brings instructional faculty members into the Faculty Senate, an arena in which they can discuss their concerns. President Bohannan commented that the policy does provide for a greater degree of job security than instructional faculty previously have had.

Professor Kolker moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the Instructional Faculty Policy be approved with the suggested revision. The motion carried with one opposing vote and one abstention.

IV. From the Floor – There were no items from the floor.

V. Announcements

- Faculty Council elections will begin this Friday, March 25, for the Colleges of Business, Dentistry, Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Medicine. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 12, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The next regular Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 26, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Elections of officers will take place.
- President Bohannan announced that an additional Faculty Senate meeting has been planned for Monday, April 11. President Harreld, Provost Butler and other central administrators have been invited to attend. Senators will have the opportunity to engage these administrators over issues regarding how to move the university forward. She added that over a year ago, Regents President Bruce Rastetter had challenged the faculty to develop a plan for moving the university into the top tier ranks of public research universities. The Senate had put together a faculty working group, chaired by Professors Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Larry Weber, that had created a report, the findings of which will be shared with administrators and senators at the April 11 meeting.
Professor Gallanis requested that the report be distributed ahead of time. President Bohannan will look into this. Professor Tachau commented that she had attended President Harreld’s Town Hall forum last month and that she questioned the inferences made from some of the data he presented. She cautioned against accepting presuppositions that have a potential for ideological overtones. Professor Durham commented that it would be useful at the meeting to hear more about President Harreld’s vision for the university. President Bohannan noted that President Harreld has spoken about working with the university community to develop a shared vision for the institution; this is why the strategic planning committees were recently created.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Gallanis seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Bohannan adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.