

MINUTES<sup>1</sup>  
UNIVERSITY SENATES CONFERENCE

DATE: Thursday, January 17, 2013

PLACE: Videoconference: 414 AOB, 180G BRK, 364 HAB

PRESENT: Boltuc (Vice Chair), Burbules (Chair), Chambers, Deberry-Spence, Fadavi, Fisher, Francis, Gibori, Graber, Leff, Mallory, Mohammadian, Shanahan, Struble, Tolliver, Villegas\*

ABSENT: Andersen, Campbell, Erricolo, Wheeler

GUESTS: Christine Des Garennes, Christophe Pierre, Richard Wheeler, Phyllis Wise

\* Attended by phone

Professor Nicholas Burbules, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. He welcomed new member Professor Benet Deberry-Spence.

I. Approval of University Senates Conference Minutes of November 28, 2012

The minutes were approved as written.

II. Classification of Senate Minutes

Class I:	Matters of policy affecting one campus only. Item is sent to the President and Board of Trustees for action.
Class II:	Matters affecting more than one campus. Item is sent to Senate(s) for action, then to President and Board of Trustees. At the time of this classification, the Conference member will file with the recording secretary an accurate final copy of the Senate action.
Class III:	Amendments to the <i>University of Illinois Statutes</i> . Procedure is the same as with Class II items. At the time of reporting this classification, the Conference member will file with the recording secretary an accurate final copy of the Senate action.
Class N:	This designation requires no USC action, but alerts one or more Senates to an item of interest from the originating Senate. The "N" is preceded by and followed by a lower case letter(s); c = Chicago; s = Springfield; u = Urbana-Champaign; usc = University Senates Conference. Example: "cNs,u" means that a matter has come up in the Chicago Senate, which may be of interest to Springfield and Urbana-Champaign.

---

<sup>1</sup>Subject to approval at the University Senates Conference meeting of February 19, 2013

A. The following items were classified I by the University Senates Conference:

1. University of Illinois at Chicago, November 29, 2012

PR-13.05 Elimination of the Online Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) Program

PR-13.07 Revision of the Master of Science in Medical Biotechnology

PR-13.08 Rename the Department of Pharmacy Administration as the Department of Pharmacy Systems, Outcomes and Policy; Redesignate the Pharmacy Administration Course Subject (Rubric) from PMAD TO PSOP (Pharmacy Systems, Outcomes and Policy); and Eliminate the Pharmacy Administration Concentration within the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Pharmacy

PR-13.09 Revision of the Master of Science in Occupational Therapy

PR-13.10 Revision of the Bachelor of Science in the Engineering Physics

2. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, December 3, 2012

EP.13.10 Proposal to Establish the Jewish Studies Concentration within the BALAS in Interdisciplinary Studies

EP.13.15 Proposal from the College of Fine and Applied Arts to Rename the BMUS in Music History as the BMUS in Musicology

GP.13.02 Proposal to Permanently Establish the Grainger Center for Electric Machinery and Electro-mechanics

GP.13.04 Proposal to Establish the Center for a Sustainable Environment in the Office of the Chancellor

B. The following items were classified III by the University Senates Conference:

3. University of Illinois at Chicago, November 29, 2012

Approved the Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes* and *The General Rules Concerning University Organization and Procedures* - to change throughout both documents "Vice President/Chancellor at the (Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, or Springfield) Campus" to "Chancellor at the (Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, or Springfield) Campus/Vice President" (USC ST-78/GR-47)

4. University of Illinois at Springfield, November 30, 2012

R42-8 Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes* and *General Rules*  
[ST-78/GR-47]

5. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, December 3, 2012

SP.13.04 Proposal Amendments to the *Statutes* Regarding the Title of  
Chancellor

6. The University of Illinois at Springfield, December 14, 2012

R42-10 Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes* Article X, Section 2 – Academic  
Freedom [ST-72]

C. following item was classified N by the University Senates Conference:

7. University of Illinois at Springfield, December 14, 2012

sNc,u R42-9 Transition of the Human Development Counseling (HDC)  
Curriculum to 61 Credit Hours

### Explanation of File Numbers

ST - University of Illinois *Statutes*

GR - *The General Rules Concerning University Organization and Procedure*

NC - Nominating Committee

OT - All other items

### III. Old Business – Action Items

1. ST-78/GR-47. Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes* and *The General Rules Concerning University Organization and Procedures* – to change throughout both documents “Vice President/Chancellor at the (Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, or Springfield) Campus” to “Chancellor at the (Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, or Springfield) Campus/Vice President”. Passed UIC Senate 11/29/12. Passed UIS Senate 11/30/12. Passed UIUC Senate 12/3/12.

Professor Burbules said that all three campuses have approved the title change of the vice president/chancellor to chancellor/vice president. In addition, the UIUC Senate approved editorial changes recommended by its USSP Committee. He suggested that the Conference endorse the editorial changes and include them in its recommendation to the Board. Professor Chambers moved to endorse editorial changes approved by the UIUC Senate. The motion was seconded, voted on, and approved.

Professor Burbules commented on the other recommendation by the UIUC Senate. USSP recommended that the term “chancellor/vice president” in the new configuration be used only the first time it is mentioned in the *Statutes* and *General Rules* and then all subsequent references to the position would simply be “chancellor.” He said it is standard practice in documents where there is a long title to state the title once and then indicate that, hereafter, the title will be as such. Professor Burbules commented that there are concerns that the intention of this change could be misunderstood. Also, most people do not read the *Statutes* all the way through; the later text would only read “chancellor.” After much discussion among the Conference members, Professor Burbules made a motion that the transmittal letter from the Conference to the President indicate that there is support from all three senates for the reversal of titles. In addition, the UIUC Senate suggested additional editorial changes, marked in yellow, that the Conference endorses and supports. Another recommendation from the UIUC Senate suggests that the term chancellor/vice president be used only in the first incidence and thereafter in the document only the term chancellor be used. USC agreed to send forward the recommendation, as required, but not take a position one way or another. Professor Chambers suggested deleting the statement of not taking a position one way or another. This was verbally accepted as a friendly amendment. The motion was seconded, voted on, and approved.

2. ST-72. Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 (Academic Freedom). Passed UIUC Senate 12/6/10; Passed UIC Senate 9/22/11. Passed UIS Senate 12/14/12.

Professor Burbules commented that all three senates have approved identical language and suggested that the item be forwarded to the President. Professor Tolliver recommended that the UIUC Senate background information be forwarded as well in order to understand the rationale of the proposed statutory changes. By acquiescence, the Conference approved transmitting the proposed statutory changes to the President.

#### IV. New Business

3. Board of Trustees Meeting: Thursday, March 7, 2013, Urbana

Designation of Observer: George Francis

Faculty Report: Peter Boltuc

The Conference agreed that the topic of the faculty report would be academic freedom. Professors Chambers and Tolliver agreed to help write the presentation. Possible future topics for the faculty report included health and medical affairs and public engagement.

4. OT-294. Recalculation of Apportionment of USC Membership.

Professor Burbules reported that Ms. Sailor had conducted a calculation of faculty numbers in order to review the apportionment of USC members from each campus, as required by the *Statutes* every five years, and found no basis for changing the current ratio.

5. OT-295. Resolution on campus jurisdiction over the *Statutes* and the *General Rules*.

Professor Burbules commented that each campus has the legal right to decide what to do regarding unionization. He added that collective bargaining is actively proceeding at UIC. One of the things that could come up in that bargaining context is rewriting or changing requirements that are written in the *Statutes* and *General Rules*. Professor Burbules stressed that he did not want USC to take a position on unionization. However, he felt that USC should have a role to play in taking a stand on the status of the *Statutes* and *General Rules* as university-wide governing documents. He said that this position is laid out in the resolution being proposed.

Professor Burbules gave the example of the section on sanctions less than dismissal, which is currently being reviewed in the process of editing the *Statutes* and *General Rules*. He said that it would not be surprising in a collective bargaining agreement for negotiators on the union side to want to modify, change, or remove this language. This would be problematic for one campus to have rules that go against the *Statutes* that the other campuses must follow.

Professor Leff commented that she was not sure what USC is reacting to. Also, all kinds of situations occur that cannot be predicted. Professor Gibori said that many UIC faculty are not privy to what is happening in union negotiations. She felt that USC should be ready to address issues that come up.

Professor Burbules said that he has reviewed unionized campuses, particularly those that are similar to the U of I. There seems to be two models: a peaceful coexistence model where what the union controls is defined – e.g. salary and benefits – and the rest is left to traditional shared governance, and a model where the collective bargaining contract incorporates within it some or all of the traditional elements of shared governance, making these matters contractually binding, but always subject to renegotiation.

Professor Fisher felt that the proposed resolution was based upon hypotheses about what might happen. She was concerned that there might be unintentional consequences of appearing to be anti-union and felt that the resolution was not necessary since it is a restatement of existing policy. Professor Fisher commented that grievance procedures could potentially be negotiated to protect faculty who feel that procedures in the *Statutes* have not been carried out properly in their individual cases. She said that any negotiated contract would go through the Board of Trustees and she did not believe the Board would work against their own *Statutes*. Professor Fisher added that, if anyone is going to help faculty create something along the lines of a peaceful coexistence model, it could be a collaborative Senates Conference that is interested in considering the various models.

Professor Tolliver did not think that USC should only react to things that have already happened. She felt that typically resolutions are reflective and anticipate potential action. She commented that the resolution is a reassertion of a principle that no one disagrees with. Therefore, she did not see the resolution as being anti-union. Professor Boltuc thought it was important to spread useful information. Professor Chambers endorsed the

sentiments of Professors Tolliver and Boltuc. He added that there were never open discussions of unionization at UIC, which has led to many problems. Professor Chambers stated that he endorsed the proposed resolution. He also commented that the Conference should be a catalyst for discussion rather than be silent. Professor Deberry-Spence agreed that there was a need for some type of platform for an open dialogue. Professor Burbules suggested that USC come back to the issue of determining how to promote meaningful discussions and focus on the resolution at this point.

Professor Struble said that, when first reading the resolution, she did not know the reasoning behind it. She suggested that a background statement be written before the Conference takes a vote. In addition, the background statement could help accomplish the task of promoting discussion. Professor Mallory supported Professor Fisher's comments and reiterated that the resolution did not seem necessary as everyone should already be aware of the purposes of the governing documents. Professor Mohammadian thought that the resolution was not anti-union, but also felt that it was not necessary. He suggested that someone from the UIC campus be an observer in the labor discussions. He was concerned that decisions were being made for those who have not joined the union. Professors Chambers and Gibori expressed concerns over the lack of communication with the faculty.

Professor Burbules commented that there should not be an assumption that all senators understand the provisions of the *Statutes* and *General Rules*. In addition, not everyone involved in negotiations are senators. Professor Leff supported an open discussion of the issues. However, she commented that the resolution is not transparent and did not know that it would be achieving anything by approving it. She thought that dealing with the *Statutes* and constraints of collective bargaining needed to be considered in a larger discussion. Professor Tolliver asked what was in the resolution that could be perceived as anti-union. Professor Leff responded that the resolution in itself does not give that perception, but the explanation of the resolution will provide an understanding of the larger discussion. Professor Tolliver commented that it is not unusual for there to be a statement in a document stating that it supersedes all other documents. She added that it makes sense to remind colleagues who are outside of governance but representing faculty that they have an obligation to follow the *Statutes*.

Professor Burbules suggested adding the following sentence to Par. 3 of the resolution: "Any local provisions must be consistent with those documents." He then read a background statement that he drafted during the meeting: "Collective bargaining negotiations are taking place on one of the U of I campuses and may occur on the other campuses. The University Senates Conference is concerned that the provisions of the *Statutes* and *General Rules* may be modified or overridden in those negotiations."

Professor Burbules asked the Conference to think about the future of USC if one or more of the campuses have different governing rules and inconsistent governing rules from what is going on at the other campuses. He felt that USC would become immobilized by various issues if there were not a common set of rules and procedures shared across all three campuses. Professor Burbules stressed that this was a real concern for him.

Professor Shanahan reminded the Conference that, while the *Statutes* and *General Rules* are the governing rules of the University, they have to be consistent with state and federal laws, which also govern collective bargaining. The University has to stay within the laws of Illinois. The University cannot determine what is acceptable under collective bargaining and its limitations; it is set by state and federal law. Professor Tolliver commented that her reading of the *Statutes* is that there can be nothing in the *Statutes* that contravenes state or federal law; so the *Statutes* are in line with state and federal law. Professor Shanahan felt that the resolution is incorrect if it is implying that collective bargaining cannot set any rules that are outside of the *Statutes*. He added that federal law states that collective bargaining can set grievance procedures. Professor Burbules said that grievance procedures are laid out in *Statutes* and *General Rules* and there is a provision for changing them. He recognized the right of people to participate in collective bargaining, but thought that there should be consistency between the collective bargaining agreements and the *Statutes* and *General Rules*. Professor Francis acknowledged that administration and the efforts of collective bargaining could do away with shared governance. He said that this is a perfect way to reiterate the Conference's wish to those making decisions that the tradition of shared governance be respected by both sides. Professor Boltuc agreed that the *Statutes* were not the highest authority, as mentioned by Professor Shanahan. He also agreed with Professor Francis' sentiment and added that it is the role of the Conference to encourage all parties to respect shared governance.

Professor Burbules suggested modifying the new sentence in Par. 3 of the resolution by changing "must" to "should." Professor Fisher considered whether Professor Shanahan's point might indicate that the Conference needs to take a different path; perhaps an affirmation of the value of shared governance rather than stating that collective bargaining cannot supersede the *Statutes*. Professor Burbules mentioned that Legal Counsel did not find any problems with the resolution. Professor Mohammadian suggested that the new sentence in Par. 3 include a statement about preserving shared governance. Professor Burbules suggested the following wording: "Any local provisions should be consistent with those documents and with the procedures of shared governance." Professor Tolliver suggested stronger wording: "The University Senates Conference affirms that any provision of any collective bargaining agreement that contravenes the *Statutes* and the *General Rules* would undermine the principles and practices of shared governance at the University of Illinois."

Professor Chambers said that he supports the amended resolution and is also cognizant of the federal and state law issues. He thought that the real issue is dealing with trying to annunciate boundaries and who speaks for whom.

The Conference decided to postpone further decision on this item to a later meeting.

(The Conference recessed from the business meeting at 11:00 a.m.)

V. Meeting with Vice President Pierre and Visiting Associate Vice President Wheeler

Dr. Wheeler discussed a working document that outlined the metrics that are being considered for a review of academic units. He has consulted with the chancellors and the provosts. The review will look at academic units in a consistent format while avoiding getting lost in a sea of data. The review will be designed to provide a better understanding of the relations among academic priorities in terms of quality, costs, and revenue generation. The review will not be designed to make unit decisions or to take the place of regular unit reviews. The review is not intended to provide a comprehensive review of a unit, but could trigger the need for a more comprehensive review. Nor will the review determine budget allocations. Much of the information to be used will come from existing data. Indicators to be considered include the size of a unit compared to its instruction and research, distribution of teaching, diversity, and funding in relation to tuition and general revenue funds. Rankings will be used to some extent.

Dr. Wheeler said that the review will recognize that there are huge variations among units and that not all units are market driven. There need to be cross-subsidies in order to enable the campuses to function. Research varies greatly among units as well.

Dr. Wheeler welcomed the comments and suggestions made by Conference members. He said that he did not want to seek out other faculty conversations before meeting with this group. Professor Burbules asked the USC Academic Affairs and Research Committee and the Finance, Budget and Benefits Committee to monitor the review. Dr. Wheeler indicated his willingness to provide updates.

Vice President Pierre commented that this process is not an evaluation of units, but rather a sheet of indicators to help departments make useful decisions. He added that University Administration has the resources of the Office of Planning and Budgeting and a decision-support group to assist in the process.

The Conference expressed appreciation for the presentation.

VI. Meeting with Chancellor Wise

Chancellor Wise discussed the Visioning Future Excellence at Illinois initiative, which is a form of strategic planning that aims to position the campus to meet what it views to be the most important societal challenges over the next 10-20 years. She commented that this is especially important since we are a land grant university.

The visioning exercise included a retreat, focus groups, and surveys to gather input from the campus community, alumni, and community leaders. Six prominent themes emerged: education, economic development, energy and environment, health and wellness, information and technology, and social equality and cultural understanding. A working group has been assigned to each theme to formulate a plan for addressing the specific issue. After all of the working groups report, the Chancellor will meet with campus leaders to develop the framework for a strategic plan.



Chancellor Wise also discussed the need to figure out how to fund a public research university with decreasing state funds.

Conference members praised Chancellor Wise with regards to the impressive visioning initiative and thanked her for her excellent comprehensive leadership.

(The Conference resumed the business meeting at 12:35 p.m.)

New Business – continued

6. OT-296. Proposal that USC should be able to initiate revisions to the *Statutes*.

Professor Tolliver brought forth a recommendation from the USC Statutes and Governance Committee to amend the *Statutes* to allow the University Senates Conference to initiate proposed revisions to the *Statutes*. She pointed out that there is precedence for USC to propose amendments. The recommendation would codify this practice.

Professor Burbules commented that the present language in the *Statutes* includes provisions for only the Board and the senates to initiate revisions to the *Statutes*, which is not actual practice. Since the University is in the larger process of editing the *Statutes* and the *General Rules*, he felt that this seemed like a good occasion to consider this revision.

Professors Chambers and Boltuc spoke in support of the recommendation. Professor Burbules asked whether the Conference was in agreement. By voice vote, the Conference approved the recommendation. Professor Burbules said that he would carry it forward into the current *Statutes* and *General Rules* revision process (ST-77/GR-46).

7. OT-297. Implications of the Open Meetings Act to the operations of the University Senates Conference.

Professor Burbules commented that he discovered several provisions in the Open Meetings Act while taking the examination where USC might be in violation. He referred to his list of these items and the list of questions that had been answered by Legal Counsel in spring 2012. Professor Burbules asked the Conference's sense of how these discrepancies should be addressed. He thought that some might need to be addressed in the USC bylaws, and others might be dealt with in an *ad hoc* way. One example is that meetings cannot be held virtually, as the USC meeting is being held today, unless there is a full committee quorum at one of the locations. Suggestions from the Conference included trying to get the Open Meetings Act changed, doing nothing, and obeying the law as closely as possible while remaining operational. Professor Shanahan questioned whether USC is really subject to OMA since it is an advisory group.

Professor Burbules suggested asking the USC Statutes and Governance Committee to look into whether any changes should be made to the USC bylaws and whether any changes should be made to USC practices. The Conference agreed.

## VII. Old Business – Information and Discussion Items

### 8. ST-77/GR-46. Revisions to the *Statutes* and *General Rules* – Edits and Updates.

Professor Burbules said that the drafting committee has been expanded to add three faculty members; one from each campus. The committee will meet in early February. The next set of changes will be coming from Human Resources and Legal Counsel. This stage is coming to an end. At some point, the Board will give the approval to take the proposed revisions to the campuses. The Board would like to vote on the changes in May.

Professor Burbules reminded the Conference that Professor Tolliver, Chair of the USC Statutes and Governance Committee, has suggested that the committee divide the changes into those that are simply editorial in nature or uncontroversial, those that require more consideration, and those that need extensive deliberation. He added that USC should determine when it will need to forward the proposed revisions to the senates in order to allow two readings. Professor Burbules predicted that at least some proposed changes would have to carry over to the next academic year.

### 9. OT-291. Recommendation to establish Faculty Advisory Committees for all four Vice Presidents.

No new information.

### 10. OT-123. Discussion of University Senates Conference guests.

The Conference discussed possible guests for future meetings.

### 11. Campus Updates.

Professor Tolliver reported that the UIUC Senate meeting of February 4 will include a discussion on collective bargaining. There will also be an update on Coursera at that meeting.

### 12. Reports from USC Committee Chairs:

Academic Affairs and Research Committee	Matthew Wheeler
Finance, Budget and Benefits Committee	Peter Boltuc
Hospital and Health Affairs Committee	Donald Chambers
Statutes and Governance Committee	Joyce Tolliver

There were no reports

### 13. OT-142. Updates on External Committees: Common Application Consortium (Graber); Enrollment Management Policy Council (Leff); Pre- and Post-Award Research Money Policy group (Wheeler); Strategic Communications and Marketing Council; UI Labs Task Force (Chambers); University Technology Management Team (Campbell); Vice President for Academic Affairs Faculty Advisory Committee

(Burbules, Chambers, Mohammadian, Villegas); Vice President for Research Faculty Advisory Committee (Boltuc, Chambers, Wheeler).

Professor Chambers, VPR FAC, reported on pre- and post-ward and UI Labs concerns.

14. Review of Pending Items.

No new information

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Pending USC Items  
January 17, 2013

OT-167. Faculty Representation to the Board of Trustees. UIUC Resolution 9/27/99. UIS Resolution 11/5/99. UIC resolution 12/2/99. USC Resolution to Senates 2/3/00. Endorsed by UIS 2/18/00. Endorsed by UIC 3/9/00. Endorsed by UIUC 4/24/00. Transmitted to the President 6/30/00. Transmitted to the Board 7/6/00. Letter from Trustee Eppley institutionalizing process for meetings with Chair of BoT Academic Affairs Committee and senate observers 12/1/04. Letter to Ikenberry 12/10/09.

OT-223. Annual Review of the Vice Presidents.

OT-248. Intellectual Property Issues.

OT-260. University Information Security Policy.

OT-262. Accelerated Degree Program.

OT-265. Academy on Capitalism and Limited Government Foundation.

OT-268. Administrative Reorganization.

OT-276. Performance Based Funding.

OT-280. Faculty Participation in Shared Governance at University of Illinois.

OT-288. Faculty/Staff Pension and Benefit Issues (formerly Resolution on Pensions/  
Pension Reform).