

MINUTES¹
UNIVERSITY SENATES CONFERENCE

DATE: Tuesday, February 21, 2012

PLACE: Room 206 Student Center West, Chicago

PRESENT: Andersen*, Boltuc, Burbules (Vice Chair), Campbell, Chambers (Chair),
Erricolo***, Fadavi**, Fisher, Francis, Graber, Leff, Mallory, Mohammadian*,
O'Brien, Patston, Shanahan, Struble, Villegas, Wheeler

ABSENT: Gibori

GUESTS***: Christine Des Garennes, Avijit Ghosh, Thomas Hardy, Michael Hogan,
Christopher Kennedy, Susan Kies, Christophe Pierre

*Attended by phone

** Attended in the morning

***Attended in the afternoon

Professor Donald Chambers, Chair, called the University Senates Conference to order at 10:03 a.m.

I. Introduction of New UIS Members

Professor Chambers introduced and welcomed Professors Peter Boltuc, Lynn Fisher, and Jorge Villegas. The new members briefly discussed their academic areas of interest.

II. USC Chair's Comments

Professor Chambers reminded everyone of the confidentiality guidelines and asked everyone to continue to use judgment when discussing issues outside of the Conference. He said that at the September retreat the Conference pledged to support the ultimate good of the University and the campuses. He reminded the Conference that communications with the President and the Board of Trustees should go through the USC Chair.

Professor Chambers commented that discussions on campus autonomy and centralization have created tensions. While there has been a lot of conflict, there have also been positive outcomes as a result of USC's advisory role. He specifically mentioned the prescription of a summit and the report on enrollment management that was approved by USC. Professor Villegas commented that he thought the enrollment management report was very well done.

¹Subject to approval at the University Senates Conference meeting of March 27, 2012

Professor Campbell said that the Conference might think of the Open Meetings Act (OMA) as a way to make what USC does more transparent. Professor Fisher said that she and her colleagues from UIS who are now on USC are just becoming aware of some of the events that took place over the last several months. She commented that the UIS Senate did not discuss the FOIA request.

Professor Chambers said that he would like to have an expert on OMA talk with USC. He noted that draft documents are not subject to FOIA. Professor Wheeler said that discussions of draft documents are subject to OMA but copies do not have to be distributed outside of the membership of the group.

Professor Burbules discussed the dual-nature of USC. There are the senate-like functions that include considering statutory changes and passing resolutions. There is also the advisory role where issues need to be discussed and information needs to be shared. These discussions, for example with the President or alone as USC colleagues, sometimes need to be in confidence. If others are not in the room, for example the press, there are no legal boundaries that keep these discussions from being confidential. There needs to be ethical boundaries and an agreement with each other to keep certain discussions in confidence. Professor Francis asked that it be noted that he agreed with Professor Burbules. Professor Boltuc agreed that there needed to be an ethical dimension that everyone could understand.

Both Professor Campbell and Professor Wheeler commented that the USC meetings should be taped again. Professor Mallory said that there is a public option for OMA training on the web. She and others agreed that the meetings should be taped. There were no objections.

III. Approval of University Senates Conference Minutes of January 13, 2012

Professor Burbules moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. The minutes were approved with one abstention.

IV. 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.

Professor Leff moved to approve the classification of senate minutes. The motion was seconded, voted on, and approved.

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

1. University of Illinois at Chicago, January 26, 2012

- PR-12.14 Establish an Interdepartmental Graduate Concentration in Cardiovascular Science
- PR-12.15 Revision of the Master of Science in Health Informatics
- PR-12.16 Revision of the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Pharmacy
- PR-12.17 Revision of the Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD)/Master of Science in Clinical and Translational Science (CTS) Joint Degree Program
- PR-12.18 Revision of the Doctor of Dental Medicine (DMD)/Master of Science in Clinical and Translational Science (CTS) Joint Degree Program
- PR-12.19 Revision of the Doctor of Medicine (MD)/Master of Science in Clinical and Translational Science (CTS) Joint Degree Program
- PR-12.20 Revision of the Minor in Environmental Engineering
- PR-12.21 Revision of the Bachelor of Science in Architecture
- CP-12.03 Elimination of the Post-Baccalaureate Campus Certificate in Health Informatics

2. University of Illinois at Springfield, January 27, 2012

- R41-26 Rename the Department of Visual Arts to the Department of Art, Music, and Theatre

3. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, January 30, 2012

SP.12.08 Adjustment of numbers used in calculating size of Faculty Voting Units

SP.11.12 Revisions to the Bylaws and Standing Rules Regarding Illinois Open Meetings Act compliance

B. The following item was classified III by the University Senates Conference:

4. University of Illinois at Chicago, January 26, 2012Motion to approve the proposed revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 failed (USC ST-76)5. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, January 30, 2012SP.12.07 Proposed Revisions to the *University Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 – University Senates Conference (Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions)

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

6. University of Illinois at Chicago, January 26, 2012

Approved the UIC Senate Recruitment, Admissions and Retention Committee Response to the Final Report of the External Review Team on Enrollment Management & Services at the University of Illinois

Endorsed the University Senates Conference Enrollment Management Task Force Assessment and Recommendations Regarding the External Review of University Enrollment Management Report

Endorsed the resolution regarding the Public Comments to the Board of Trustees on January 18, 2012 regarding the Ethical Dimensions of Leadership

7. University of Illinois at Springfield, January 27, 2012

Vote of No Confidence; Demand for Resignation of Professor Tih-Fen Ting from the UIS Campus Senate and University Senates Conference

8. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, January 30, 2012
- SC.12.09 Endorsement and Support of University Senates Conference Chair Donald Chambers' Statement on the Ethical Dimension of Leadership to the Board of Trustees on January 19, 2012
- SC.12.10 Statement on Ethical Leadership and Shared Governance
- RS.12.02 Resolution on Enrollment Management, Diversity and Share Governance
9. University of Illinois at Springfield, February 10, 2012
- R41-25 Modification of Post-Tenure Review Committee Selection Procedures

Explanation of File Numbers

ST - University of Illinois *Statutes*

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

BG - University Administration Budget and Benefits Study Committee

NC - Nominating Committee

OT - All other items

V. New Business

1. OT-287. Election of USC Executive Committee Members from UIS.

Professors Peter Boltuc and Lynn Fisher were elected.

2. Designation of Observer of Board of Trustees Meeting:

Thursday, March 15, 2012 Urbana Carol Leff

3. OT-283. Endorsement and Support of University Senates Conference Chair Donald Chamber's Statement on the Ethical Dimension of Leadership to the Board of Trustees on January 19, 2012. **Endorsed by UIC Senate 1/26/12. Endorsed by UIUC Senate 1/30/12.**

Professor Struble made a motion to endorse the statement. The motion was seconded and approved with five abstentions.

4. OT-284. Urbana-Champaign Senate Statement on Ethical Leadership and Shared Governance. **Passed UIUC Senate 1/30/12.**

Professor Patston made a motion to approve the statement. The motion was seconded. Professor Boltuc thought that the resolution was vague, but the spirit seemed understandable. Professor Wheeler did not think that the version presented to USC included the amendments made by the UIUC Senate. He explained the changes that had been made. Some members thought that the statement should be sent to the other senates while others thought it was time to move past these issues. Professor Burbules noted that the document had already been transmitted to the President, Board of Trustees, and senate leaders. He said USC's endorsement was of a symbolic nature. The Conference voted to endorse the statement.

5. OT-286. UIS Campus Senate resolution of no confidence in the UIS Senate Chair. **Passed UIS Senate 1/27/12.**

The Conference accepted the resolution. Professor Burbules commented that the resolution was a very important act by the UIS Senate that understandably was not easy. However, he felt that it was necessary and the right thing to do in order to move forward. Professor Chambers stressed that this has never been an anti-UIS issue. He said that this was demonstrated in the Conference's resolution to return to the practice of rotation as soon as possible.

VI. Old Business – Action Items

None.

VII. Old Business – Information and Discussion Items

6. ST-76. Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 (University Senates Conference) – Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions. Passed UIS Senate 9/9/11. Failed UIC Senate 1/26/12. Failed UIUC Senate 1/30/12.

Professor Chambers noted that the proposed statutory revisions were not approved by the UIC and UIUC Senates. Professor Wheeler made a motion to remove the item from the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

7. OT-275. Enrollment Management.

Professor Chambers commented that the report from the external reviewers appears to have had input from the President's Office; possibly even written jointly. He said that the President was given thirty days from the last USC meeting to respond to the concerns and recommendations made by the Conference. The revised draft document is the President's response. Professor Burbules stressed that there needs to be time for USC to discuss the document, gather information, and solicit advice from the senates. There were concerns about how processes would ultimately be carried out.

The Conference discussed questions and concerns to bring to the afternoon discussion with Chairman Kennedy, President Hogan, Vice President Pierre, and Special Assistant Ghosh.

8. OT-281. Conflicts of Commitment and Interest - revisions mandated by changes in federal-level policy by the Dept. of Health and Human Services. Transmitted to the Senates 1/26/12.

No new information.

9. OT-282. USC ad hoc Committee to develop more specific standards for implementing the existing USC Confidentiality Guidelines.

The committee provided an interim draft report.

10. OT-269. Cross-Campus Dialogue (formerly Call for a University-wide Summit on Organization and Governance).

No new information.

11. OT-271. University Senates Conference presentations to the Board of Trustees.

No new information.

12. OT-276. Performance Based Funding.

No new information.

13. OT-277. Nominations for Search Committee for Executive Director of University Relations.

No new information.

14. ST-72. Consideration of the language in the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 (Academic Freedom). Passed UIUC Senate 12/6/10. Transmitted to UIC and UIS Senates 2/7/11. Passed UIC Senate 9/22/11.

No new information.

15. OT-123. Discussion of University Senates Conference guests.

No new information.

16. Campus Updates.

There were no campus reports.

17. OT-142. Updates on the Management Teams: Academic Affairs; External Relations; Vice President for Research Faculty Advisory Committee; University Technology.

No meetings were held.

18. Report of Observer of Board of Trustees Meeting:

January 18 and 19, 2012
(Retreat/Meeting)

Chicago

Donald Chambers

VIII. Meeting with Chairman Kennedy, President Hogan, Vice President Pierre, and Special Assistant Ghosh

President Hogan brought attention to the draft enrollment management document that is a response to questions and concerns that have been raised. He acknowledged that there are still questions to be answered. The President commented that the recommendation concerning branding had been taken off of the table. He said that he has already been working with the provosts, chancellors, and the Board to begin implementing some of the recommendations that are not under contest, such as setting tuition earlier and packaging financial aid. He added that PAP (President's Award Program) has been upgraded by offering more financial aid. There will be task forces to look into student information systems, the common application, and cost analysis. President Hogan said that he would take time to talk with the appropriate people and keep USC informed. He would like to set up small working groups because some issues are not definitive until there is more information. The President would like to begin moving forward. He said that Dr. Ghosh would continue to assist him with the work on enrollment management issues.

Dr. Ghosh said that they are trying to move forward while being sensitive to the concerns being raised. He thinks that there is a great deal of consensus on the objectives and the best way to achieve the objectives is with a lot of discussion. In the areas where there is agreement, such as financial aid, there will continuously be efforts to make improvements. This will mostly be done by the initiatives of the campuses. One effort is to try to create more campus-based scholarships in a coordinated kind of way. There are a number of issues where there cannot be a decision yet because there is not enough background information. What will be the cost? What will be the impact on student information systems? Is there a way to adapt the existing information systems? Dr. Ghosh thought it was important to move ahead with an assessment of the Common Application Consortium. The assessment could include talking with schools that have implemented the common app. There needs to be data we can rely on. The assessment group should include IT people, admissions people, and someone from the VPAA office. This group should be responsive to questions raised in order to make the best decision possible.

Dr. Ghosh commented that it was clear that Recommendations 1 and 2 could move ahead. He envisioned two parallel processes. 1) At the college level: Each college should come

up with goals that include the kind of students and the number of students the college wants to have. The colleges should have an established process that includes administrators and faculty governance. However, the process should not be in a vacuum and should acknowledge University-wide goals. At the campus-level: There should be a process driven by the chancellors and the provosts. 2) The chancellors, president, and vice president for academic affairs should be responsible for setting university-wide goals. Both processes should have a back and forth flow. And be sensitive to individual processes.

Professor Francis asked for a clarification on the bottom of Page 7. He asked what “this” meant in the sentence, “With the consent of the Board Chair, however, I’ve decided to put this recommendation in abeyance for at least a year.” President Hogan clarified that it meant that the VPAA will need an enrollment manager, but there would not be a change in the current reporting lines of the campus enrollment and admissions personnel.

Professor Burbules said his understanding after the President’s comment was that an enrollment manager would be hired but there would be no changes in reporting lines. If the Enrollment Management Policy Council works, there would be no need to have reporting line changes.

President Hogan said that it was his “presumption” that current reporting lines would not need to change so long as the VPAA and Provosts committee is effective in promoting campus to campus and university administration to campus coordination.

Vice President Pierre confirmed Professor Burbules’ understanding and added that the Executive Director of Enrollment Management would report to the VPAA. President Hogan said that Vice President Pierre would chair the search committee. Vice President Pierre said that there is also an assistant vice president for academic affairs position open in his office. He acknowledged that it would be an undertaking to fill both positions, but there will be a need for an Executive Director of Enrollment Management.

Professor Francis recommended that the word “executive” not be used in the title. Chairman Kennedy asked for clarification of the issue. Professor Francis responded that the title suggests that the VPAA needs a presidential commissar to watch his actions. He added that reporting line issues can be misread by people who analyze structures. The title of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs was discussed and agreed upon.

President Hogan said that the last paragraph would be changed. Once the document is no longer a draft it should be widely circulated.

Professor Burbules said that his understanding was that enrollment management policies would be under the Enrollment Management Policy Council. President Hogan said that he was happy with that. He added that the VPAA and the Provosts would plan together.

Responding to a question, President Hogan confirmed that the campuses would retain control over financial aid policy.

Vice President Pierre commented that the equivalent of an Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management is already taking place in an ad hoc role in his office. The provosts, vice chancellors, and staff in his office, Charlie Evans and Marilyn Marshall, are discussing and working on PAP, course transfers, and other enrollment management issues.

Professor Struble asked for confirmation of whether the campus enrollment managers would have a dual reporting line or keep the campus reporting lines. Several people responded that there would not be a dual reporting line.

Professor Burbules pointed out a discrepancy. On Page 7 it says that issues related to enrollment management will be discussed by Policy Council and then recommendations will be forwarded to the President's Cabinet for final decision. On Page 2 (ii) it says that "The Chancellors and the President, on recommendation of the Enrollment Management Policy Council, will establish overall university and campus goals and policies..." It was agreed that p. 7 should say President and Chancellors, not the full Cabinet.

Dr. Ghosh said that financial aid is a major issue with enrollment management. How do you make resources more effective? How do you adopt best practices? There are a lot of questions, but university goals should be part of the entire goal setting process. The campus admissions offices and enrollment managers should decide how to best implement policies. There are a lot of opportunities for the three campuses to work together. All three campuses are trying to recruit Chicago Public Schools students. He mentioned that Salute to Academic Achievement is an effort involving all three campuses.

Professor Francis commented that departments have the greatest motivation to recruit students. In Math, there is a merit program targeting underrepresented high schools that uses extra money to provide assistance to the students. He said that faculty used to go recruit. Professor Boltuc said that it is important to reach down to the level of junior high school to start offering support.

Professor Leff thought that, instead of competing for top students to improve diversity, students should be prepared so they do not need so much support later on. This could happen with more enrichment programs and summer programs for high school students. President Hogan said that UIC is thinking about a summer program.

Dr. Ghosh agreed that we are not broadening the pool of students and everyone is going after the same pool. He commented on the Possey Foundation, which helps those students who traditionally do not go to top colleges. Another group, the Lead Foundation, supports students who would go into engineering and business. Professor Chambers discussed the concept of establishing a pre-med institute for post-baccalaureates to get them up to par.

Professor Wheeler said that his college has had programs that work with high school students to prepare them for college, and then other schools plucked them because they had better scholarships. He works with high school students every year that end up going elsewhere.

President Hogan acknowledged that there is a need to put more money into the scholarship fund.

Professor Struble suggested that it might be worth having faculty on the Enrollment Management Policy Council. Vice President Pierre thought that was a good point. He said that he had been thinking about a faculty advisory committee for his office. The committee would discuss enrollment management issues and other faculty matters such as scholar awards and recruiting faculty.

Professor Patston stressed the need to strive for excellence and diversity. He thought that it was important to have good articulation agreements. Also, students from challenging backgrounds will need help to succeed. He said that the UIC SEC talked about graduation rates and discussed the possibility of having decelerated graduation programs.

Professor Campbell thought that one of the most powerful groups to do recruiting is the undergraduate students. Their enthusiasm could make significant gains in attracting people.

Vice President Pierre commented on the increase in PAP dollar amounts that students can receive. He said that another change in the program sets expectations of the students. There is a need to keep following up on and mentoring these students.

Chairman Kennedy commented that this discussion was incredibly gratifying. He was interested in hearing about things that have been done in the past and ideas that look to the future. Chairman Kennedy discussed the need to also deal with the issues that the middle class face.

Professor Chambers said that making diversity work is more than attaining certain numbers. He said that groups at UIC tend to stay in their own centers rather than integrate into society.

Professor Leff was concerned that, on the Policy Council, academic affairs at UIS was left out of the loop in the planning process. Professor Boltuc had that concern as well. He said that admissions is under student affairs. He was also concerned that there was no faculty representation on the Policy Council. President Hogan said that he would talk with Chancellor Koch. Chairman Kennedy said, if the UIS campus moves the responsibility from Student Affairs to the Provost, that would change.

Professor Mallory said that she was very disappointed when she saw that there were no faculty on the Policy Council. She did not feel that a separate faculty advisory committee was a good alternative to having faculty on the Policy Council. Vice President Pierre said that there absolutely needs to be faculty involvement. He said that the interactions with the provosts and vice provosts often involve the nuts and bolts discussions. He envisioned that a faculty advisory group would have more substantive discussions.

Professor Burbules commented that the Vice President for Research has a faculty advisory committee. He said that the USC should also be a faculty council to Vice President Pierre. He added that USC had always had a special relationship with the VPAA, but this had been moved away from in recent years. President Hogan thought that it was a good idea for USC to meet with the VPAA and VPR on a regular basis. He also liked the idea of a faculty advisory committee in the VPAA Office. He said that Michael Hites has a faculty advisory committee. President Hogan said that there are plenty of places for faculty voices at every level.

Professor Mallory asked that faculty representation also be considered for the assessment study committee for the common application.

Professor Burbules wanted to clarify the President's comment that branding was off of the table. He said that the report indicates that "these recommendations require further exploration and discussion before moving forward." Professor Burbules asked if that meant exploration and discussion of *whether* to move forward. The President said that was correct.

Dr. Ghosh said that there seems to be a misunderstanding of Recommendation 21. Transfer agreements would still be made by each campus. Agreements already made would not be changed. The same articulation process would be used. Articulation starts at the department level.

Professor Wheeler commented that there should be periodic reviews of the courses and agreements. Things change over time and we do not want to set the student up to fail.

President Hogan said that there are many articulation agreements with community colleges throughout the state. That formula could basically be used as a model. Transfer articulation should only be applied to the general education curriculum and does not guarantee admission.

Professor Burbules asked a question about the VPAA committee that is looking at inter-campus agreements (bottom of Page 6). He asked what the committee would be doing if inter-campus agreements run through the departments first. Vice President Pierre said that the committee would be looking at the technical processes and possibly defining sets of courses that could have agreements. But any articulation agreements would have to be approved by the colleges and campuses, as at present.

Chairman Kennedy said that the document would be revised before it goes to the campuses. He suggested that the group go through the document page by page to see if there are any other suggestions and concerns.

Professor Mallory said that Chairman Kennedy's letter of January 30 has a statement about branding that is different from what is in the draft report. Chairman Kennedy responded that he will reconcile the language; most likely by dropping the comment from his letter into the report.

Professor Francis wanted to clarify that the title of the enrollment manager would not be Executive Director of Enrollment Manager. He reiterated the title that had been agreed upon earlier in the meeting; Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. (There were nods of agreement.)

Professor Francis asked that there be consistency throughout the document in regards to using either uppercase or lowercase for the chancellor and provost titles.

Professor Leff said that she is startled that many faculty members have a misunderstanding of the Common Application. Some faculty think that it means a common application for the three campuses.

Professor Wheeler commented on the assessment study of the Common Application (middle of Page 3). He said that any study generates a lot of data. More data gives more credibility and validity, assuming that it is a well-controlled study. He reminded the group that the U of I has many resources to do assessments.

Professor Mallory reiterated the request for faculty on the assessment committee. Professor Graber reiterated the request for faculty on the Enrollment Management Policy Council.

Professor Francis asked about the target date for all of this to happen. Chairman Kennedy said that it will happen whenever it is ready.

(Page 5) Professor Burbules said the he liked the approach of consolidation in the big bang letter. He asked where the letter would come from. President Hogan responded that the letter would come from the campuses.

Professor Struble asked about providing financial aid to the PAP students for four years of tuition when some students might take longer to graduate. Dr. Ghosh said that adjustments can be made. The President confirmed that decisions could be made case-by-case.

Professor Andersen asked if a student who chooses to finish in three years could draw on the financial aid during the summer. President Hogan responded that that was a good question for consideration. He thought that there could be flexibility. Professor Burbules thought that summers could also be utilized to help students who would most likely graduate in five years graduate in four.

There were other comments about tailoring multi-year scholarships to certain programs and the needs of students. Professor Burbules said that he did not think this needed to be put into the draft document. Chairman Kennedy agreed and said that these discussions would fall into Vice President Pierre's lap.

Professor Leff commented that the heading for Recommendations 7-10 was confusing because Recommendations 8-9 are separate. Dr. Ghosh said that he would correct the heading, and include information on Recommendation 10 from the Appendix.

President Hogan said that there could be a quick turn-around of a revised document. Professor Chambers asked that the revised document be sent to USC. Professor Chambers said that he would then give no more than seven days to receive comments back from Conference members. The USC Executive Committee would then consider all of the recommendations and send comments back to the full USC. After a couple of days for final suggestions, the document would then be sent back to President Hogan, and then sent to the campuses.

Professor Campbell said that the message needs to get out about the issue of how to market degrees. Professor Burbules said that there is no such thing as a U of I degree, as is mentioned on the bottom of Page 6. Degrees come from one of the three campuses. In the next sentence, he requested that "in part" be taken out. The sentence would read, "Our strength as a whole derives from the unique identity of each campus." Someone suggested also deleting "unique".

Vice President Pierre said that he would talk with Chancellor Koch about the situation of having the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs on the Policy Council. He also noted Professor Mallory's point of having input from faculty members from each campus.

Professor Burbules commented that the closing paragraph characterizes the new enrollment management position in a different way from what USC has been reviewing. The person in the new position would work with the enrollment management campus teams. The description in the draft document also uses the terms promote and facilitate. Professor Burbules wanted to clarify that, during today's discussion, it was decided that the title of the position was no longer "Executive Director" but "Associate Vice President". This would be a staff position under the VPAA. He reiterated that the job duties spelled out in the last paragraph are a sharply reduced scope of authority than previously proposed. (There were nods of agreement.)

Professor Francis suggesting taking out the last three words of the document, which are "prove its effectiveness."

Professor Burbules expressed his appreciation for the great conversation that had just occurred. USC members responded with a round of applause.

Chairman Kennedy said that it was helpful to have this dialog. He said that it would be great if he were invited back. He said that he looked forward to seeing what impact the big offer letter has. President Hogan said that we are beginning to see results from putting more money into PAP scholars. The campuses were asked to put in more money. There are improvements in key areas, but there are some yield issues. The quality of the pool is up. With more scholarship money, the yield will respond.

Professor Graber commented that Chairman Kennedy's involvement with the faculty has been unprecedented. There was more applause.

President Hogan and Chairman Kennedy requested that the meeting move into Executive Session to discuss University employment and appointments. The meeting was closed for Executive Session at 3:10 p.m.

The Executive Session ended at 3:53 p.m.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

Pending USC Items
February 21, 2012

GR-41. Review of language in *The General Rules*, Article V, Section 3 – Private Use of University Property Forbidden.

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-202. Review of the *University Senates Conference Organization and Functions*.

OT-211. Process for Selecting Board of Trustees Members.

OT-223. Annual Review of the Vice Presidents.

OT-232. Interactions with Legislators.

OT-247. USC Budget.

OT-248. Intellectual Property Issues.

OT-249. Exit Interviews.

OT-252. Vendor Code of Conduct.

OT-253. Program Review Process Collaboration among the Campuses.

OT-256. Positive Time Reporting.

OT-257. Role of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty in University Governance.

OT-260. University Information Security Policy.

OT-261. Short-Term and Long-Term Budget Planning.

OT-262. Accelerated Degree Program.

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

OT-266. Proposed revisions to the *University Senates Conference Organization and Functions* – (including proposed revisions to the subcommittee structure).

OT-268. Administrative Reorganization.

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