

MINUTES¹
UNIVERSITY SENATES CONFERENCE

DATE: Thursday, October 26, 2010

PLACE: Student Center West, UIC

PRESENT: Andersen, Burbules, Campbell, Chambers (Vice Chair), Eisenhart, Fadavi, Finnerty, Francis, Koronkowski, Martin*, Massat, O'Brien, Patston, Ramsey, Struble, Ting, Tolliver, Weech*, Wheeler (Chair)

ABSENT: Gibori

GUESTS: Michael Hogan, Christopher Kennedy, Lawrence Oliver, Lisa Troyer

*Participated by phone

Professor Matthew Wheeler, Chair, called the University Senates Conference to order at 10:05 a.m.

I. Executive Session

President Hogan provided an update on the status of the relationship between the University and the Academy on Capitalism and Limited Government Foundation.

President Hogan reported that he had met with various groups to discuss the administrative restructuring plan. He said that the issues have had open and fair hearings. He believes that the Board is anxious to hear what the faculty have to say. The group discussed ways to have ongoing communication.

Professor Patston said that the UIC Senate will be asking that the final decision be put off until March. The senate respectfully requests a slow-down. Professor Chambers commented that a lot of negativity could be made positive if there were more time and information. Other members mentioned that more time and information was needed. Professor Ting said that the UIS Senate has reached consensus and the Senate Executive Committee will be formulating a response. President Hogan stressed that the faculty should make concrete recommendations that the Board can react to. If more of an explanation of the rationale for the changes is needed, make that request.

Professor Tolliver commented that the proposed changes reflect real changes in practice and it would be helpful to have a clarification of what the global vision for the University is. President Hogan responded that there is commitment to one University with three distinct campuses with a clear chain of command and an effective Office of the President.

¹Subject to approval at the University Senates Conference meeting of November 30, 2010

Professor Campbell believed that the campuses need independence to achieve their unique missions. Professor Hogan said that there is nothing in the proposed changes that would undermine the authority of the chancellors.

Vice President Knorr provided an update on the budget. He said that support for higher education has been miserable over the last decade and this is not going to end soon. He reported on the dire financial condition of the State of Illinois. The state still owes the University \$290M from FY10. Nothing has been paid for FY11. Vice President Knorr said that the University needs to fund a meaningful general salary program as well as provide a pool of money for retention. The University is working on a three-year program. Vice President Knorr noted that the University saved \$83M in FY10 by controlling spending.

During lunch, Professors Andersen and Koronkowski gave short presentations about themselves and their careers.

II. Guests

Trustees Kennedy and Oliver met with the Senates Conference. Trustee Kennedy told the Conference members that he would like to listen to their thoughts on the administrative restructuring plan. Professor Tolliver recounted the recent meetings of the Urbana Senate, some of which were called specifically for the purpose of discussing the restructuring proposals. She also discussed plans for upcoming meetings of the Urbana Senate. Professor Patston reported on the additional UIC Senate meetings being held to discuss the proposals. One meeting will be devoted to discussing the proposal to create the position of Vice President for Health Affairs. Professor Ting said that both the UIS Senate and Senate Executive Committee already meet every other week. The Senate Executive Committee is formulating a response based on advice received during the Senate meetings. Both Professors Tolliver and Patston said that their senates need more time to discuss the proposals. Professor Chambers suggested that a retreat be held in early January with the President, members of the Board of Trustees, and members of the Senates Conference.

Trustee Kennedy commented that Illinois is losing industry. The University is of great importance to the State of Illinois. One way to create new business in Illinois is by creating knowledge.

Trustee Kennedy said that the changes proposed by the Board are not intended to weaken the campuses and the chancellors. They are intended to strengthen the role of the President, which benefits the entire University. He expressed concern that the Board may have difficulty having a quorum at the beginning of the year when the terms of three Board members expire. The Governor will have approximately 400 board appointments to fill at the beginning of the year, so there is no guarantee when the Board will have full membership.

Professor Finnerty commented that changing the University's culture takes a lot of care and should be done correctly. Trustee Oliver responded that the Board's intent is to make the University's whole greater than its sum of parts. Trustee Kennedy added that the Board is not looking for sweeping cultural changes. The campuses should not operate competitively. One leader is needed to insulate the campuses. President Hogan commented that he believes the Board is receptive to advice on particular items. The bigger philosophical issues take a lot of time.

Professor Francis said that he appreciates and endorses Trustee Kennedy's vision of the University, but does not see how imposing a corporate model on the University will fulfill that vision. Trustee Kennedy responded that a corporate model is not being proposed. He stated that he believes the University needs a strong president with clear authority.

Professor Burbules commented that there needs to be the proper balance between the philosophies of the university as a whole and the university with three significantly independent campuses. He thought that the proposed changes are an overcorrection that shifts power to a more centralized direction. The campuses need to have a certain degree of autonomy. Professor Burbules said that he believes the proposed statutory changes to add the title of vice president to the chancellors are not necessary because the *Statutes* already say that the chancellors report to the president, the chancellors have a university-level role, and the chancellors are part of the president's cabinet. In regards to adding "research" to the title of the Vice President for Technology and Economic Development, Professor Burbules pointed out that a lot of research does not include technology or economic development. He thought it would be important for a Vice President for Research to facilitate, not direct, research. He was concerned that this proposed change was not discussed with the Vice Chancellors for Research.

Professor Patston said that the environment on campus due to the political and budgetary landscape has caused suspicion and cynicism. People are wondering how the University can afford more positions when the ARR report recommended eliminating a vice president position. People are being laid off and positions are frozen.

Trustee Kennedy commented on the importance of the hospital. If the University does not have the proper facilities, it is more difficult to bring in research dollars. The University needs great doctors, professors, and teachers.

Trustee Oliver indicated that he needed to leave in order to attend another meeting. The Conference members thanked trustee Oliver for coming to the meeting which was followed with a round of applause.

Professor Ting said that morale is low at UIS due to the furlough year. She commented that the position description of the chancellor needs to be in the context of being the CEO of the campus. However, it is important to be able to articulate the mission of the campus within the whole of the University. She added that it is important for resources to go back into teaching and research.

Professor Tolliver said that she was grateful for the information and clarifications that Trustee Kennedy and President Hogan shared with the Senates Conference. She thought that it would be beneficial to have a cost-benefit analysis.

Professor Wheeler asked Trustee Kennedy if it was possible to allow more time to consider the restructuring proposals, as two of the senates had requested. Trustee Kennedy responded that his instinct was not to draw a line, but added that it might not be structurally possible given the situation with the outgoing trustees.

Professor Burbules commented that it is not just more time for the senates, but more time for the trustees to consider revisions to the proposals.

Professor Wheeler thanked Trustees Kennedy for meeting with the Senates Conference. The Conference responded with a round of applause.

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

III. New Business

1. ST-75/GR-44. Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes* and *General Rules* – Administrative Reorganization.

Professor Campbell said that it would be helpful for President Hogan to represent the faculty viewpoint in order to get the right changes through to the Board. Professor Finnerty reminded that Conference that the President invited the faculty to recommend changes to the proposals. Professor Tolliver said that the senates need to vote on what has been presented to them. If the senates decide not to support the changes, they can then propose an alternative vision. Professor O'Brien did not think that the senates necessarily had to vote on the changes as a first step. She said that if the senates have concerns with the document, they can communicate the points of concern to the Board for its consideration. Professor Tolliver said that the UIUC Senate Statutes Committee feels that the only way to get the sense of a body of 250 people is through a vote and the UIUC SEC endorsed that thought. Professor Burbules thought that the senates and USC have to make a statement on what was proposed, whether they make other recommendations or not.

Professor Wheeler said that USC would schedule at least one additional meeting to discuss the proposed changes. He was in favor of making recommendations if parts of the proposal do not have support.

Professor Chambers commented that he felt it was important for the Conference members to know what the group as a whole agrees on. There may be agreement on the principles of the changes, but there may not be agreement on or an understanding of the specifics. The Conference decided to discuss each proposal: 1) vice president/chancellor title realignment, 2) adding Research to the VPTED, 3) addition of a VPHA, 4) identify the duties of the VPAA, and 5) change in the provost language. Professor Burbules cautioned against voicing approval of the various proposals in principle, as this might send the message that USC approves the proposal, when, in reality, there are many details that need to be worked out before the actual change would be acceptable. The Conference thought it would be good for a wider circle to hear the comments made by Trustee Kennedy.

Professor Burbules thought it was important for USC to give advice to the senates as soon as possible, and then USC can make a decision on how to advise the President and the Board. Professor Wheeler was concerned that USC will not have given its advice to UIS, because the senate has already come to its conclusions. Professor Struble thought that the responsibility of USC was to give feedback to the Board. Professor Chambers thought it was important to develop a list of concerns.

Professor Eisenhart suggested that the Conference start with the proposal that there seems to be agreement on; changing the VPTED title. Professor Eisenhart made a motion to change the title of the Vice President for Technology and Economic Development to Vice President for Research. The motion was seconded.

Professor Eisenhart commented that technology and economic development should still be included in the portfolio. Professor Francis said that technology and economic development should also be part of the portfolio of the VPAA and VPHA. Professor Tolliver was concerned that there has been no information on how this vice president would articulate with the vice chancellors for research. Professor Francis said that the *General Rules* should use the word facilitate, not manage. Professor Burbules said that a major part of the rationale states that part of the role of this vice president would be to keep the campuses from competing with each other. He has heard concerns that this person could dictate which campus submits a proposal for a particular grant or require campuses to work together. Professor Wheeler said that his understanding was that the vice president could help the campuses work together when it would be beneficial. Professor Ting said that her understanding was that the vice president could help identify grants and opportunities. Professor Tolliver suggested that the Conference focus on the text and not what the intention might be. Professor Wheeler said that it was important to have a presence in Washington D.C. Professor Burbules pointed out that not all research involves technology and economic development. Professor Wheeler suggested that the Conference focus on the motion and then add some verbiage that describes the concerns of USC. There was general agreement.

Professor Wheeler restated the motion: To change the title of the Vice President for Technology and Economic Development to the Vice President for Research with the stipulations discussed by USC:

1. We would like to see a relationship which focuses on facilitating rather than managing. (The word “facilitating” be used instead of “managing” - Line 25)
2. We request an explanation of how the VPR will articulate with the Vice Chancellors for Research.
3. That the intent of this position is to identify opportunities (e.g. federal grants) where various units – including cross-campus collaborations – could work together. The intent of this position is not to dictate to or decide which units apply for particular grants.
4. That this person could be a presence in Washington D.C. to represent our endeavors.

The motion was approved by voice vote with one abstention.

Professor Struble made a motion to support the re-titling of the chancellor to include vice president, but to change the title to Chancellor/Vice President. The motion was seconded.

Professor Burbules thought this would be a mistake because everything that is needed to do what they say they want to do with the chancellor’s role is already contained in the existing language of the *Statutes*. He believed that people who want to be chancellor and lead a great campus do not necessarily want to be listed as part of the president’s staff. He thought the University would lose potential candidates. Sitting university presidents might not want to become a vice president. Professor Burbules added that the *Statutes* say that the chancellors work at the direction of the president, the chancellors are responsible as university officers for the well-being of the institution as a whole as well as their campuses, and that the chancellors are a member of the president’s cabinet. He did not see what including the title of vice president would add.

Professor Ting commented that, if the *Statutes* are clear, then there is nothing to worry about. However, what happened in the past is a clear indication that this is not the case. Adding the title of vice president makes it clear that the chancellors have a say in the planning of the University as a whole. She believed that adding vice president to the chancellor title would make the UIS chancellor position more attractive.

Professor Tolliver thought that Professor Burbules had provided abundant evidence from various points of the *Statutes* that the function of the chancellors is already contained in the *Statutes* and therefore amendments to the *Statutes* are redundant and unnecessary. Other members agreed that adding the title would be redundant.

Professor Andersen said that, if the Conference decides to endorse the title change, the viewpoints and concerns of those who do not endorse the title change could be given.

Professor Tolliver said that views have expressed that recent problems were a management/personnel problem, not a structural problem. She had serious concerns about amending the *Statutes* to deal with a personnel problem that has been resolved.

Professor Ting believed that the title change would make the relationship between the chancellor and the president more explicit and clear.

Professor Struble restated the motion: To support the proposal to add the title of vice president to chancellor, but switch the order to chancellor/vice president. The motion was not approved (No-9, Yes-6).

Professor Burbules made a motion that USC takes the position that all of the powers that are defined currently in the *Statutes* are sufficient to establish the proper relationship between a strong president and a strong chancellor and that we see adding the title of vice president as at best redundant and at worst a diminution of the chancellors' authority within the statutory definition. The motion was seconded. The motion was approved (Yes-8, No-7, Abstention-1).

The Conference decided that the vote count would not be stated in the report to the President, but the minority position would be recorded.

The Conference agreed that consideration of the proposal to create a Vice President for Health Affairs should be postponed until after the UIC town hall meeting to discuss the issue.

IV. Approval of University Senates Conference Minutes of September 22, 2010

Professor Chambers moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded, voted on, and approved.

V. 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 Eisenhart moved approval of 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, September 30, 2010

PR-11.01 Revision of the Doctor of Philosophy in English

PR-11.02 Establish a Human-Centered Computing Concentration, Bachelor of Science in Computer Science

PR-11.03 Eliminate the Department of Surgical Oncology and Incorporate it into the Department of Surgery

CI-11.01 Establish the Center for Cardiovascular Research

2. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, October 4, 2010

EP.11.01 Proposal from the Graduate College and College of Media to Revise the M.S. in Advertising

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

3. University of Illinois at Chicago, September 30, 2010

Approved Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment

4. University of Illinois at Springfield, October 8, 2010

R40-11 Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment

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

5. University of Illinois at Chicago, September 30, 2010

Approved Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article VIII

6. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, October 4, 2010SP.10.11 Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 – Academic Freedom
(First Reading)

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

7. University of Illinois at Springfield, September 24, 2010

R40-3 Modifications in Workload for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

R40-4 Designation of Scholar in Residence

8. University of Illinois at Springfield, September 10, 2010

R40-9 Clarification of Review Cycle for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The Conference suspended the remainder of the agenda until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Professor O'Brien moved that the USC Executive Committee schedule a time for a videoconference for USC to discuss of the remaining items in the administrative restructuring proposal. The Conference agreed.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Pending USC Items
October 26, 2010

ST-72. Consideration of the language in the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 (Academic Freedom).

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

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

OT-223. Annual Review of the Vice Presidents.

OT-232. Interactions with Legislators.

OT-247. USC Budget.

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

OT-262. Accelerated Degree Program.