MINUTES\textsuperscript{1}

UNIVERSITY SENATES CONFERENCE

DATE: Friday, June 7, 2002

PLACE: Room 219 Student Residence Hall, Chicago

PRESENT: Alston, Conry (Chair), Jones, Kaufman, Langley, Marshall, Strom (Secretary), Weech, Weller, White, Wood, Zaki


GUESTS: Chester Gardner, Stephen Rugg, James Stukel

Professor Thomas Conry, Chair, called the University Senates Conference to order at 10:00 a.m.

I. Executive Session

(Text suppressed due to confidential nature of material discussed.)

II. Approval of University Senates Conference Minutes of April 30, 2002

The minutes were approved as distributed.

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. Campus Updates

Professor Weller said that the new UIC Provost, Dr. Michael Tanner, officially begins in July. An interim University Librarian has been appointed and a search will begin after Provost Tanner starts.

Professor Langley said that UIS has a new Business Dean and Library Dean, as well as a new basketball team and coach.

\textsuperscript{1}Subject to approval at the University Senates Conference meeting of June 24, 2002
Professor Alston said that at UIUC there are five dean searches that are at various stages: Law, Agriculture, Social Work, Library and Information Science, and Communications. She also noted that UIUC has a new Vice Chancellor for Research.

IV. Old Business – Action and Discussion Items

1. OT-178. USC Web Page.

Professor Kaufman commented on the web page he had created. The Conference commended him for the work he had done. Professor Kaufman said that there was a question as to whether links to the minutes should be on the web page. He added that he deleted the executive session portion of the minutes when he posted them. The Conference agreed that the executive session portion of the minutes should not be posted on the web page.


The Conference briefly discussed some of the follow-up items from the retreat.

3. Report of Observer to the Board of Trustees Meeting.

May 15, 2002, Chicago

Professor Strom commented on the meeting.

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

The Conference discussed possible guests to invite to future meetings. Because President Stukel was no longer available to meet on June 21, the group decided to change the meeting to sometime during the next week.

5. OT-142. Update on the Management Teams: Academic Affairs; Business Administration and Human Resources; Economic Development and Corporate Relations; Governmental Relations.

Reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAMT</td>
<td>May 21, 2002</td>
<td>Professors Conry and Strom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 6, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHRTM</td>
<td>April 12, 2002</td>
<td>Professor Weller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. New Business

6. Designation of Future Observers of Board of Trustees Meetings:
6a. Follow-up Discussion on Salary Increases

Professor Weech said that equity was an important point in the persuasion for a salary increase. He added that more data is needed on how much it would cost to give a salary increase to faculty and staff not on contractual agreements and how many positions could be lost. Professor Kaufman remarked that there could be more damage by not giving raises because of the potential loss of faculty. Professor Alston mentioned that the campus units have already calculated their budgets with the worse-case scenario that the University would be looking at a $100M budget cut, and the current figure is $65M. Professor Marshall commented that maybe the Conference should not view a salary increase as unthinkable. Professor Strom suggested that Professor Conry draft a letter to the President requesting further exploration on these issues. Professor Conry commented that the timing is crucial.

Professor White asked if the Conference really wanted to pursue an increase for FY03 at this late time or really push for a substantial increase for FY04. Professor Conry remarked that there has already been planning for a $100M budget cut, there is some percentage of employees under union contracts that have raises programmed in, and it is important that a message be sent that faculty and staff are important. Professor Zaki said that employees have only received about a 3% increase in good years, so the Conference might want to think more about whether to pursue a raise for this year. Professor Weech thought that it was important to inform the President of concern that was expressed at this business meeting and to request the additional information mentioned earlier. Professor Zaki agreed that the issues should be followed up with the President.

Professor Kaufman suggested that the letter begin discussion of the FY04 budget and push for a larger increase, possibly in the double-digits, in FY04 rather than focus on FY03. Professor Conry thought that it was too soon to get any kind of commitment for FY04. Professor Langley thought that it was important to ask for a raise for FY03 and to give the message that salary increases must be viewed as a priority.

Professor Kaufman summarized what had been discussed: ask for information on the cost of salaries for employees not on contractual agreements, ask for information on the other Big Ten institutions, ask for a salary increase, and ask for large salary adjustments for FY04. Professor Langley commented that she would rather ask for a 1% raise for all employees who are not receiving raises necessitated by contracts instead of 3% for only faculty. No Conference members expressed opposition.

Professor Langley moved that a letter be sent to the President with the request for information on the budget situations at the other Big Ten institutions and the raises they are receiving, and ask for salary increases of 1%-3% for employees not on contractual agreements. The motion was seconded. By a show of hands, the motion passed 7-3 with one abstention. The chair did not vote.
6b. Representation on the Tuition Planning Committee.

Professor Conry said that he was a member of the central tuition planning committee. Professor Strom volunteered to serve on the committee. Professor Langley said that she would find someone to serve from UIS.

VI. Old Business – Information Items


No new information.


No new information.


No new information.

10. ST-54. Amendment to the Statutes, Article IX, Section 10 – Nonreappointment of Academic Professional Staff. Passed UIUC Senate 3/19/01. Transmitted to Senates 5/18/01. Passed UIC Senate 9/28/01. Passed UIS Senate 11/30/01. Transmitted to the President 2/14/02.

No new information.

11. BG-12. 2001-02 University Administration Budget and Benefits Study Committee.

No new information.


No new information.
13. BG-10c. Resolution on Faculty Salary and Benefits. Passed UIUC Senate 5/1/00. Passed UIS Senate 6/16/00. Passed UIC Senate 9/28/00. USC Resolution Transmitted to the President 1/11/01.

No new information.


No new information.


Professor Kaufman brought copies of the draft document he had distributed by e-mail, noting that he had made an editorial change to the hard-copy version on Page 2, VI. 2., fifth line, deleting “including any record:”. Professor Kaufman said that this began as an ADA policy six to seven years ago. The UIUC Senate acted on it first and folded into the policy behavior issues. The UIC Senate made several changes. The UIS Senate, working from the UIC Senate version, did a re-write that made the document more fluent. Professor Kaufman said that he took the approach that the document should be *Evaluation of Ability to Work*, which would be a simple policy that describes the procedure for the way that an employee might be evaluated. He said that the UIS version provides sufficient protections in the processes. One substantial change made by UIS was to permit the employee to trigger the process. Professor Kaufman proposed that this provision be deleted.

Professor Weech said that he was on an earlier committee looking at this issue and there was concern over the protection of the employee. He suggested that the employee be permitted to request a second evaluation from a doctor of his or her choice. Professor Kaufman suggested the words, “The employee may provide their own evaluation.” Professor Kaufman pointed out that the document is for all employees but there are special considerations for faculty members listed in III. He also reminded the Conference that this is an evaluation process, not a determination of what happens to the employee after the evaluation.


No new information.

17. OT-161. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments.

No new information.

No new information.


No new information.

20. OT-181. Proposed Revisions to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Integrity in Research and Publication*, Section IV.B.2. Transmitted to the President 7/13/01. Transmitted to the Senates 10/4/01. Transmitted to Vice President Gardner 4/22/02.

No new information.

21. OT-184. Committee on Vice Presidential Search Procedures, Processes for Commenting on the Reappointment of University Officers and (formerly OT-176) Periodic Vice President-Level Reviews. *Periodic Vice President-Level Reviews* approved by USC 11/28/00; Transmitted to the President 1/19/01. *Recommended Principles to be Used in Searches for Major Administrative Positions* transmitted to the President 11/14/01; President transmitted to Board of Trustees 11/27/01.

No new information.

22. OT-185. Senate Resolutions on Benefits for Domestic Partners. Passed UIUC Senate 4/23/01; Passed UIS Senate 9/14/01. Letter of reaffirmation of USC support transmitted to the President 11/14/01.

No new information.


No new information.


No new information.

VII. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.