Professor Thomas Conry, Chair, called the University Senates Conference to order at 10:04 a.m.

I. Executive Session

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

II. Approval of University Senates Conference Minutes of October 19, 2001

The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Classification of Senate Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I:</td>
<td>Matters of policy affecting one campus only. Item is sent to the President and Board of Trustees for action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III:</td>
<td>Amendments to the <em>University of Illinois Statutes</em>. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Subject to approval at the University Senates Conference meeting of January 23, 2002
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.

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

1. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, October 29, 2001

   I 10/29/01 EP.01.22, Revision of Course Numbering System

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.01, Revision of the Bachelor of Science Curriculum in Speech and Hearing Science, ALS

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.02, Addition of an Undergraduate Concentration in Rehabilitation Studies

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.05, Proposed Changes to the M.S.P.H. in Community Health, ALS

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.06, Proposal to Discontinue the Speech Teaching Option in the Speech Communication Major of the Sciences and Letters Curriculum

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.07, Proposal for a Graduate Concentration in Medieval Studies

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.08, General Education Requirements for Teaching Option of Majors in Mathematics, Science, English, Social Studies, and Foreign Languages

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.09, Proposal from the College of Engineering to Establish a Minor in Physics

   I 10/29/01 EP.02.12, Proposal to Discontinue the Teacher Education Minor in the Speech Communication Major of the Sciences and Letters Curriculum

2. University of Illinois at Chicago, October 31, 2001

   I 10/31/01 PR-02.01, Proposal to Establish a New Graduate Degree Program, Ph.D. in Educational Psychology, College of Education
B. The following items were classified III by the University Senates Conference:

3. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, October 29, 2001

III 10/29/01 Revisions to the University of Illinois Statutes – Terms of Faculty Employment (ST-30)

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

IV. Old Business – Action and Discussion Items


Professor Fossum, Chair of the USC Statutes Committee, referred to his letter to Professor Conry. He said that he had sent a proposal to the committee recommending that the Conference transmit to President Stukel the language that was referred to the senates
on July 18. He added that this was the language passed by the UIUC Senate. This version was amended by the UIC and UIS Senates to include a sentence on mediation. He reported that two members of the Statutes Committee agreed with his recommendation. Two other members of the committee said that both versions should be transmitted to the President.

Professor Kopecky said that he had not voted as a Statutes Committee member, but felt that the language approved by his senate should not go unreported. He also felt that it was important for the Conference’s final recommendation, whatever that might be, to be adopted by the Board. He suggested that the version approved by USC and the UIUC Senate be recommended to the President, with the version approved by the UIC and UIS Senates attached. The letter to the President should include that mediation would be allowed at any campus that wanted to include it in the campus policy.

Professor Jones thought that, whichever version goes forward to the President, it should be pointed out that two of the senates felt strongly about the inclusion of mediation and campus procedures could accommodate that need. Professor Conry said that it was the Conference’s duty to make a recommendation to the President that does not waver on its interpretation. He added that the total record, which would include everything passed by the senates, would be sent to the President.

Professor Kopecky asked if it would be a problem to put forward the version approved by the UIC and UIS Senates, which includes mediation, as the USC position. Professor Fossum said that he would then prepare a minority report from the USC Statutes Committee in opposition to doing so. Professor Wood said that if this version with mediation was put forward, the letter could include that the UIUC Senate does not endorse the part about mediation.

Professor Rich said that the Conference worked very hard on the version that was sent to the senates on July 18. He thought that the Conference’s discussion around the table had been that everyone would work very hard to take this language back to the senates for an up or down vote. He also thought that it had been very clear that in the implementation process, the campuses could have their own procedures that adhered to the statutory framework. He recommended that the Conference put forward the language that it approved, noting that two of the campuses added the amendment.

Professor Strom moved that the Conference pass the July 18 version with a note that mediation was favored by two campuses and that it should be allowed as part of campus procedures. The motion was seconded. Professor White said that he did not think the UIUC Senate was against mediation, but rather that it should not be placed where it was. Professor Kopecky said that the motion addressed his concern that mediation be allowed. Professor Fossum asked for clarification as to whether the interpretation of this motion would imply that the President should put forward the July 18 version. Professor Conry said that he did not think it would be necessary for the President to mention to the Board the option of mediation in the implementation process, which is a local campus issue. The motion was voted on and unanimously approved.
Professor Fossum pointed out that, as Chair of the UIUC Senate Council, he sent a letter to Professor Conry concerning the provision on the elected committee. Professor Marshall asked if he understood correctly that the Trustees could alter the language sent forward by the Conference. Conference members responded that the Board could alter the language. Professor Fossum said that his letter asks the Chair of the Conference to notify the Conference members and the President of this concern.

Professor Kopecky expressed concern that by highlighting this letter in the letter to the President, it could be an open invitation to make the change. Professor Jones said that the three senates passed language that does not include the recommendation from the UIUC Senate Council. Professor Fossum explained that the UIUC Senate Council did not permit this proposed change to go before the UIUC Senate because it was operating under the agreement to put the USC version before the senates unchanged. However, he and the rest of the UIUC Senate Council wanted it to be noted that it opposed the language in (b) 4) and would like it to be parallel to the statutory language in the process for dismissal contained in Article X.

Professor Alston referred to the Statutes, noting that a senate, after Senates Conference has given its advice, may send its further comments to the President for transmittal to the Board of Trustees. Professor Wood suggested that, in the Conference’s transmittal letter to the President, the letter from Professor Fossum on behalf of the Senate Council be noted as one of the attachments. The Conference agreed. Professor Jones said that it should be made clear that this proposal was not approved by any of the senates.

Professor Conry said that he would draft the transmittal letter to the President and send it to the USC Executive Committee for comments.

2. OT-184. Committee on Vice Presidential Search Procedures and Processes for Commenting on the Reappointment of University Officers.

Professor Conry remarked that the Conference had heard President Stukel’s comments during the Executive Session. Professor Rich proposed to amend the language as the President recommended. He suggested that the last sentence of the first paragraph read, “We believe that similar procedures should be adopted for the following positions: President, Chancellors, three Vice Presidents, Legal Counsel, and the Secretary of the Board.” Professor Weller suggested that the number of Vice Presidents not be specified. Professor Alston recommended taking out “President” and “Chancellors” since those positions are mentioned in the previous sentence as already having a process in place. The motion, with the proposed changes to the language, was seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Professor Conry said that he would transmit the document to the President.

3. OT-185. Senate Resolutions on Benefits for Domestic Partners. Passed UIUC Senate 4/23/01; Passed UIS Senate 9/14/01.

Professor Conry noted that the UIUC and UIS Senates passed separate resolutions in
support of benefits for domestic partners. Professor Rich felt that Senates Conference should be on record as saying that it continues to be very concerned about this issue, strongly supports it, and urges the President to make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Professor Fossum said that this issue comes up often at Senate Council meetings and during the question period of senate meetings. He added that there are hiring concerns by not offering benefits to domestic partners. Professor Alston suggested that the chancellors be advised to support this issue and assist in moving it to the next level.

Professor Rich moved that Senates Conference express its strong, continued support for this issue and urge the President to send a positive recommendation forward to the Board of Trustees. Some Conference members questioned why this issue should be sent to the President again, since the President had already responded that it would be contrary to Illinois law and public policy to extend benefits to domestic partners. Professor Rich said that a group of faculty from the College of Law determined that it would not be inconsistent with State law to extend these benefits. Professor Rich also noted that the number of public universities and corporations that provide benefits to domestic partners has grown. Professor White said that this issue comes up at most senate meetings and the senators want to keep pushing it forward. Professor Rich said that it was important to show the various constituencies that the Conference continues to support this issue. The motion was unanimously approved.

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

The Conference discussed possible guests to invite to future meetings. It was decided to hold the January 23 meeting by videoconference.

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

Reports:

- AAMT October 31, 2001 Professors Kopecky and Strom
- EDCRMT November 7, 2001 Professor Fossum
- GRMT October 24, 2001 Professor Rich

V. New Business


The Conference decided to defer discussion of this item until the next meeting.
7. Designation of Future Observers of Board of Trustees Meetings:

University of Illinois at Chicago
Wednesday and Thursday, January 16-17, 2002  Professor Ann Weller

VI. Campus Updates

Professor Jones reported that the Interim Provost announced that she would be reorganizing her office, which includes the Honors College and the Grad College. He added that there was concern due to the lack of faculty consultation. Professor Jones said that the search committee for a new provost hopes to begin on-campus interviews in January.

VII. Old Business – Information Items


No new information.


No new information.

10. ST-53. Proposed Revisions to the Statutes, Article V, Section 2, Graduate Colleges – Campus Research Board; Article XII, Research and Publication. Passed UIUC Senate 2/12/01. Revised by UIUC Senate 4/23/01. Transmitted to Senates 5/18/01. Passed UIC Senate 9/28/01.

No new information.

11. 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.

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.

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

No new information.


No new information.


No new information.

17. OT-158. Support Services Strategy ($^3$).

No new information.

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

No new information.

19. OT-162. UI-Integrate.

No new information.


No new information.


No new information.

22. OT-178. USC Web Page.
No new information.


No new information.

24. 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.

No new information.


No new information.


No new information.

VIII. Guest – Chancellor Sylvia Manning

Chancellor Manning said that there are no definite goals for becoming a member of the Association of American Universities. There are sets of standards and criteria an institution should meet, but institutions have to be invited in order to join. She believes that UIC should make decisions based on its own academic goals and values.

The campus continues to pursue growth and recognition and has made significant gains. Three colleges on the west side of the campus are in the top four recipients of NIH grants in their disciplines. The campus now has a second faculty member to have won the MacArthur genius grant. Chancellor Manning said that the campus has spectacular faculty.

One concern of the Chancellor is the need to have higher student performance. The campus has been admitting more high quality students but performance has been lower than predicted. Improving undergraduate education is necessary. The campus had its first Rhodes Scholar last year.

Chancellor Manning told the Conference that it is important for the campus to provide the right environment for commuter students. Students will soon vote on whether a new recreation center should be built. She said that the construction of the faculty lounge has been delayed due to the need for the Pavilion to be completed quickly.

Chancellor Manning said that there is an effort to improve freshman retention through intense advising, mentoring, and learning clusters and by making sure students are taking the
right classes. There tends to be a higher retention rate of freshman and sophomore students who live in dorms.

Professor Fossum said that there is a push from the UIUC administration to establish multi-year contracts. The UIUC Senate has not approved provisions for multi-year contracts because sanctions are not in place for academic professional staff. Chancellor Manning said that she remembered the reason for pursuing multi-year contracts was to make certain faculty positions more attractive, positions such as clinical faculty and lecturers. The group discussed some of the benefits, such as improved job security, and problems, such as the sense that tenure would be eroded, that would come with offering multi-year contracts. Professor Marshall said that he has wondered if two bodies of tenure-track faculty might be an appropriate way to improve conditions for those faculty currently not on the tenure-track, although it does not seem to be a preferable solution to many of his colleagues.

Professor Conry asked about the effect of UI-Integrate on offices that are losing staff to the project. Chancellor Manning said that it is necessary to have people involved in the project who know what goes on in their units. She commented that some units probably did not move fast enough in filling positions when backfill funds were available. Chancellor Manning said that the student component of UI-Integrate is the most critical.

Chancellor Manning said that the campus enrollment is 25,000 students, which includes 9,000 graduate and professional students. There is no racial minority group on the campus. Most students have jobs.

In summary, Chancellor Manning said that UIC is a great place and it’s getting greater.

Professor Conry thanked Chancellor Manning for meeting with the Conference.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.