A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:16 pm on the third floor of Levis Center with Chancellor Phyllis Wise presiding and Professor Emeritus H. George Friedman, Jr. as Parliamentarian.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from February 10, 2014 were approved as distributed.

Senate Executive Committee Report

Roy Campbell (ENGR), faculty senator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) reported that the Senate Committee on Committees is accepting faculty nominations for the search committee to assist in the selection of a president. Faculty nominations will be accepted through midnight on Thursday, March 13. This is for faculty only. The student and academic professional nominations will be handled separately. Each nomination must be accompanied by the nominee’s willingness to serve, a brief biographical statement listing the individual’s full title or titles, unit in which the individual is employed at the University, any information available about the individual’s record of service to the University, details on service to any previous search committees, and the promise to be available for meetings between April and December. An online election will be held March 19-21. The top six nominees will be forwarded to the University Senates Conference (USC) for submission to the Board of Trustees (BOT). The BOT will then select three of these faculty members to serve on the search committee to assist in the selection of a president.

The Senate Committee on Committees is also seeking Athletic Board (AB) nominations. The deadline for AB nominations is Thursday, March 13.

The review of University Administration (UA) report indicates that there will be no large budget cuts, but it will certainly lead to downsizing some UA operations over time through rigorous review processes operating within the framework of shared governance. The review process set forth in this report will produce more clarity and accountability. The report includes a clear reversal of centralizing trends and returns substantial resources and control back to the campuses.

The Senate Committee on the Budget has been reviewing the University’s budget, and the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget plans to make a presentation at the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting. The State pensions are massively underfunded. The University remains cautious of its spending due to outstanding commitments. The University has a large amount of deferred maintenance, anticipated salary agreements on the Chicago campus, the faculty hiring plan and matching start-up costs, and also key upgrades such as the wireless network on the Urbana campus. The need to increase in the number of faculty must be balanced with available funding. The University must also review benefits and salaries to remain competitive with peer institutions. In compensation comparison with peer institutions Illinois is lagging behind. There is a possible 12.5% State budget cut as well.

Further budget discussion will be delayed until the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget makes his presentation to the full Senate.

Chair Campbell moved that floor privileges be extended to Undergraduate Engineering student Sakshi Srivastava to speak to EQ.14.02 and Mathematics Professor and Campus Faculty Association Vice President Richard Laugesen to speak to the Senate Executive Committee Report, Chancellor’s Remarks and Questions/Discussion.
Floor privileges were approved without objection.

Chair Campbell announced that the following senators have agreed to serve as tellers for today’s meeting: Josh Baalman (LAS), H. F. (Bill) Williamson (LAS), and Kevin Waspi (BUS)

Chancellor’s Remarks
Chancellor Phyllis Wise reported that in the face of the pension uncertainties the administration is working very hard to try to provide benefits that are comparable and competitive with our peer institutions. The administration is also working hard to prepare for the potential sun-setting of the income tax that was scheduled to end in 2014. This would be a substantial cut to the budget.

The presidential search committee is very important and Wise is aware of the short timeline that was asked of the Senate to provide faculty nominees. Wise appreciates the consideration that is being given to these nominations.

Questions/Discussion
No questions.

Old Business
Committee of the Whole

Specialized Faculty Presentation
Tolliver (LAS) made a motion at the February 10, 2014 that the full Senate endorses the principles laid out in the draft Provost Communication document. Tolliver withdrew this motion without objection.

Proposals (enclosed)

Resolution to Endorse the Guiding Principles of the “Draft Employment Guidelines for Specialized Faculty Holding Non-Tenure Positions”

Barbara Wilson, Executive Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs presented updated information on the proposed Provost Communication for Specialized Faculty. The robust discussion and constructive suggestions at the February 10, 2014 Senate meeting led to strengthening of language and a survey of the employees with the specialized faculty titles.

The survey indicated that the term Specialized Faculty was clearly the preferred title. The term Specialized Faculty is a category of employees and titles such as clinical associate professor would continue to be used as titles for documents such as résumés. This change in employee category terminology does not require departments to change current titles in the system.

The next steps will consist of ensuring that bylaws and practices are consistent, and also discussing the funding of promotions with deans.

Wilson added that the Office of the Provost is working on an additional Provost Communication that will mirror the current Provost Communication 9: Promotion and Tenure. Riedel (LAS) asked about Specialized Faculty moving to the Tenure track. Wilson responded that those decisions are made at the college and department level.

Bond (ENGR) expressed her concern that current communication from the College of Engineering may conflict with language in the Provost Communication for Specialized Faculty. Wilson responded that she was not aware of any great distinction between language used by the College of Engineering and the language used in the Provost Communication for Specialized Faculty.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chair Campbell moved approval of the Guiding Principles of the “Draft Employment Guidelines for Specialized Faculty Holding Non-Tenure Positions”. Further discussion followed.
O’Brien (FAA) proposed that the word “should” in the third sentence of the Guiding Principles beginning with “Every department and college should...” be changed to the word “shall”. The word “should” in the third bullet point in the Guiding Principles be changed to “shall”. And in the fourth bullet point the phrase “benefit from having” changed to “shall have”. Mallory (LIBR) seconded the motion.

By voice vote, the amendment to change “should” to “shall” as noted above, was approved.

Romero (LAS) made a motion to add the sentence “In conducting searches and hiring, departments shall adhere to the campus’s guiding principles relating to equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, diversity, and inclusivity.” at the end of the second bullet point of the Guiding Principles. The motion was seconded.

By voice vote, the amendment to add the proposed sentence noted above, was approved.

Geil (ENGR) made a motion to add the phrase “one or more of” be inserted after “…contributions to…” but before “…the teaching…” in the first bullet of the Guiding Principles. The motion was seconded. Discussion followed.

Tolliver (LAS) made a motion to substitute the following amendment for Geil’s (ENGR) amendment. Insert the phrase “, as a group,” after “…campus community who” but before “make significant contributions...” Bullet point one would then state “…campus community who, as a group, make significant contributions...” The motion to substitute the Tolliver (LAS) amendment for the Geil (ENGR) amendment was seconded and approved by voice.

The substituted amendment was approved by voice vote.

Mallory (LIBR) made a motion to replace “The Senate Executive Committee unanimously...” in the first sentence of proposal SC.14.08 with “The Urbana-Champaign Senate...” and also to remove “The Senate Executive Committee proposes that the...” from the Recommendation. Maher (LIBR) seconded the motion.

By voice vote, the amendment made by Mallory (LIBR) was approved.

By voice vote, the amended motion to endorse the Guiding Principles of the “Draft Employment Guidelines for Specialized Faculty Holding Non-Tenure Positions” was approved.

CC.14.08* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Kalita moved approval of the nominees listed in proposal CC.14.08. There were no nominations from the floor and nominations were closed.

By voice vote, the slate of names on proposal CC.14.08 was approved.

SP.14.10* Proposed Revision to Election Rules for the Student Electorate

Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP) Chair Maher gave a brief overview of the proposal. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify that if the Committee on Graduate and Professional Student Affairs has not been constituted, USSP can act in order to fill vacancies. USSP would be the fourth and last option in filling vacant student Senate seats.

On behalf of USSP, Chair Maher moved approval of the proposed revision to the Election Rules for the Student Electorate stated in proposal SP.14.10.

Bolden (ACES) requested that the language “despite a pool of willing applicants” be removed from the background statement. USSP Chair Maher noted that the proposal recommendation is voted
on for approval, not the background language. Bolden (ACES) adamantly opposed the revision to the *Election Rules for the Student Electorate*.

Lear (GRAD) supported the revision and noted that USSP has jurisdiction over all senator elections. USSP Chair Maher then read from the *Bylaws*, USSP’s duty number 6. Supervise and conduct all nominations and elections of senators, including: determination of faculty voting units and of student election units; allocation of senatorial seats among faculty voting units and among student election units; ruling on questions of eligibility; generally ensuring that nominations and elections are conducted in accordance with rules and procedures that it shall devise; and certifying election results.

03/10/14-20 By show of hands, the motion to approve the proposed revision to the *Election Rules for the Student Electorate* stated in proposal SP.14.10 passed.

03/10/14-21 **EQ.14.02** Resolution for Support for Awareness of Women in Engineering

03/10/14-22 On behalf of the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion (EQ), Chair Hilton gave an overview of the resolution and moved approval.

Baalman (LAS) noted that this resolution was a joint effort between the Illinois Student Senate (ISS) and the EQ Committee, and voiced his support of the resolution. Sakshi Srivastava, an undergraduate woman in engineering, read the following statement in support of the resolution.

> You might not all be aware, but the percentage of women students in engineering is less than 20%. Imagine an engineering campus where there are no organizations like Society of Women Engineers, because women have ceased to be underrepresented in engineering.

> I am here to discuss the difference a woman engineer statue on the engineering campus can make. The engineering profession cannot continue to ignore the talents of half of our population.

> When I won a scholarship, a classmate told me that I received it because I am a woman. That comment made me feel marginalized. I refuse to be told that it is easy for girls to get internships because of affirmative action. Women in engineering work as hard as men in engineering do, and sometimes even harder to overcome bias.

> I want to promote women in engineering because that adds to the diversity in the college and the campus. I want to promote women in engineering because of the 38 engineers in the Illinois engineering hall of fame, only 2 are women.

> The college of engineering has taken multiple steps to attract students form underrepresented groups through student organizations and support programs.

> A way of promoting women to attend the college of engineering is having a statue of female engineer erected on the engineering campus. In his paper, named, Towards the Understanding of Sculpture as Public Art, Curtis Carter writes that “public art might aim at fostering unity among people by idealizing the sentiments of the community, or by focusing on some areas of common agreement.”

> A women statue on the engineering campus will inspire perspective students, who visit the campus for tours and Engineering Open House, to aspire to be a part of the Engineering at Illinois family. It will also serve as a reminder to the current women students in engineering that the community supports their goals and that they belong in engineering.

03/10/14-23 By voice vote, the motion to support awareness of women in engineering passed.
Current Benefits Issues
Kindt (BUS), Chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits, reminded those present that if an individual chooses to contact a representative regarding an issue, University resources cannot be used in support of any political activities and any political activities must not interfere with employment obligations to the University.

The State University Annuitants Association www.suaa.org has initiated a court case against the pension reform. Pension issues are complex and complicated. Kindt suggested that individual pension questions be directed to SURS (State Universities Retirement System).

Reports
03/10/14-24 HE.14.06* IBHE-FAC Report – February 22, 2014

New Business
No new business.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

*Filed with the Senate Clerk and incorporated by reference in these minutes.