

AGENDA

Senate of the Urbana-Champaign Campus

April 3, 2017

3:10 – 5:15 pm

ILLINI UNION – BALLROOM

- I. Call to Order** –Chancellor Robert Jones
- II. Approval of Minutes** – March 6, 2017
- III. Senate Executive Committee Report** – Chair Gay Miller
- IV. Chancellor’s Remarks** –Chancellor Robert Jones
- V. Questions/Discussion**
- VI. Consent Agenda**

Consent Agenda items are only distributed online at <http://www.senate.illinois.edu/20170403a.asp>

EP.17.37	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Science in Learning and Education Studies in the College of Education	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.44	Proposal to Establish Four New Graduate Concentrations, Eliminate Two Graduate Concentrations, and Rename and Revise One Graduate Concentration for the Master of Laws degree, from the College of Law	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.57	Proposal to Increase the Number of Major Credits for the Bachelor of Social Work, (BSW), in the School of Social Work	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.58	Proposal to Establish a Formal Addition of Winter Session to the Illinois Academic Calendar Starting in 2017-2018 Academic Year	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.59	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Fine Arts, Sculpture Major from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.60	Proposal to Revise the BFA in Industrial Design from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.61	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Fine Arts, Photography Major from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.63	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Fine Arts, Art History Major from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.64	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Fine Arts, Crafts Major from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.65	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Fine Arts, Graphic Design Major from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.66	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Fine Arts, New Media Major from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.67	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Fine Arts, Painting Major from the College of Fine and Applied Arts	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.68	Proposal to Eliminate the MENG with a Major in Bioinstrumentation from the College of Engineering	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.69	Proposal to Establish a Graduate Concentration in Actuarial Science and Risk Analytics from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>

EP.17.71	Proposal to Revise the French Commercial Studies Concentration in the BALAS, French Major from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.72	Proposal to Revise the Concentrations in the Bachelor of Science in Liberal Arts and Sciences, Psychology Major from the College of LAS	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.75	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Science in Journalism from the College of Media	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.76	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Arts in the Teaching of French from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>
EP.17.81	Proposal to Revise the Bachelor of Science in Media and Cinema Studies, Eliminating the Concentrations in Media Studies and in Cinema Studies from the College of Media	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>

VII. Proposals (enclosed)

SC.17.11	Extension of the Term for the Athletic Board Faculty Representative to the Big Ten Conference	Senate Executive Committee <i>G. Miller, Chair</i>	1
SC.17.12	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Senate Statement on Inclusion, Tolerance, and the Free Pursuit of Knowledge	Senate Executive Committee <i>Burbules, Oberdeck, Steinberg</i>	3
EP.17.55	Proposal to Reorganize the Departments of Comparative Biosciences & Pathobiology into the Dept. of Comparative Biomedical Sciences in the College of Veterinary Medicine	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>	5
SP.15.08	Proposed Revisions to the Senate <i>Constitution</i> and <i>Bylaws</i> to Provide Representation for Specialized Faculty (Second Reading)	University Statutes and Senate Procedures <i>W. Maher, Chair</i>	31
SP.16.11	Revision to the <i>Bylaws</i> , Part D.2 – Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure	University Statutes and Senate Procedures <i>W. Maher, Chair</i>	37
SP.17.05	Revisions to the <i>Bylaws</i> , Part F.4 – Research Policy Committee	University Statutes and Senate Procedures <i>W. Maher, Chair</i>	39

VIII. Athletic Board Update – Thomas Ulen, Athletic Board Chair

AB.17.01	2016-2017 Annual Report of the Athletic Board		41
----------	---	--	----

IX. Current Benefits Issues (5 min.) – John Kindt, Chair of Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits**X. Reports for Information (enclosed)**

EP.17.79	Report of Administrative Approvals through March 13, 2017	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>	45
EP.17.82	Report of Administrative Approvals through March 27, 2017	Educational Policy <i>B. Francis, Chair</i>	47

XI. New Business

Matters not included in the agenda may not be presented to the Senate without concurrence of a majority of the members present and voting. Items of new business may be discussed, but no action can be taken.

XII. Adjournment

SENATE OF THE URBANA-CHAMPAIGN CAMPUS

March 6, 2017

Minutes

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois Senate of the Urbana-Champaign Campus was called to order at 3:10 pm in the Illini Union Ballroom with Chancellor Robert Jones presiding and Professor Emeritus H. George Friedman, Jr. serving as Parliamentarian.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

03/06/17-01 The minutes from February 6, 2017 were approved as amended.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Gay Miller (VMED), faculty senator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), reported on various SEC items and important topics senators should be aware of.

The SEC held a discussion following a report from GUP (Senate Committee on General University Policy) Chair Burbules about the GUP committee meeting with Chancellor Jones on racism at our University. SEC members shared their opinions and concerns during this discussion. Before the SEC meeting, Chancellor Jones sent a massmail email on February 23, 2017. Chair Miller quoted the massmail in which Chancellor Jones stated "We value respectful discourse while also recognizing that even offensive speech is protected by the First Amendment." Jones also stated that "We can't predict what the next issue will be but we know there will be one. These are often painful moments for our students, faculty, staff and community and we need to support one another as we strive to address divisive issues in society." Miller added that Jones also asked that "all of us do our part in helping us work to improve our academic community on this."

Miller reported that Matthew Wheeler is the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) to the Big Ten Conference and COIA (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics) Representative for Illinois. Originally, Illinois voted to join COIA on principle, but did not agree with all aspects of COIA. A two-thirds majority of those present was needed to amend the COIA bylaws, not the majority of the 64 COIA members. COIA did not give the Senates a chance to properly review the proposed changes to the bylaws so Wheeler voted against the proposed amendment to the bylaws. COIA approved the bylaws and then proceeded to amend the bylaws under the new bylaws rules. Wheeler plans to submit amendments to the newly revised bylaws, but SEC has also asked GUP and USSP to review the document and make additional recommendations by the end of the academic year.

The MCore (Multimodal Corridor Enhancement) project started today. The project is a significant investment in public infrastructure that will bring streets into a state of good repair. Included in the project are Green, Wright, White, and Armory Street which will be periodically closed throughout the project.

Miller noted the massmail email that was sent on February 17, 2017 inviting participation in this year's Commencement ceremonies. Miller encouraged senators to be involved in acknowledging accomplishments of and celebrating with students, faculty, and staff.

The Sesquicentennial Celebration kickoff last week. Miller encouraged those unable to attend to watch the event video that will be available by the end of the week on the Sesquicentennial website, www.150.illinois.edu.

Lastly, Miller thanked senators for their work this year and invited senators to begin thinking about serving on a Senate committee next year. Miller also encouraged senators to reach out to committee chairs or herself to engage with as new or continuing members. Miller also

invited senators to contact her or committee chairs with topics of interest that need to be addressed.

CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

Chancellor Robert Jones stated that it was unsettling to start the meeting with sad news of a student death during the unsupported Unofficial St. Patrick's Day event. This was a senseless loss during a dangerous event. We need to work together as a community to put an end to this event. This is the third death since the inception of this event.

The Sesquicentennial Celebration kick-off was last week. The entertainment was amazing and included a number of highly experienced performers. This event honors the past, but there is difficult and challenging work ahead. This is an opportunity to define what it means to be a land-grant university in the twenty first century.

Many of you are aware of the Racism and Free Speech petition. Jones sent out a mass email responding to concerns about Chief related Unofficial St. Patrick's Day t-shirts, harassment of Muslim students, anti-immigrant chalking on the Quad, and the defacing of an Israeli flag at a protest. Jones acknowledged that his message was not expressed as forcefully as it should have been. Jones stated that it was important to acknowledge mistakes, learn from them, and then move forward. There is not a question of if another incident will occur, but when will the incident occur. We need to be ready to quickly and clearly respond to incidents. Even if the incident is within the rights of free speech, we must hold true to our values and condemn these types of incidents.

Massmail emails is one way to communicate, but it will not resolve these divisive issues. There is a need to restructure how we define diversity and inclusivism. Jones has called for an external review of diversity so we can further the wonderful programs we have, but also do better.

Jones is acting on these issues. He has reached out to the deans and to others to have critical and sometimes uncomfortable conversations that will move us forward. The chalking policy and the student code are being reviewed to potentially revise and add more explicit language.

There will be training scheduled through Interim Provost designate Wilkin's Office for executive officers on the new H1 visa changes that came out today.

Jones thanked the Senate on the work in putting together a search committee for the Provost position. Jones is hopeful that he will be able to at least name a new Provost by this fall.

The Career Center released this year's edition of the first-destination report "Illini Success." The report shows the success rate of graduates and what their current positions are after graduation. Across campus, the average salary for full-time employed graduates is \$57,031. The report showed 66% of employed graduates said their jobs were located in Illinois, and 39% of graduates who participated in internships while in school indicated that it lead to a full-time job offer.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Faculty senator Romero (LAS) recounted an attack on his son at a University sponsored event by an unknown man last summer. Romero's son was attacked for wearing a hat mocking Trump that read, "Make America Mexico Again." To Romero's knowledge, no follow-up on the attack has taken place. Romero read from the petition on racism and free speech.

Jones thanked Romero for sharing comments and thoughts on this subject. Jones again acknowledge that communications were not framed as strongly as needed. Jones also

expressed concern with the petition's suggestion that administration would tolerate xenophobia, racism, as well as white supremacy, as forms of free speech.

Faculty senator Benson (LIBR) commented on bars allowing entrance at age 19 and thought this should be a topic of discussion with students.

Faculty senator Oberdeck (LAS) and Chair of the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion (EQ) stated that the EQ committee wants to urgently work on the issues discussed today, but was unable to present an item for action due to the submission deadlines.

Faculty senator McDuffee (LAS) expressed concern for the safety of people of color, women, and the LGBTQ community. McDuffee called for an end to the violence and racial climate on campus.

CONSENT AGENDA

Faculty senator Snir asked to move EP.17.51 from the Consent Agenda section to the Proposals section of the agenda. Senate Committee on Educational Policy Chair Francis noted that EP.17.51 was a report and not part of the Consent Agenda. Therefore, not eligible to be moved.

Hearing no objections, the following proposals were approved by unanimous consent.

03/06/17-02 EP.17.46*Proposal to Revise the BALAS in Spanish from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

03/06/17-03 EP.17.47*Proposal to Revise the Undergraduate Spanish Minor from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

03/06/17-04 EP.17.53*Proposal to Revise the Curriculum Requirements for the Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering, Dept. of Mechanical Science & Engineering

PROPOSALS

03/06/17-05 CC.17.13* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Monda-Amaya moved approval of the slate of nominees listed in proposal CC.17.13. There were no nominations from the floor and nominations were declared closed.

03/06/17-06 By i>Clicker, proposal CC.17.11 was approved with 122 in favor and 3 opposed.

03/06/17-07 CC.17.14* Nominations for Membership on the Search Committee to Advise the Chancellor on the Selection of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Monda-Amaya introduced the slate of nominees listed in proposal CC.17.14.

Faculty senators Oberdeck (LAS) and Maher (LIBR) nominated Harley Johnson from the floor. Chancellor Jones declared nominations closed and invited Chair Monda-Amaya to explain the voting procedures outlined in the previously approved document SC.17.10: Procedures for Selecting a Search Committee to Advise the Chancellor on the Selection of a Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

03/06/17-08 SP.15.08* Proposed Revisions to the Senate *Constitution* and *Bylaws* to provide representation for Specialized Faculty (First Reading)

On behalf of the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP), Chair Maher introduced proposal SP.15.08 for a first reading. Maher also reviewed the procedures for amending the Senate *Constitution* and *Bylaws*.

Maher noted that this proposal addresses how to move specialized faculty into the Senate with a greater role and summarized the USSP committee discussions that have occurred since this topic was first introduced to the Senate as a Committee of the Whole Discussion on March 7, 2016. The process for Senate elections is complicated. With simplicity and inclusiveness in mind, the conclusion USSP came to was to include the specialized faculty in the regular faculty electorate. After discussion today, USSP will consider the comments and bring the proposal back at the next regular Senate meeting. Discussion and questions followed.

Maher responded to questions about allocation of Senate seats. Maher stated that the allocation of senators a given unit is allotted is dependent upon the number of eligible faculty in that unit, but the overall faculty portion of the Senate would be as close to 200 as possible.

Maher also responded to questions about the ratio of eligible faculty to the number of faculty Senate seats. The number of 200 faculty was put into place in the early 1970s when there were about 3,000 faculty. At one point the 200 faculty were representing about 3,000, now the 200 represent approximately 1800. The current formula used in apportionment would have to change, but is an annual responsibility anyway. At any given year the number of eligible faculty changes.

Concern was expressed regarding unintended consequences and changing the composition of the Senate as a whole. Some units have more NTT (non-tenure track) faculty than others. Other senators were supportive of the inclusion of NTTs in the regular faculty electorate.

USSP committee member Friedman noted that one of the reason USSP was not proposing to increase the size of the Senate was that if the faculty seats are increased, then students will also want increased representation.

Any additional comments or questions should be directed to USSP Chair Maher for consideration by the USSP committee.

03/06/17-09 SP.17.06* Proposed Revision to the *Bylaws*, Part E – Joint Advisory Committee on Socially Responsible Licensing and Investment

On behalf of the USSP, Chair Maher introduced and moved approval of proposal SP.17.06.

GUP originally developed the proposal that was sent to USSP. Burbules, as Chair of GUP, responded to a question about the inclusion of building naming in the name of and the duties of the committee. Naming of buildings and spaces can be extremely political and increasingly so. The issues raised in building naming is compatible with the current duties of the committee and the socially responsible aspect was not removed.

03/06/17-10 By i>Clicker, proposal SP.17.06 was approved with 96 in favor and 5 opposed.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PRESENTATION

Lt. Todd Short presented information on emergency preparedness including information on the Run-Hide-Fight response campaign and Building Emergency Action Plans (BEAP).

Short reviewed the Run-Hide-Fight campaign and discussed the elements that are included in each BEAP. There are about 350 BEAPs completed. This includes floor coordinators to help account for employees on each floor of the building.

Short noted that some faculty members have resisted disseminating information on the Run-Hide-Fight campaign to students. Short also acknowledged that the Run-Hide-Fight strategy is not appropriate for every situation. The notion to run in an emergency goes against what most

people have been taught since childhood. Short stated that in an emergency situation, people should move quickly and as orderly as possible.

Presentation slides are available online:

<http://www.senate.illinois.edu/20170306runhidefight.pdf>

CURRENT BENEFITS ISSUES

John Kindt, Chair of Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits, noted that everyone will now need to use the www.Mybenefits.illinois.gov website to manage their benefits and encouraged everyone to become familiar with the website.

REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

- 03/06/17-11 [EP.17.51](#)* GEB (General Education Board) Proposed Revisions to the Criteria for Approval of Courses in All Cultural Studies Categories
- 03/06/17-12 [EP.17.56](#)* Report of Administrative Approvals through February 13, 2017
- 03/06/17-13 [EP.17.70](#)* Report of Administrative Approvals through February 27, 2017

NEW BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

*Filed with the Senate Clerk and incorporated by reference in these minutes.
A video recording of these proceedings can be found at <https://go.illinois.edu/senate>

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
Senate Executive Committee
(Final; Action)

SC.17.11 Extension of the Term for the Athletic Board Faculty Representative to the Big Ten Conference

BACKGROUND

In a letter dated February 24, 2017 to Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Chair Gay Miller, Chancellor Robert Jones requested the Senate extend Matthew Wheeler's term as one of the Faculty Representatives to the Athletic Board.

Senate *Bylaws* Part E.1.c.1.a states that "The two Faculty Representatives of this campus to the Big Ten Conference, appointed annually by the Chancellor, following consultation with the Athletic Board. The Faculty Representatives shall serve at the pleasure of the Chancellor, but for a period normally not to exceed ten years. The Senate shall approve any extensions beyond ten years."

In 2012, the Senate approved a five year extension of Wheeler's term through 2017. Chancellor Jones is requesting the term be extended one additional year to 2018. Wheeler has been assisting the Athletic Board through the recent transitions of the Athletic Director and the Chancellor. Additionally, he serves on several Big Ten committees and to not extend his service at this juncture in time could prove detrimental to the Illinois Athletic program.

BACKGROUND

The SEC recommends a one year extension of Matthew Wheeler's term as the Athletic Board Faculty Representative to the Big Ten Conference with his term ending in 2018.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Gay Miller, Chair
Kim Graber, Vice Chair
Sara Benson
Nicholas Burbules
Bettina Francis
George Francis
David Hanley
Harley Johnson
Sam LeRoy
William Maher
Lisa Monda-Amaya
Kathryn Oberdeck
Rahul Raju
Jeff Stein
Mark Steinberg

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**
Senate Executive Committee
(Final; Action)

SC.17.12 University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Senate Statement on Inclusion, Tolerance, and the Free Pursuit of Knowledge

Preamble: We live and work in a time when the vitality and independence of institutions devoted to democratic values, diversity of backgrounds and viewpoints, tolerance, free expression, critical inquiry, and fact-based thought can no longer be taken for granted. Universities have long stood for these values, and members of university communities – faculty, students, and university leaders – have often taken a leading role in protesting their neglect. Today, again, we see a need for reaffirming and defending these values.

As members of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign community:

We condemn the rising discourse of hatred against people of color, Muslims, Jews, refugees and other immigrants, LGBTQ communities, and Native peoples. So-called “white nationalism” is a rhetorical cover for bigotry and prejudice, and we view its resurgence in this country, and around the world, with alarm.

We reject every form of discrimination, hateful rhetoric, and hateful action, whether directed toward a person’s race, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, disability, citizenship, political views, socioeconomic status, veteran status, or immigration status.

We endorse the University of Illinois’ values of open, respectful discourse and exchange of ideas from the widest range of intellectual, religious, class, cultural, and political perspectives. While we seek to create a welcoming and inclusive learning environment, we want that environment to include difficult, challenging, and controversial ideas.

We condemn attacks against fact-based institutions, including the free press, scientific researchers, and the university itself, when they disclose facts and information that go against preferred policies. Across the political spectrum, public policies and the debates over them must be informed by the best available knowledge, not by propaganda or “alternative facts.”

We uphold the principles of scientific method and factual, reason-based inquiry. We affirm the value of critical questioning and debate as well as of creativity and artistic expression. We recognize the fundamental role that all of these methods of investigation, critique, and creative thought play in how we understand and address the difficult challenges we face, personally and as a society.

Finally, we express a shared commitment to support any member of our community who may feel fear or oppression. We pledge to work with all members of the community – students, faculty, staff, postdoctoral researchers, and administrators – to defend these values in our policies and practices, and not only in our words.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Gay Miller, Chair	George Francis	Lisa Monda-Amaya
Kim Graber, Vice Chair	David Hanley	Kathryn Oberdeck
Sara Benson	Harley Johnson	Rahul Raju
Nicholas Burbules	Sam LeRoy	Jeff Stein
Bettina Francis	William Maher	Mark Steinberg

PROPOSAL TO THE SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

PROPOSAL TITLE:

Proposed reorganization of the Departments of Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology into the Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences in the College of Veterinary Medicine

SPONSORS:

Dr. David Bunick
Interim Head, Comparative Biosciences
217-333-2310
dbunick@illinois.edu

Dr. Philip Solter
Interim Head, Pathobiology
217-244-6106
psolter@illinois.edu

COLLEGE CONTACT:

Dean Peter Constable
217-300-1744
constabl@illinois.edu

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

Reorganization of two departments (Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology) in the College of Veterinary Medicine into one department with the title of Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences. This title was selected because it encompasses the research areas of faculty and is consistent with the name of our proposed College-wide doctoral graduate program (Doctor of Philosophy in Veterinary Medical Science – Comparative Biomedical Sciences). The three departments in the College of Veterinary Medicine have already submitted a proposal to the Senate Educational Policy Committee to combine their doctoral graduate programs into one College-wide doctoral graduate program. The veterinary curriculum has always been College-wide, and there will be no changes in other programs currently offered through the existing units. The organizational structure and draft by-laws for the proposed reorganized unit are attached in Appendix A.

JUSTIFICATION:

After discussions over the past three years focused on reorganization of the University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM), we propose the creation of a new department that will coalesce basic and applied research activities in the College and that will replace the current departments of Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology. We have structured this reorganization based on the principles that it:

- Results in a department with a well-focused mission, recognized for nationally competitive strengths
- Complements the focus of the existing Department of Veterinary Clinical Medicine
- Retains successful research and instructional activities underway in the current Departments of Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology
- Provides opportunities to identify and support new research foci that are currently less well defined, but are priorities for the future
- Increases economic and organizational efficiencies gained through shared resources, clearer organization structures, and better academic focus

The new Department will significantly enhance the ability of the College to develop a critical mass of research-oriented faculty to achieve excellence in research and graduate education. The reorganization will increase the College's ability to initiate new interdisciplinary scholarly communities and collaborations that are focused on critical and complex biomedical and environmental health challenges. A renewed clarity of purpose, with a clear focus on increasing research capacity will increase the potential to identify and recruit new faculty, making the College's research program more competitive as we compete for external and internal resources. The College will also realize efficiencies through integration of shared resources, including departmental leadership positions, administrative support, and shared space and equipment.

The current structure of the CVM includes two basic science departments: Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology, and one clinical department: the Department of Veterinary Clinical Medicine. The College also includes three units: the Veterinary Teaching Hospital and the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory in Urbana, and the Medical District Veterinary Clinic in Chicago. Upon the inception of the new Department, the two basic sciences departments will close. At the same time, the College will review faculty appointments in all units to ensure that appointments are optimal to achieve the research, teaching, and service missions of the College, and that the new Department will be structured to support sponsored research activities.

Due to the diverse areas of research encompassed by the new department, we recognize a benefit to the establishment of subgroups and special research focus areas. The proposed organizational structure of the new department will include separate divisions to organize groups around the themes of: Developmental and

Reproductive Biology, Infectious Diseases, Pharmacology and Neurobiology, and Population Health.

The new department will help achieve the College mission of research, education, service and outreach, but the primary focus moving forward will be to support excellence in research. The core research faculty in the new department will have appointments that are at least 50% research. The core research faculty will be expected to contribute to the needs of teaching basic sciences in the DVM professional program, building and maintaining vigorous research programs, and better enabling translational and outreach programs. In areas where clinical expertise is needed to fulfill teaching functions, faculty lines in Veterinary Clinical Medicine and the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory will be considered as priority for those functions.

Reorganization will positively impact the College graduate students in multiple ways. Recruitment and retention of increased faculty numbers will help attract top tier graduate students. The reorganized unit will expand opportunities for funding graduate education through increasing the amount of externally funded research. Additionally, reorganization will allow for a stronger application for securing graduate student training grants. The funding currently available to graduate students in the existing units (i.e., fellowships and graduate assistantships) will remain available following reorganization. Reorganization will provide the numbers and diversity necessary for increased synergy as we continue to explore ways to generate new opportunities for graduate students and as we move forward with a parallel proposal titled; Restructuring Doctoral Education in the College of Veterinary Medicine.

As a College, we believe the potential benefits of reorganization outweigh improvements possible by continuing to support the existing departments. By bringing together outstanding scholars into one unit, we can create an organizational structure that is better positioned to respond to emerging issues that can be addressed by biomedical research. Because "the whole is greater than the sum of its parts," we can realign our faculty and disciplinary specializations, and in the process create a powerful academic unit that will be recognized as one of the top Departments in the nation that can aggressively attract the highest quality faculty, students, and staff.

BUDGETARY AND STAFF IMPLICATIONS:

A. Additional staff and dollars needed

The proposed reorganization will have minimal budgetary impact on the College. The College already uses shared service centers for its business, human resources, and grants management functions. No additional staff will be required for these centers.

The Departments of Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology are operating under interim Department Heads since January 2016. Reorganization will require hiring

only one new Department Head instead of two new Department Heads. It is anticipated that the new Department Head will need an Assistant Department Head and a full-time administrative assistant.

Nearly all the faculty offices and research laboratories of research focused faculty in the two basic science departments are located on the 2nd and 3rd floors of the Veterinary Medicine Basic Sciences Building (VMBSB). Faculty in the Department of Pathobiology that have <50% time available for research are located on the 1st and 2nd floors of the VMBSB, an adjacent building (the Veterinary Teaching Hospital), and in Chicago. The close physical proximity of research focused faculty in the VMBSB will facilitate the proposed reorganization and free up one suite of department administrative offices for alternative use.

As a result of the reorganization, there will be costs that come from changing letterhead and departmental materials, including stationery, signs, and the website. We estimate the costs to be modest and the College will assume the costs.

B. Internal Reallocations

We do not anticipate changes in class size or student-faculty ratios as result of the reorganization. We do anticipate that the reorganization of our faculty will increase enthusiasm and attract the highest quality students to our programs.

C. Effect of course enrollment in other units

We do not anticipate an impact on other units.

D. Impact on the University Library

We do not anticipate an impact on the University Library.

E. Impact on computer use, laboratory use, and equipment

We do not anticipate an impact on computer use, laboratory use, and equipment.

DESIRED EFFECTIVE DATE:

Target date for implementation January 17, 2017.

STATEMENT FOR PROGRAMS OF STUDY CATALOG:

Graduate Degree Programs

Currently, the Department of Comparative Biosciences and the Department of Pathobiology have Ph.D. programs that are focused on biomedical research. Both of these departments, as well as the Department of Veterinary Clinical Medicine, recently submitted a proposal to restructure the Ph.D. programs within the CVM into one College-wide Ph.D. program. This proposal has been submitted to campus for review and appropriate approvals. The proposed program will continue to focus on training Ph.D. students to conduct biomedical research.

Degrees: D.V.M., M.S., Ph.D.

Off-campus degrees: None

On-line degrees: None

Joint degree programs: D.V.M./Ph.D., M.D./Ph.D. (through the Medical Scholar Programs), and D.V.M./M.P.H. (in collaboration with University of Illinois – Chicago)

CLEARANCES:

Signatures:

David Bunick David Bunick
Comparative Biosciences Representative

09.09.2016
Date:

Philip Solter Philip Solter
Pathobiology Representative:

Sept. 9, 2016
Date:

Dean Peter Constable Peter Constable
College Representative:

Sept 9, 2016
Date:

Appendix A

DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE



Note: The divisions named above are based on current research focus, but it is possible that division names and number will change over time as a result of changes in research strengths. In addition to divisional faculty, the new department will have specialized faculty. Some of these specialized faculty will have a primary role in contributing to the teaching mission of the new department and CVM. Currently, these faculty include Drs. Michael Biehl, David Coleman, Patricia Hoiem-Dalen, and Leslie McNeil. Some specialized faculty currently are research associate/assistant professors who have a primary role in conducting research in the department. Such faculty include Drs. Andrea Aguiar, Quanxi Li, Mohamedain Mahfouz, Wenyan Mei, and Sherry Zhou.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES BYLAWS

PREAMBLE

The Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences is dedicated to excellence in biomedical research and the education of professional and graduate students as well as postdoctoral fellows in the biomedical sciences and allied fields. The purpose of these bylaws is to provide an operational framework for expediting the efforts of the departmental faculty and other members of the department in these pursuits and to define the rights and responsibilities of those concerned.

I. Head

A. The Head is the chief executive officer of the Department and is responsible for its administration.

B. In the discharge of her/his duties, the Head of the Department shall:

1. Be responsible for the execution of departmental, college, and university policies and shall have general direction of the departmental activities.
2. Consult with the departmental Advisory Committee in formulation of departmental policies.
3. Regularly call meetings (at least monthly during the fall and spring semesters) of the departmental faculty and staff for explanation and discussion of educational procedures, research programs, policies, and activities of the Department, College and University.
4. Report to the departmental faculty on the teaching and research of the Department, have general supervision of the students in the departmental curriculum, prepare departmental budgets, and be responsible for the distribution and the expenditures of departmental funds and for the care of departmental space and property.
5. Be responsible for maintaining high standards of scholarship in the Department and efficient progress in departmental programs.
6. Meet annually with each faculty member of the Department for the purpose of evaluation, and discussion of the nature and scope of the faculty member's work.
7. Consult annually with the appropriate departmental committee regarding faculty promotion and tenure matters.
8. Be responsible for initiating and supervising the departmental faculty recruiting activities in consultation with properly appointed search committees and with the Dean of the College.
9. Ensure that decisions on faculty lines within the department are made taking into account the research focus as well as the

professional and graduate instructional missions and needs of the department.

II. Assistant Head

- A. The Assistant Head is appointed by the Head and must hold an associate or full professor appointment with indefinite tenure in the department.
1. The Assistant Head shall serve for a two-year term beginning at the start of the academic year. The Assistant Head may succeed themselves.
 2. The Assistant Head shall be responsible for representing the Head and act as a liaison to the faculty.
 3. The Assistant Head shall help the Head carry out the duties of the department and shall substitute for the Head in her/his absence.

III. Department Divisions

- A. The Department is organized according to the following divisions, and faculty members are assigned to a division by the Head. Divisional assignment will be based on research focus of the faculty member and mutual agreement between the faculty member and Head.

1. Developmental & Reproductive Biology
2. Infectious Diseases
3. Pharmacology & Neurobiology
4. Population Health

B. Division Chairs

1. The chairperson of each division is elected from the salaried faculty with the rank of associate or full professor and indefinite tenure by the voting members of the respective divisions.
2. The election is conducted every other year in the month of May by secret written ballot of the faculty with voting rights (see section IV B below for explanation of faculty voting rights).
3. The Head or her/his designated representative calls for and supervises the elections.
4. The length of term for the chairpersons is two years, beginning at the start of the academic year. Chairpersons may succeed themselves. Each division will establish a policy by majority vote whether its chairperson may serve successive terms. This policy may be changed by a majority of voting members in each division (see section IV B below for explanation of faculty voting rights).
5. The division chairperson shall consult with her/his division members on departmental policies and programs and convey their

wishes to the Head.

IV. The Faculty

A. Membership

1. The membership of the Department consists of all persons with a terminal degree appointed to the faculty at the level of instructor or above, whether on a full-time, part-time, joint appointment, or visiting appointment basis,
2. All future tenured and tenure-track faculty hires shall require a 50% or greater research appointment.

B. Voting Rights

1. The voting faculty of the Department shall include the following:
 - a. Those who hold an academic appointment within the Department, with at least a half-time salary and the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor and who are tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure.
 - b. Specialized faculty who hold a non-visiting academic appointment within the department, with at least a half-time salary and the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, voting rights would extend to all issues except those pertaining to the promotion and/or tenure of tenure-track faculty and research-related activities.
 - c. Others who have at least a half-time appointment within the department who are approved by a 2/3 majority vote of the Department faculty as provided for in the University Statutes.
 - d. Emeritus and other faculty members of the Department shall be accorded voice but no vote in faculty meetings.

C. Non-Department Faculty Seeking Adjunct Appointment

1. The use of "adjunct" as a prefix to a faculty rank indicates that the position is not the individual's primary position. "Adjunct" may be used in the title of a faculty appointment when the individual to be appointed is expected to have some sort of long-term, peripheral association with the University or when the individual holds a non-faculty salaried appointment as a primary position with the University.
2. There must be a department faculty sponsor from the division in which the candidate seeks an adjunct appointment.
3. At least 2/3 of the entire faculty of the division in which the non-department faculty member is being considered for adjunct appointment must approve the appointment.

4. The Division Chair will present the candidate in writing for consideration by the divisional faculty.
5. Following consideration by the Department Head, the candidate's nomination will be presented to the entire departmental faculty at the next available faculty meeting for vote. A 2/3 present vote in favor of appointment will be required.
6. Final approval of the adjunct appointment will rest with the Department Head and Dean of the College.
7. Adjunct appointments will be for 5-year renewable terms and will be evaluated annually during the annual review process.

D. Non-Department Faculty Seeking 0% or Greater Joint Appointment

Most 0% appointments are extended by academic departments to members of the tenure track faculty who are fully budgeted in one or two other units. Tenure will not be approved for any new 0% appointment.

1. There must be a departmental faculty sponsor from the division in which the candidate seeks an affiliate appointment.
2. The Division Chair will present the candidate in writing for consideration by the Divisional faculty. The divisional faculty must approve by a 2/3 majority the non-Department faculty member that is being considered for 0% or greater joint appointment in the division.
3. After the division approves the candidate, the candidate will present a seminar that is open to the entire department.
4. The candidate's nomination will be presented to the entire departmental faculty at the next available faculty meeting for vote. A 2/3 present vote in favor of appointment will be required.
5. Final approval of the joint appointment will rest with the Department Head.
6. Zero percent or greater appointments will be yearly renewable terms and will be evaluated during the annual review process.

E. Annual Review of each faculty member each academic year (distinct from the promotion and tenure process)

1. Documentation: Early during the spring semester of each year every faculty member will complete and submit an annual activities report. The faculty member will provide an accounting of didactic teaching activity, graduate student and post-doctoral fellow mentoring activity, scholarly activity, and service activity. Each of these four sections of the activities report will include an estimation of actual time spent in that particular activity and a calculation of the percentage that time represents of total effort for the year.

2. Definition of roles: The Department Head, in consultation with the Assistant Department Head, and the Faculty Advisory Committee (as defined below) will complete a standardized evaluation form for each faculty member based on the activity reported by that faculty member. The form shall include each of the activity areas: didactic teaching, professional and graduate student and post-doctoral fellow mentoring, scholarly activity, and service activity. The form will contain a clearly defined evaluation scale and measures of effectiveness for each of the activity areas. An evaluation score will be generated for each of the four areas by multiplying the score awarded times the percent effort using the departmental score sheet for evaluation (provided by the Department Head). The evaluation may also include the awarding of additional points for items such as the importance of the faculty member's contributions to the department, difficulty of replacing the faculty member because of unique training or skills, success at participation in all aspects of the departmental mission, and other similar subjective criteria.

The Faculty Advisory Committee (as defined below) will meet with the Department Head for a compilation of scoring for each faculty member. They will engage in a frank and open discussion for each of the four areas of activity for each faculty member. If significant discrepancies in the scoring exist for any faculty member, a consensus score will be agreed upon before the discussion continues.

3. Annual meeting with the Department Head with feedback to the faculty member: Following completion of the scoring process, the Department Head will schedule an interview and meet with each faculty member. During this interview, the Department Head will report on the results of the annual review and discuss with the faculty member relative strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the Faculty Advisory Committee during the review process. Where deficiencies are identified, a plan will be discussed to correct the problem(s). Following the interview, the Department Head will provide the faculty member with a written summary of the discussions held, including an evaluation of how well the faculty member is meeting expectations. The faculty member will be encouraged to append comments to this document if there is any disagreement about the substance of the meeting, the points of discussion, or any agreed upon course of action.

4. Record keeping: A summary of each year's evaluation forms, the activity report, and a copy of the annual evaluation document and all appended comments will be placed in the permanent file for each faculty member. The department head will meet with each faculty member annually to discuss the evaluation procedures and summary.
5. Option for periodic broader review of the post-tenure faculty: The Department Head or the faculty member may initiate action to broaden the annual review process to include, but not be limited to, such things as solicitation of additional insight and information from selected external reviewers. Issues appropriate for a broadened review might include uniqueness of training and skill, importance to the mission of the department, and quality of scholarly activity when a close peer group is not available in the department. This option for a broadened review process cannot be invoked more frequently than once every five years.

V. Department Committees

A. Advisory

1. The Faculty Advisory Committee consists of the Assistant Head, elected division chairpersons, and up to two tenured faculty members elected by the departmental faculty.
2. The Faculty Advisory Committee shall:
 - a. Provide for the orderly voicing of suggestions made for the good of the Department.
 - b. Recommend procedures and committees that will encourage faculty participation in the formulation of policy.
 - c. Represent the faculty by advising the Head in regard to Departmental policy, preparation of the Departmental budget, assignment of space, and the allocation of ICR funds exceeding \$2,000.
 - d. Perform such other tasks as may be assigned to it by the faculty.
 - g. Be involved, in conjunction with the Dean of the College, in an evaluation of the Head by the entire Departmental faculty every five years.
 - h. Review and approve, by vote, the qualifications and appropriateness of the promotion of Academic Professionals to non-tenure track, visiting research assistant professor. This is in furtherance of the departmental policy of promoting Academic Professionals who have, or will soon receive, independent, or path to independence, funding.

3. The Advisory Committee and the Department Head should meet regularly (at least once per month during the fall and spring semesters).

VI. Departmental Faculty Meetings

1. The presiding officer of Departmental meetings shall be the Head of the Department or Assistant Head. In the event that both of the above individuals will be absent, the Head will appoint a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee as temporary presiding officer.
2. The administrative assistant to the Department Head will serve as recorder at Departmental meetings and will provide minutes of the meeting to the Departmental faculty.
3. Retired faculty and other members of the academic staff with half-time or greater appointment, may attend and voice their opinions at meetings, but shall not vote.
4. Regular meetings shall be called at least monthly during the fall and spring semesters, but may be held more frequently at the discretion of the Head.
5. Special meetings may be called by the Head, the Faculty Advisory Committee, or upon petition by five or more faculty. The discussion and action at a special meeting shall be confined to the item or items listed in the call.
6. Emergency meetings may be called by the Head of the Department or the Advisory Committee without written notice, but an attempt shall be made to notify all Departmental faculty members.
7. A written summary of topics discussed and actions taken must be distributed by the Secretary within three calendar days of special or emergency meetings or seven calendar days of regular meetings.
8. A quorum at meetings of the Department shall consist of a simple majority of the eligible voting members.
9. Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, shall govern the conduct of all meetings of the Department.

VII. Grievance Procedures

1. The Faculty Grievance Committee shall be advisory to the Department Head. The Committee shall consist of three members at large elected by the faculty. In addition to electing three members, two alternates will be elected from those faculty receiving the next highest number of votes. Only faculty with indefinite tenure are eligible to serve. The current faculty members of the Faculty Advisory Committee may not serve.
2. Initial members will serve one-, two-, or three-year terms by lottery. Subsequent elections of members will occur every year. The member whose term has expired each year will serve as an alternate

- for two years.
3. If a committee member cannot participate in a grievance proceeding due to conflict of interest or other reason, she/he will be replaced by the alternate.
 4. Before filing a formal grievance with the Committee, the faculty member should first try to resolve the problem informally with the individual(s) against whom the grievance is being made. The Department Head may be asked to assist (if mutually agreed upon).
 5. In the event that resolution via such means is not possible, a formal grievance, explicitly stated in writing, should be presented to the Committee, detailing the facts relating to the matter and the resolution sought by the grievant. Within 10 working days of receipt of the grievance, the Committee will acknowledge receipt of the grievance and inform, in writing, the individual(s) against whom the grievance is made of the matter under dispute, including the identity of the grievant. The respondent(s) will then be given the opportunity to reply in writing to the written grievance, followed by a written reply from the grievant to the respondent's rejoinder.
 6. The Committee will convene to address the grievance and to solicit whatever information it deems appropriate to consider.
 7. All deliberations of the Committee will be kept in strictest confidence. The findings of the Committee will be communicated in writing to the grievant, to the respondent(s), and to the Department Head including any further avenue of appeal. All grievance investigations will function in a timely manner, specifying reasonable time frames for each step in the process, and a known point at which the process shall be considered complete. The process should be concluded within 3 months of filing the grievance.
 8. A written appeal of a grievance decision to the Dean must be initiated by the faculty member within 2 months after notification of an adverse decision.

VIII. Committees

A. Annual Review Evaluation Committee

The Annual Review Evaluation Committee shall consist of the Department Head, the Assistant Head, and the Faculty Advisory Committee. They shall evaluate each faculty member annually at the departmental level. The Committee shall prescribe and derive the faculty annual review dossier format and set Department Third-Year Review and Promotion and Tenure Calendars that are synchronous with the College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) Third-Year Review and Promotion and Tenure Calendars.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

1. Composition of Mentoring Committee

- a. The Head of Department shall constitute a Mentoring Committee for each entry-level tenure-track faculty during the first probationary year.
- b. The Mentoring Committee shall constitute 3-4 faculty members at a rank higher than the faculty under consideration and shall be familiar with the candidate's research, teaching, and service.
- c. For specialized faculty, the Head of Department shall constitute a Mentoring Committee made of 3-4 faculty during the first year of the appointment and will constitute faculty members of a higher rank, including not only tenured faculty, but also specialized faculty.
- d. Entry-level tenure track and specialized faculty shall be accorded the opportunity to make suggestions to the Department Head on member composition for their Mentoring Committee.
- e. Three members of the Mentoring Committee shall be requested to write research, teaching, and service evaluations for the Third-Year Review dossier as well as for the Promotion and Tenure dossier. The faculty under consideration shall be given the opportunity to suggest the lead-author for each of the evaluations to facilitate preparation of an accurate package for external evaluators.
- f. There shall be a provision for changing (addition/replacement) the composition of the Mentoring Committee members based on evolving needs (research, teaching, and service) of the faculty under consideration. The faculty member in consultation with the Department Head can request changes to the mentoring committee.

2. Promotion and Tenure Review Process

- a. Every tenure track faculty shall be reviewed in the third year by the Department and College, and at the end of the fifth year by the Department, College and University.
- b. Specialized faculty will be reviewed annually for progress toward promotion and will be reviewed for promotion by the Department, College, and University no sooner than five years after the start of their appointment in the department.
- c. Submission of the Third-Year Review package shall follow the Department Promotion and Tenure Calendar, which shall be synchronous with the CVM Third-Year Review/Final promotion calendar (see below).

- d. For the Third-Year Review outcome, tenure-track faculty shall be provided with an official letter outlining both the strengths and weaknesses. The letter shall include suggested areas in which the faculty needs improvement to progress towards tenure.
 - e. Tenure track and specialized faculty due for promotion and tenure review will submit their dossier to the department for review on or before the set date prescribed in the Department's Promotion and Tenure Calendar.
 - f. Once the final dossier including letters of external evaluators is obtained, the Head of Department shall consult with the candidate for any clarifications deemed necessary to build an accurate package.
 - g. The final modified dossier, including the external letters, shall be sent to all the voting members of appropriate rank of the Department by the Head of Department at least one week before the final voting.
 - h. The Department Head and the Mentoring Committee shall lead the discussion on the completed dossier, after which voting by secret ballot shall be conducted.
 - i. The faculty member shall be notified of the final Department evaluation at least one week before submission of the Promotion and Tenure documents to the CVM Dean's office.
 - j. Decisions of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee can be appealed by following the policies as outlined in Communication No. 10, Guidelines and Procedures for Notice of Non-reappointment for Non-tenured Faculty Members. A copy of Communication No. 10 must be sent with the official letter of notification of the action by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 - k. Members of the Departmental and CVM Promotion and Tenure Committees can only vote at one level.
3. Department Calendar for Third-Year Review for Tenure-Track Faculty
- a. Submission of Third-Year Review package shall follow the Department Third-Year Review Calendar that is synchronous with the College of Veterinary Medicine Third Year Review calendar:

May 1:	Head of Department identifies candidates entering third year of probationary period.
June 1:	Send candidates the Third-Year Review instructions from Communication No. 13 and from the College. Instruct candidates that they should prepare their dossier in the format required and send it to the department office. Candidate may work on document until January 20th.
January 20:	Final dossier is due to Department office. The Department Head requests the Mentoring Committee members to write summaries of teaching, research and service. Consult the faculty under consideration regarding corrections to the dossier.
February 15:	Department Head determines list of internal reviewers (tenured faculty with higher ranks only will be included in this evaluation process).
February 28:	Final dossier is prepared and sent to internal reviewers.
March 15:	Department Head finalizes dossier.
April 1:	Dossier is due in CVM Dean's Office.

4. Department Calendar for Final Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Full Professor Level
 - a. Submission of Promotion and Tenure package shall follow the Department Promotion and Tenure Calendar that is synchronous with the College of Veterinary Medicine Promotion and Tenure calendar:

January 15:	The Head of Department will review all faculty and identify those due for Tenure Review and for Promotion, and have them begin development of all parts of dossier including teaching, research and service statements.
April 1:	Preliminary stage for preparation of dossier: Ask faculty due for Tenure and Promotion to compile names/addresses for 4-5 references, and identify 4-5 representative publications. Mentoring Committee for candidates seeking promotion from assistant to associate professor needs to separately develop a list of 4-5 names and provide to the Department Head. Full professors need to separately develop a list of 4-5 references for candidates seeking promotion from associate to full professor and provide the reference names to the Department Head. Request ICES report from Division of Management Information. Email: dmi@illinois.edu.
May 30:	Send out dossier materials to Mentoring Committee, if not already done.
June 15:	Department sends out formal request for external letters of reference with dossier and representative publications.
August 16:	Letters of reference due. Follow-up on tardy letters.
September 1	First draft of Promotion and Tenure document ready for review by Department Head. Summaries complete from the Mentoring Committee members. Consult the faculty under consideration regarding corrections.

September 15:	Second draft of Promotion and Tenure document ready for review by Department Head. Schedule Department Promotion and Tenure meeting.
October 1:	Send draft of Promotion and Tenure document to Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.
October 15:	Department Promotion and Tenure Committee vote by secret ballot at scheduled meeting.
October 30:	Department Head writes final evaluation for document.
November 16:	Promotion and Tenure document due in CVM Dean's office.
December 15:	Promotion and Tenure document due in Provost's office.

C. Standing Committees

1. Standing committees shall consist of three faculty members nominated by the Faculty Advisory Committee and elected by the faculty for 3-year staggered terms. The election shall be for 1, 2, or 3-year terms to initiate the rotation. The most senior member shall serve as chair. A faculty member may serve consecutive terms.
2. The standing committees are:
 - a. The Courses and Curriculum Committee will make recommendations to the Department faculty on issues concerned with educational policy. The committee, following consultation with appropriate departmental faculty, will: (1) review all new course outlines; (2) evaluate any experimental courses after they have been given the first time; (3) review any major substantive changes to existing courses; and (4) provide recommendations to the faculty regarding the structure and organization of the professional and graduate curriculum. One of the committee members should be nominated by the department to serve as one of the departmental representatives on the College Courses and Curriculum Committee to facilitate communication.
 - b. The Graduate Studies Committee, which will: (1) evaluate all materials required for admission to the graduate program and make specific recommendations to the department Head and Director of Departmental Graduate Programs; (2) determine the admissibility of applicants for the graduate program including recommendations for probation; (3) assist the Director of the Graduate Training Program in placing graduate students with advisors; (4) advise the Departmental Head and Director of the Departmental Graduate Program on matters related to Department-sponsored graduate research fellowships and other forms of financial assistance; (5) recommend Departmental policies for the graduate program; (6) provide an annual evaluation

of the progress of graduate students in the Department by assessing timely progress toward completion of graduate programs; sending out forms to enable students and their advisor(s) to report activities, progress and problems; reviewing activity reports of graduate students and evaluations by their advisors; and writing to students advising them of their progress, including any suggestions for overcoming problems or hindrances to completion of their programs; and (7) respond to petitions by graduate students to the Department concerning acceptance of coursework or modification of requirements for graduate degrees or residency programs within the Department.

- c. The Safety Committee, which will: (1) make recommendations to the Departmental Head concerning equipment, personal protection devices, safety and health procedures and adherence to safety regulations; (2) plan and coordinate health and safety training within the Department; and (3) coordinate or conduct internal inspections of Departmental facilities to assure safe and healthful conditions.
- d. Capricious Grading: (1) Those eligible for election to the Committee shall be associate professors and professors. (2) The Committee shall be composed of three members and one alternate. The alternate shall replace an absent member and/or a member whose grading procedures have been challenged. The person with the fourth highest number of votes shall be the alternate member. The length of term shall be one year; members may succeed themselves. (3) The election shall be conducted in the month of May by written ballot and shall be supervised by the Head of the Department. The Head shall call the first meeting of the Committee to elect a chairperson.
- e. Seminar Committee: The seminar committee shall consist of 1 faculty member from each division and 2 graduate students. The faculty members will be selected by the Divisions to stagger 2-year terms. Students will be elected by the graduate students in the Department and also will serve 2 year staggered terms. The committee will elect a chair of the committee from the two faculty members in their second year of service to the committee. The committee will be responsible for the organization of the seminars. A list of speakers and topics should be completed and distributed to the Department within the first 2 weeks of the semester. The committee is responsible for local arrangements for the seminar including: arranging travel, housing, and itineraries for the speakers, and arranging for honoraria and travel

expense reimbursement. A budget will be provided by the Department Head in June prior to the start of the seminar series to support the seminar series.

- f. Creation of Additional Committees: Additional standing committees may be created by amendment of these Bylaws. *Ad hoc* committees may be appointed and dismissed by the Head but such committees shall not duplicate or infringe upon the activities of any of the elected committees described above.

3. General procedures

- a. Advice, recommendations or decisions of committees shall be secured only through a meeting of the committee that is duly convened in group session with a majority of its members in attendance.
- b. Committees shall meet at least once each fall or spring semester.
- c. Each committee shall provide the faculty with a report of its activities and meetings held during the previous year by September 15 of the new academic year.

VIII. INTERPRETATION AND AMENDMENTS

A. Ratification and implementation

These Bylaws shall become effective after adoption by at least two-thirds of the Departmental faculty who submit ballots and after review and approval by the Executive Committee and Dean of the College. Copies shall then be distributed to each faculty member and made available on the college intranet for download.

B. Interpretation

Interpretation shall reside with the Departmental faculty. However, these Bylaws are intended to supplement and be in accord with the University Statutes and the College Bylaws, which shall take precedence in the event of conflicts.

C. Amendments

- 1. May be introduced as agenda items of a regular or special meeting by any three Departmental faculty.
- 2. Shall be distributed to Departmental faculty at least three working days prior to the meeting.
- 3. Shall be voted upon by mail ballot not earlier than seven days nor later than twenty-one days after introduction at the faculty meeting.

4. Shall require the approval of two-thirds of the faculty to be incorporated into these Bylaws.

D. Revision

These Bylaws may be re-written and shall require the same presentation and action as for Amendments described in Article VIII, Section C.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

College of Veterinary Medicine

Office of the Dean
3505 Veterinary Medicine Basic Sciences Building
2001 South Lincoln Avenue
Urbana, IL 61802



October 14, 2016

Dr. Edward Feser
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost
217 Swanlund Administration Building, MC-304

Dear Provost Feser,

Please find enclosed a proposal for the reorganization of two departments (Comparative Biosciences, Pathobiology) in the College of Veterinary Medicine into a single academic unit, the Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences. Voting for the proposal was approved to be conducted by an electronic secret ballot vote at the monthly college faculty meeting on May 9, 2016, according to section VI-14-c of the college bylaws that states *“an electronic vote- set for a specific time- may be taken by the Faculty, when that voting process to decide a motion and second, is previously approved by a quorum of the faculty assembled at a regular or properly called meeting”*. The approved voting window was May 10 to May 17, 2016.

The proposal has been approved by faculty in the Department of Comparative Biosciences, the Department of Pathobiology, and the College of Veterinary Medicine (see Table below), and has been approved by the Senior Leadership Team (6 yes, 0 no) and the College Executive Committee (4 yes, 2 no) in accordance with university and college bylaws.

Vote tallies for the electronic vote conducted from May 10 to 17, 2016 for *“the reorganization of two departments (Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology) into one department”*. The numbers in the three departments do not sum to the number in the college because each unit has different voting eligibility requirements.

Unit (number with voting privileges)	Number voting (% of those eligible to vote)	Yes	No
Department of Comparative Biosciences ^a (13)	12 (92%)	12	0
Department of Pathobiology ^a (12)	12 (100%)	7	5
Department of Veterinary Clinical Medicine ^b (49)	25 (51%)	21	4
College of Veterinary Medicine ^c (76)	55 (72%)	45	10

^a All eligible to vote in the College of Veterinary Medicine; ^b Thirty eight eligible to vote in the College of Veterinary Medicine; ^c Includes all Comparative Biosciences, Pathobiology, and Veterinary Clinical Medicine faculty eligible to vote at both department and college levels, as well as 10 Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory faculty eligible to vote only at the college level, and 3 other faculty eligible to vote at the college level.

The department name was selected because it encompasses the research areas in each of the proposed divisions and because it includes the name of our proposed College-wide doctoral graduate program (Doctor of Philosophy in Veterinary Medical Science – Comparative Biomedical Sciences). Our *Proposal to Unify all College of Veterinary Medicine PhD Programs into a Single Doctoral Program named “Comparative Biomedical Sciences”, and Eliminate the Existing PhD Degrees* (#EP.17.09 Final) was approved by the University Senate on October 10, 2016.

The college would appreciate the assistance of your office in submitting the proposal in order to begin the approval process. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Constable', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Peter Constable
Professor and Dean

cc: D. Bunick, Interim Head of the Department of Comparative Biosciences
P. Solter, Interim Head of the Department of Pathobiology

Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs

Swanlund Administration Building
601 East John Street
Champaign, IL 61820



February 6, 2017

Bettina Francis, Chair
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Office of the Senate
228 English Building, MC-461

Dear Professor Francis:

Enclosed is a copy of a proposal from the College of Veterinary Medicine to reorganize the Comparative Biosciences and Pathobiology departments into a single unit called the Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Kathryn A. Martensen'.

Kathryn A. Martensen
Assistant Provost

Enclosures

c: P. Constable
D. Bunick
P. Solter
A. Benmamoun
K. Kuntz

Notice

Deans, Directors, Department Heads, Faculty, Staff, Students,
and Friends of the University

Public Hearing

Reorganization of the Departments of Comparative Biosciences & Pathobiology into the Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences in the College of Veterinary Medicine

March 8, 2017
1-3 PM
VMBSB 2251

Copies of related documents may be obtained at: <https://vetmed.illinois.edu/intranet/facmtgs/2012-2016.faculty.meetings.htm>

This hearing is being held in accord with Senate Standing Rule #13, "Formation, Termination, Separation, Transfer, Merger, Change in Status, or Renaming of Units." See Senate website at <http://www.senate.illinois.edu/standingrules.asp#sr13>.

The hearing will be chaired by Professor Bettina Francis, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. The proposal sponsor will give a brief overview of this proposal (10 minutes); those requesting to speak in advance of the hearing will be given 2 minutes each. Others will be given an opportunity to speak and ask questions after advanced notice individuals have spoken and will be given two minutes each.

Those who wish to speak at the hearing should contact Tanya Sutton (tsutton@illinois.edu) by 5:00 pm on March 6, 2017. Those who wish to send comments for consideration by the Educational Policy committee and the Senate should forward them to Rachel Park in the Office of the Senate at rlpark@illinois.edu, also by 5 PM on March 6, 2017. Please indicate if you wish these comments to remain confidential and/or anonymous.

Organized by

The College of Veterinary Medicine and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(Final; Action)

SP.15.08 Proposed Revisions to the *Senate Constitution* and *Bylaws* to provide representation for Specialized Faculty

BACKGROUND

SP.15.08, initially presented to the Senate for a Committee of the Whole Discussion on March 7, 2016, began as an attempt by the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP) to expand and clarify the role of the Specialized or non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty in the UIUC Senate, including how the Specialized faculty become eligible to serve in the Senate and how they factor into the current electorates of the Senate. It emerged as a response to both the growth of the Specialized faculty pool and their somewhat limited options for service in the Senate, as well as a response to changes in the system of titles held by the Specialized faculty following the issuance of *Provost Communication #25: Employment Guidelines for Specialized Faculty Holding Non-Tenure System Positions*. *Provost Communication #25* also urges that units across campus revisit their policies regarding the involvement of NTTs in governance structures from the unit level up (VII.B). Similar concerns were expressed in the Seventh Senate Review Commission’s report (XSR.15.01), which recommended that the Senate should “[e]stablish a more uniform mechanism for election of Specialized Faculty as Senators,” noting that at present, “[s]ome units [now] may allow such faculty to stand for election as Senators, while others do not” (2.c, p. 2). Additionally, the Commission’s report listed the “[i]nclusion of Specialized Faculty in the Senate in a more consistent way” under “Issues that require further consideration” (p. 8).

At present, NTT faculty serve in the Senate in a hodgepodge fashion: some can be elected by their units if unit-level bylaws allow, some can vote for a single at-large representative—a position that to date has gone unfilled—from the “Other Academic Staff” electorate, and some (those holding newly authorized “teaching” titles) are currently ineligible for any representation. This is a more complicated scheme than those employed by the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) and University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS) Senate *Constitutions* and *Bylaws*:

UIC’s *Senate Constitution* defines the relative size of the electorates of their Senate, as well as terms of service, but defers eligibility for said electorates to its *Bylaws* (Article III). “Faculty members” are then defined in their *Bylaws* as “academic staff members with rank of lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, including clinical, research, adjunct or emeritus titles. Not included are teaching and research associates, teaching and research assistants, and visiting faculty members” (Article I.1.a). Academic Professionals serve in a separate electorate.

UIS’s *Senate Constitution* defines the Faculty Electorate as “all persons holding full-time faculty appointments who devote fifty percent or more of their time to instruction,

research, and/or public service” and excludes those with administrative titles of Dean or above (Article I.2). Academic Professionals serve in a separate electorate.

As background to the Senate’s March 2016 Committee of the Whole discussion, SP.15.08 thus outlined the current description of the faculty electorate from Article II, Section 1 of the UIUC *Senate Constitution* and the current definition of “Other Academic Staff” from Article III of the *Constitution* (the so-called ABC electorate), the combination of which leaves significant gaps in how NTT faculty become eligible to serve in the Senate. It noted that “this creates an anomaly: full time instructors and lecturers can be included in the faculty electorate at the option of their unit, but teaching, research, and clinical assistant, associate, and full professors cannot.” This is both an issue for the current population of full-time NTT faculty (there are currently more than 600 NTTs employed above .5 FTE), and in the future, as more faculty are hired with teaching, research, and clinical assistant, associate, and full professor titles, as provided by *Provost Communication #25*.

SP.15.08 also included four somewhat overlapping options, each of which would bring the NTT faculty (“Specialized Faculty”) into the Senate in various ways and would require several adjustments to the composition and electorates of the Senate. Over the subsequent year, USSP has taken the input from the Senate’s March 7, 2016 session, in addition to its own research and deliberations, weighing each of those options and its permutations to offer the following conclusions. The first two options presented in SP.15.08 would have changed the parameters of ABC electorate, allowing some additional NTTs into that electorate and/or increasing the number of representatives for that electorate. However, these solutions would have left many NTTs unrepresented and would have maintained an electorate system that is yet to have elected a representative.

An additional possible solution presented in SP.15.08 featured the creation of a new, separate Specialized Faculty Electorate, with a new set of parameters around its creation and relation to the current electorates. After much research and discussion, this path initially seemed appealing, but created quite a number of problems. First, the shifting number and proportion of NTT faculty would require recalibrating this electorate regularly (at least annually), both to ensure whatever internal proportions it would have (by unit and college), and also in relation to other electorates. This means that the ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty would need to translate to the ratio of the Faculty Electorate to the Specialized Faculty Electorate, most likely still fitting in to the current size of the Faculty Electorate. Second, a representation structure would need to be established where one does not currently exist—NTT faculty are distributed throughout colleges in an uneven pattern, as well as across various schools and units not attached to colleges, so a series of structures would need to be established. Finally, the work of electing senators for a new electorate would most likely fall upon individual units, which would thus need to conduct additional elections and police eligibility. After considering these complications, USSP does not recommend this path.

Finally, SP.15.08 offered an additional solution: changing the definition of the faculty electorate to include full-time NTT faculty, removing the more complicated language present in Article III defining NTT roles in the “Other Academic Staff” electorate, and simplifying the eligibility of faculty for the Faculty Electorate. This would most fully ensure that NTT faculty are able to serve in the Senate, would eliminate gaps caused by the ABC electorate, and would enable those in each voting unit to determine whether to elect senators from its tenure system or non-tenure

system faculty. Further, it would bring UIUC's *Senate Constitution* more in line with those at UIC and UIS.

This solution would potentially change the composition of the Senate, but would not necessitate a change in the total number of faculty senators or other changes to the overall size of the Senate. In particular, if the number of Senate seats designated for faculty remains at its current level, the ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty could shift somewhat, leaving a smaller number of tenure-track faculty in the Senate. That said, this option would ensure that all NTT faculty are eligible for Senate seats, not just limited titles currently eligible, and it would allow each unit to elect tenure-system or non-tenure-system faculty senators at the discretion of the faculty of that unit. Further, this solution would be significantly simpler, because the general eligibility for the faculty electorate would apply broadly, and would not rely on title distinctions or separate electorates.

Under this proposal, the Other Academic Staff electorate defined in Article III is revised to include only the academic professional electorate; therefore, it is proposed to change the title of Other Academic Staff electorate to the academic professional electorate. This requires revisions to both the *Constitution* and the *Bylaws*.

Revisions to the *Bylaws* will not go into effect until the revisions to the *Constitution* are approved by the Board of Trustees.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends that the Senate approve the following amendments to the *Senate Constitution* and the *Bylaws*. Text to be added is underscored and text to be deleted is ~~struck through~~:

1 *Senate Constitution*

2

3 **Article I – Basic Structure**

4

5 Section 2. The Senate shall consist of persons who are members of the faculty, ~~Other Academic~~
6 Staff professional, and student electorates, elected in accordance with the provisions of the
7 *Constitution*. Elected members shall have full floor and voting privileges on all matters before
8 the Senate except as provided in Article VI, Section 11. *Ex officio* members shall have full floor
9 privileges on all matters before the Senate, but shall not vote except as provided in Article VI,
10 Section 7.

11

12 **Article II – Faculty Representation**

13

14 **Section 1.** The faculty electorate is composed of those members of the academic staff who are
15 directly engaged in and responsible for the educational function of the University; ordinarily this
16 will involve teaching and research. Specifically, the faculty electorate shall consist of all persons
17 of the campus non-visiting academic staff, other than persons holding administrative
18 appointments in excess of one-half time (the exception to this exclusion are executive officers of
19 departments or similar units, and assistant or associate executive officers of such units, who are
20 otherwise eligible), who:

21

- 22 a. ~~Are tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure or in the preceding year have~~
 23 ~~received probationary credit toward tenure or h~~Hold the modified or unmodified
 24 academic rank or title of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor ~~without~~
 25 ~~tenure~~, have at least a one-half time appointment, and are paid by the University; or
 26
 27 b. Hold the academic rank or title of instructor or lecturer at any rank, have ~~a full time~~ at
 28 least a one-half time appointment, are paid by the University, and are not candidates for a
 29 degree from this University, ~~and are designated by their voting unit for inclusion in the~~
 30 ~~faculty electorate~~; or
 31
 32 c. Are retired members of the campus academic staff with the title of emeritus, and would
 33 otherwise be eligible for inclusion in the faculty electorate. However, retired members
 34 shall not be counted for purposes of the provisions of Sections 3, 4, and 5 of this Article.
 35
 36 d. ~~Members of the faculty electorate who are members by virtue of Paragraphs (b) and (c)~~
 37 ~~of this Section shall not be counted for purposes of the provisions of Sections 3, 4, and 5~~
 38 ~~of this Article.~~

39
 40 **Article III – ~~Other Academic Staff~~ Professional Representation**

41
 42 **Section 1.** The ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional electorate is composed of those members of
 43 the ~~Other Academic~~ professional ~~Staff~~ who are engaged in and responsible for the educational
 44 function of the University; ordinarily this will involve teaching and research. Specifically, the
 45 ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional electorate shall consist of all persons of the campus non-
 46 visiting academic staff who have a full-time appointment, are paid by the University, are not
 47 candidates for a degree from this University, and who: [delete the colon and continue with text
 48 of old subparagraph d below]

- 49
 50 a. ~~Hold the academic rank or title of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor~~
 51 ~~modified by the terms “research,” “adjunct,” or “clinical;” or~~
 52
 53 b. ~~Hold the academic rank or title of instructor or lecturer and are not included in the faculty~~
 54 ~~electorate by designation of their voting unit; or~~
 55
 56 c. ~~Hold the unmodified academic rank or title of teaching associate, research associate, or~~
 57 ~~clinical associate; or~~
 58
 59 d. ~~Are~~ members of the academic staff as defined in the University Statutes, Article II,
 60 Section 5, and satisfy the teaching or research criteria established by the Senate
 61 Committee on Elections and Credentials and approved by the Senate.
 62

63 **Section 2.** All persons included in the ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional electorate shall be
 64 eligible for election to the Senate, without distinction on the basis of rank or other criteria. Each
 65 member of the electorate shall be entitled to cast one vote for each open senatorial position in the
 66 members’ electoral unit.
 67

68 **Section 3.** Elections shall be held on the basis of seven voting units each with one seat. ~~One at~~
 69 ~~large seat will be elected by those described in Article III section 1a, b, and c. Seven senators~~
 70 ~~will be elected by those described in section 1d. Elections for this group shall be held on the~~

71 ~~basis of employment in an~~ These voting units are made up of academic units or the University of
72 Illinois Extension or the Prairie Research Institute for Natural Resource Sustainability. These
73 election units shall be as nearly equal in size as is practicable and shall be the same as the voting
74 units for the relevant Council of Academic Professionals election districts.

75
76

77 **Section 4.** Those eligible to vote in each ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional voting unit shall be
78 notified that an election is to be held. Any member of the ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional
79 electorate who desires to run for election from their electorate unit shall submit a statement to
80 that effect and a short biography to the appropriate ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional voting
81 unit elections and credentials committee. The nominee receiving the highest number of votes
82 shall be deemed elected.

83

84 **Section 6.** Senators shall be elected for two-year terms commencing at the beginning of the next
85 academic year. Provision shall be made for staggered terms so that approximately half the ~~Other~~
86 Academic Staff professional senators will be elected each year.

87

88 **Section 9.** An ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional senator can be recalled by a vote of two-
89 thirds of those voting in the recall election.

90

91 **Section 10.** Membership in the ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional electorate continues during
92 the term of any member elected to the Senate.

93

94 **Article VI – General Provisions**

95

96 **Section 11.** When the Senate selects members of a search committee, faculty senators shall
97 nominate and elect faculty members of the committee, ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional
98 senators shall nominate and elect ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional members of the
99 committee, and student senators shall nominate and elect student members of the committee in
100 separate votes.

101

102 **Bylaws**

103

104 **Part C - Elections**

105

106 1. Timing of Elections; Election Rules

107 b. The Senate may delegate to the organization that conducts elections on behalf
108 of the governing organizations of the student body and/or the ~~Other Academic~~
109 professional ~~Staff~~ the authority to conduct Senate elections concurrently with
110 other elections that it administers, pursuant to rules established by the Senate
111 Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures Elections and
112 Credentials and subject to approval by the Senate.

113

114 2. Elections and Credentials Committee

115 b. ~~Other Academic Professional Staff: The Committee on University Statutes and~~
116 ~~Senate Procedures shall act as the elections and credentials committee for the~~
117 ~~Other Academic Staff described in the Constitution, Article III, Section 1a, b,~~
118 ~~and e.~~ The Council of Academic Professionals shall be the elections and

119 credentials committee for the ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional electorate
120 described in the Constitution, Article III, Section 1d.

121
122 5. Nomination and Election of Senators from the ~~Other Academic Staff~~ Professional
123 Electorate

124 The procedure for nomination and election of senators elected by the ~~student~~ academic
125 professional electorate shall be as follows:

126
127 a. Any member of the ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional electorate who desires
128 to run for election shall submit a statement to that effect and a short biography
129 to the elections and credentials committees.

130 b. If found to be eligible, the member of the ~~Other Academic Staff~~ professional
131 electorate shall be deemed nominated, and the elections and credentials
132 committee shall have the person's name placed on the appropriate election
133 ballot.

134
135 7. Recall Elections

136
137 Petition: A recall election shall be held by a college or division or ~~Other Academic~~
138 ~~Staff~~ professional elections and credentials committee promptly upon receipt of an
139 appropriate petition.

140
141 c. ~~Other Academic Professional Staff~~: For recall of an ~~Other Academic Staff~~
142 professional senator, the petition shall bear valid signatures of at least one-third
143 of the members of the election unit or of at least one-half as many members of
144 the election unit as voted in the election in which the ~~Other Academic Staff~~
145 professional senator was last elected, whichever is smaller.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES
William Maher, Chair
Nikita Borisov
Tara Chatteraj
H. George Friedman
Shawn Gilmore
Wendy Harris
Gisela Sin
Jessica Mette, *Ex officio (designee)*
Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*
Sarah Zehr, *Observer*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(Final; Action)

SP.16.11 Revision to the *Bylaws*, Part D.2 – Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure

BACKGROUND

As a follow-up to Office of the Provost Communication No. 25, “Employment Guidelines for Specialized Faculty Holding Non-Tenure System Positions”, the University Statutes and Senate Procedures Committee was contacted by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AFT) with a request to propose a revision to the rules governing the way in which the AFT is constituted.

At a general level, Provost Communication No. 25, Part IV- Grievances allows that “specialized faculty members may have access to campus grievance policies and committees if the complaint or issue falls within the jurisdiction of the committee”.

More specifically, *University Statutes*, Article X, Section 2d reads:

A staff member who believes that he or she does not enjoy the academic freedom which it is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage shall be entitled to a hearing on written request before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the appropriate campus senate. Such hearing shall be conducted in accordance with established rules of procedure. The committee shall make findings of facts and recommendations to the president and, at its discretion, may make an appropriate report to the senate. The several committees may from time to time establish their own rules of procedure.

“Academic staff” is defined in *University Statutes*, Article IX, Section 4a as:

The academic staff which conducts the educational program shall consist of the teaching, research, scientific, counseling, and extension staffs; deans and directors of colleges, schools, institutes, and similar campus units; editors, librarians, and such other members of the staff as are designated by the president and the chancellors/vice presidents.

Although specialized faculty members have access to the grievance process and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, they currently are not guaranteed representation on AFT.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends approval of the following revisions to the *Bylaws*, Part D.2. Text to be added is underscored and text to be deleted is ~~struck through~~.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE BYLAWS, PART D.2

1 **Part D – Standing Committees**

2
3 **2. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure**

4
5 a. Duties

6 The Committee shall:

7
8 Serve as an authorized ~~faculty~~ group to safeguard the academic freedom of the tenure
9 system and non-tenure system faculty and tenure status of the tenure system faculty, and
10 to assure that unit governance is in accord with the *University Statutes* and unit bylaws.
11 The Committee shall conduct hearings in cases involving dismissal of ~~tenured~~ said
12 faculty, as provided in the *University Statutes*, may investigate instances of possible
13 infringement of academic freedom and hear cases involving allegations of such
14 infringement, and may make such recommendations to the Chancellor and reports to the
15 Senate as are appropriate. The Committee may investigate allegations of violations of the
16 role of tenure and non-tenure system faculty in governance as specified in the *University*
17 *Statutes* and unit bylaws and report to the Chancellor and the Senate if appropriate
18 changes are not made. The Committee will respect the autonomy of individual units when
19 making any recommendations regarding governance.
20

21 b. Membership

22 The committee shall consist of:

- 23
24 1. Seven tenure system faculty members whose administrative duties are below the level
25 of deans and directors, with no two members from any one college, school, institute,
26 or similar unit, and one non-tenure system faculty member; and
27
28 2. Three students, of whom at least one shall be an undergraduate and at least one shall
29 be a graduate or professional student.
30

31 ~~provided, however, that w~~When the Committee is called to serve as a hearing committee
32 under Article X, Section 1(e) ~~and~~ or Section 2 of the *University Statutes* on a case
33 involving a tenure system faculty member, the non-tenure system faculty member and
34 student members shall not participate in its activities or deliberations and shall not be
35 counted as Committee members for determining the quorum. When the Committee is
36 called to serve as a hearing committee under Article IX, Section 12 or Article X, Section
37 2(d) of the University Statutes on a case involving a non-tenure system faculty member,
38 the student members shall not participate in its activities or deliberations and shall not be
39 counted as Committee members for determining the quorum.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE

PROCEDURES

William Maher, Chair
Nikita Borisov
Tara Chatteraj
H. George Friedman
Shawn Gilmore

Wendy Harris
Gisela Sin
Jessica Mette, *Ex officio (designee)*
Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*
Sarah Zehr, *Observer*

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(Final; Action)

SP.17.05 Revisions to the *Bylaws*, Part F.4 – Research Policy Committee

BACKGROUND

The Senate *Bylaws* outline the scope of responsibility, duties, and membership for Committees that are formal creatures of the Senate. The *Bylaws* also contain provisions for how the Senate participates in naming or providing nominations for other entities to committees and advisory bodies which themselves are not formally part of the Senate. One such body, the Research Policy Committee, listed in *Bylaws*, Part F.4 exists to provide advice to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Research on research policy. Presently, the Committee on Committees presents a slate of nominees to the Senate which in turn chooses those faculty and student names to forward to the Vice Chancellor for Research who makes the final appointments.

Because the existing process for the Committee on Committees and Senate actions on nominations is complex, the Vice-Chancellor for Research and the Research Policy Committee has requested a streamlining of the process used to establish the committee roster.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends approval of the following revisions to the *Bylaws*, Part F.4. Text to be added is underscored and text to be deleted is ~~struck through~~.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE BYLAWS, PART F.4

ORIGINAL

Research Policy Committee. This fifteen member committee advises the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR), and the Senate on matters of research policy. The VCR appoints all members of the committee. The Committee is composed of a faculty chair selected in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee; one representative from the Campus Research Board; the Dean of the Graduate College; ten faculty members, five of whom are appointed each year for two-year terms; one graduate student with a two-year term; and one undergraduate student with a one-year term. Four of the five faculty members and the two students are appointed from nominees provided by the Senate as follows: The Senate Committee on Committees submits eight nominations for the four faculty slots and two nominations for each student slot to the full Senate for approval and subsequent transmittal of the nominees to the VCR. The fifth faculty member is appointed at the discretion of the VCR. The Chair of the Research Policy Committee will report to the Senate Executive Committee on the activities of this committee three times a year and will report to the full Senate annually.

PROPOSED REVISION

1
2 **Research Policy Committee.** This committee advises the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for
3 Research (VCR), and the Senate on matters of research policy. The Committee should have no
4 fewer than ten members and no more than fifteen members, and the VCR appoints all members
5 of the committee, typically for two year terms. The Committee has a faculty chair selected in
6 consultation with the Senate Executive Committee. At least eight members of the Committee
7 shall be faculty chosen from nominations provided by the Senate Committee on Committees,
8 submitted to the full Senate for approval and subsequent transmittal of the nominees to the VCR.
9 The other members shall be appointed by the VCR and may include students and academic
10 professionals. The Chair of the Research Policy Committee will provide a written report to the
11 Senate on the activities of this committee at least annually and will provide additional reports to
12 the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee as requested.
13

REDLINE-STRIKEOUT

14
15 **Research Policy Committee.** This ~~fifteen-member~~ committee advises the Chancellor, the Vice
16 Chancellor for Research (VCR), and the Senate on matters of research policy. The committee
17 should have no fewer than ten members and no more than fifteen members, and the VCR
18 appoints all members of the committee, typically for two year terms. The Committee is
19 ~~composed of~~ has a faculty chair selected in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, ~~;~~
20 ~~one representative from the Campus Research Board; the Dean of the Graduate College; ten~~
21 ~~faculty members, five of whom are appointed each year for two year terms; one graduate student~~
22 ~~with a two year term; and one undergraduate student with a one year term. Four of the five~~
23 ~~faculty members and the two students are appointed from nominees provided by the Senate as~~
24 ~~follows: At least eight members of the committee shall be faculty chosen from nominations~~
25 ~~provided by the Senate Committee on Committees, submits eight nominations for the four~~
26 ~~faculty slots and two nominations for each student slot submitted to the full Senate for approval~~
27 ~~and subsequent transmittal of the nominees to the VCR. The fifth faculty member is appointed at~~
28 ~~the discretion of the VCR. The other members shall be appointed by the VCR and may include~~
29 ~~students and academic professionals.~~ The Chair of the Research Policy Committee will provide
30 a written report to the Senate ~~Executive Committee~~ on the activities of this committee ~~three~~
31 ~~times a year at least annually~~ and will ~~report to the full Senate annually~~ provide additional
32 reports to the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee as requested.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

- William Maher, Chair
- Tara Chattoraj
- H. George Friedman
- Shawn Gilmore
- Wendy Harris
- Gisela Sin
- Jessica Mette, *ex officio (designee)*
- Jenny Roether, *ex officio*
- Sarah Zehr, *Observer*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
Athletic Board
(Final; Information)

AB.17.01 2016-2017 Annual Report of the Athletic Board

History of the Academic Review System (ARS)

In April, 1992, the Athletic Board adopted the Academic Review System (ARS) to evaluate the academic progress and eligibility of the approximately 500 student-athletes at the University. The Urbana-Champaign Faculty-Student Senate established three criteria with which teams and individual student-athletes must comply:

1. Each team must have an average GPA of 2.25 each semester.
2. All grant-in-aid (scholarship) student-athletes on each team must earn at least an average 2.25 GPA each semester.
3. 80 percent of each team must earn at least a 2.0 GPA for each semester.

The Academic Progress and Evaluation Process

The Academic Progress and Eligibility Committee (APEC) of the Athletic Board evaluates three teams in depth each semester and reports to the full Athletic Board. The principal, but not only, evaluative tools are the three criteria noted above. As we shall see, there are additional criteria that APEC uses to see how student-athletes are doing academically.

The schedule by which these evaluations are conducted is laid out for years in advance. Because the University participates in 19 intercollegiate sports, that means that APEC evaluates each sport in depth once each six semesters by evaluating the academics of three sports each semester. At each of those meetings, the head coach, the Athletic Director, the two Faculty Representatives to the Big Ten Conference, the Associate Athletic Director who oversees that sport, the Chair of the Athletic Board, the Chair of APEC, and representatives from the Academic Services Office of the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics attend and participate in the evaluation meeting.

At each sport's evaluation meeting, it is the practice of the APEC Committee to go over the sport's performance with respect to the three criteria above for each of the past six semesters – that is, since the last evaluation of that sport. If the committee sees causes for concern – for example, if the team GPA fell in three semesters (even if it is above the minimum noted above), we ask for an explanation from the head coach. If there is non-compliance with any of the three criteria, we work out a corrective program with the coach and the representatives from Academic Services. APEC and Academic Services then meet every six months with the head coach to make certain that the corrective program is being followed and is working.

APEC also goes beyond the Senate criteria by looking at two different measures of academic progress toward graduation. First, we look at the "Official NCAA Graduation Rates Report." Roughly speaking, the NCAA report measures something called the GSR, how each freshman-class cohort in each sport is doing in progressing towards a degree. The report and the DIA compare the student-athlete cohort graduation rates in each sport with those at other Division I schools in that sport, with other Big Ten schools, with general undergraduate cohorts (non-student-athletes), and with other relevant categories.

Second, we look at the federal government's academic progress rate (APR) reports, which also measures how student-athletes are progressing toward graduation in many, but not all, sports at every Division I school.

We discuss these additional criteria with the head coach, the AD, and the other attendees, and they may figure in our corrective program for a sports team that is not doing well with regard to these criteria.

In addition to this sport-by-sport evaluation procedure, the Athletic Board also receives, at each of its quarterly meetings, a report from Academic Services about the academic performance of all 19 sports in the most recent semester.

Recent Experience

APEC

Over the course of the last cycle of evaluation of all 19 intercollegiate sports, every team but one has been in compliance with all the Senate criteria. In almost every single instance, the teams were in compliance for all six semesters since their last evaluation.

The one team that was not in compliance explained to APEC's satisfaction why it was not meeting the standards. Additionally, the head coach proposed a corrective plan that APEC approved. That sport very quickly came back into compliance and has remained so.

We have also noted in recent years that programs that were once challenged in meeting the Senate criteria have all been doing better. Men's basketball and football, for example, now have team GPAs that are close to or above 3.0.

There are still some concerns for one or two sports, but overall there is continuing and complete compliance with the Senate criteria.

Academic Services Report

At each quarterly meeting of the Athletic Board, the Academic Services Office of the DIA, now very ably led by Marlon Dechausay, reports on the academic performance of our student-athletes.

Here are some highlights from the report of February 23, 2017:

1. The overall GPA for all 500+ student-athletes during the Fall Semester, 2016, was 3.16.
2. The overall GPA of our female student-athletes in that semester was 3.32.
3. The overall GPA of our male student-athletes in that semester was 3.018.
4. The highest GPA during Fall, 2016, for female student-athletes was Women's Golf – 3.68.
5. The highest GPA during Fall, 2016, for male student-athletes was Men's Tennis – 3.36.
6. 42 student-athletes had a perfect 4.0 for the Fall Semester, 2016.
7. 56 percent of student-athletes had a 3.0 or higher for the Fall Semester, 2016.
8. For the latest report our APR (federal graduation rate) for all sports is 990/1000, which is much higher than for the student body of the University of Illinois. Five sports have had a perfect 1000 (all students graduate) over the past five years. 14 of 19 sports had a perfect 1000 for the most recent report.

Additional Actions of the Athletic Board

The Executive Committee of the Athletic Board has tried to stay ahead of academic issues that might arise for our student-athletes. For example, we had learned that there was concern at some of our peer institutions that student-athletes were "clustering" in certain majors and classes. This is not necessarily a bad thing: If student-athletes are clustering in engineering or finance, that would be a sign of strength, not of concern; and if there were more student-athletes majoring in Recreation, Sport, and Tourism than in other departments, that could simply be because that is where their interests lie.

There is, of course, a potential downside to clustering. There were some concerns that clustering might indicate that student-athletes had found a soft spot in the curriculum and were seeking to minimize their academic efforts by going where the academic burden was lightest.

As it happens, these concerns were ... well ... academic. Our Academic Services Office has done an analysis of student-athlete majors and of student-athlete courses-attended each semester for the last

four or so years. In essence, there is no significant clustering. Student-athlete majors are distributed among all the undergraduate colleges at the University of Illinois. The distribution is not uniform, but it does not exhibit any clustering of note.

With respect to courses, those, too, show that our student-athletes are not taking classes together in any manner that causes us concern.

In light of the as-yet-unresolved academic scandal among student-athletes at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, we became worried that we did not know enough about how our student-athletes were treating independent study classes. So, with the help of then-Director of Academic Services Keiko Price, we asked for an account of how many student-athletes were taking independent study classes. Ms. Price told us that there were, on average, 11 such classes being taken by student-athletes, and more than half of those classes were required as a part of their major field of study.

Just to be safe, we then worked with Ms. Price to create a sign-up form that every student-athlete must submit to Academic Services when they propose to take an independent study. The form requires a statement of the topic, the requirements for the course, and the number of units of credit, and must be signed and dated by both the student and the instructor. Those forms are then kept on file at Academic Services.

We are also mindful that on-line courses may become an issue for student-athletes. It was said to be the case several years ago that almost none of the members of the University of Oregon football team were taking in-class courses. If that were to happen at the University of Illinois, that might be a cause for deep concern. We have asked Academic Services to monitor on-line class-taking and report to the Athletic Board periodically.

Additional Comments

We conclude with two important observations about academics and student-athletics. There is simply no question that our current Athletic Director and the other administrators at DIA share this great university's commitment to and pride in excellence in academics. They share the core values of our faculty colleagues.

Similarly, we have no doubt that our current head coaches understand the importance of excellence in academics and seek to foster it among their students.

As a result of these commitments and attitudes, we have complete cooperation with DIA in our academic evaluations and, just as importantly, in working through any other student-athlete welfare issues (such as complying with pending restrictions on practice hours and NCAA and Big Ten rules on missed class days for competition). For example, we are working with the Academic Services Office to explore how we can accommodate study abroad experiences for student-athletes.

Finally, we draw your attention to the remarkably rich extracurricular program of activities and community outreach that our student-athletes have. The Douglas C. Roberts Illini Life Skills programs bring noted national speakers to campus to address student-athlete issues, provides a leadership academy for student-athletes, sponsors career networking for a, and has a career readiness program for seniors to get them ready for their first jobs after graduation.

Submitted on behalf of the Athletic Board
Thomas S. Ulen, Chair

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
(Final; Information)

EP.17.79 Report of Administrative Approvals at the March 13, 2017 meeting of the EPC.

Graduate Programs

MA in Linguistics – Remove LING 509, Topics in Cognitive Linguistics (4 hours) from the list of linguistics courses from which students are to select one course in both the Thesis and Non-Thesis Options. The Department of Linguistics has requested deactivation of LING 509. Removal of the course still leaves two courses in the list for students to choose from, LING 507, Formal Semantics I (4 hours) and LING 551, Pragmatics (4 hours) to fulfill the requirement. This does not change the total number of hours required for the degree.

Undergraduate Programs

Minor in Business – Add the following courses to the list of electives from which students are to select 6 hours: BADM 311, Individual Behavior in Organizations (3 hours); BADM 312, Organization Design and Environment (3 hours); BADM 313, Human Resource Management (3 hours); BADM 323, Marketing Communications (3 hours); BADM 326, Pricing Policies (3 hours); BADM 367, Management of Innovation and Technology (3 hours); BADM 381, Multinational Management (3 hours). This does not change the total number of hours required for the minor.

BSLAS in Integrative Biology, Integrative Biology Concentration – Revise the Physics course list from which students are to select 8 to 10 hours to allow student to either take PHYS 101, College Physics: Mech & Heat (5 hours) and PHYS 102, College Physics: E&M & Modern (5 hours) or PHYS 211, University Physics: Mechanics (4 hours) and PHYS 212, University Physics: Elec & Mag (4 hours). Currently, the Physics course list includes options for “mixing and matching” these two introductory Physics sequences, so it lists PHYS 101 and PHYS 212 or PHYS 102 and PHYS 211 as options. The 101 and 102 sequence is taken by the vast majority of students in IB; students with strong calculus backgrounds may opt for the 211 and 212 sequence. The “mixed and matched” options of 101 and 212 or 102 and 211 were listed to capture the rare student who starts in 211 or 212 and finds it too difficult and switches to the non-calculus based course to complete the Physics sequence. Although such students do still enter the program, the School of Integrative Biology and the College of LAS wishes to accommodate the “mix and match” sequences by way of substitution petition since they are rare and exceptional cases. The request simplifies the options for students to consider and captures the Physics sequences the vast majority of students will take.

The request does not change the number of Physics hours required, the number of hours required for the concentration, or the total number of hours required for the major/degree.

BS in Crop Sciences –Currently, ACE 100, Agr Cons and Resource Econ (4 hours) is the only course specifically listed for the principles of microeconomics portion of the Departmental Requirements. Many students in the major take ECON 102, which is then substituted as fulfilling this requirement. For purposes of transparency and efficiency, the Department of Crop Sciences and College of ACES wish to update the Program of Study listing in the Academic Catalog for this particular requirement from “ACE 100, Agr Cons and Resource Econ – 4 hours” to “ACE 100, Agr Cons and Resource Econ – 4 hours or ECON 102, Microeconomics – 3 hours.” This does not change the total number of hours required for the major/degree.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
(Final; Information)

EP.17.82 Report of Administrative Approvals at the March 27, 2017 meeting of the EPC.

Undergraduate Programs

BALAS in East Asian Languages and Cultures – Revise the minimum hours of major-required coursework to accurately reflect the hours a student who places out of the advanced language requirement would need. Students who test out of the advanced language requirement are required to take two additional non-language courses from East Asian-related offerings as indicated in Footnote 1 in the Program of Study listing in the Academic Catalog. Two additional courses equates to six hours of coursework; therefore, these students need a minimum of 33 hours of major and supporting coursework. When the minimum required hours statement currently input in the Academic Catalog listing was calculated, Footnote 1 was inadvertently overlooked, so the range for the total of major-related coursework is incorrectly listed as 37-57 hours. The requested revision would list that total as a range of 33-57 hours.