A regular meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) was called to order at 3:11 pm on Monday, September 9, 2013 in 232 English Building, with Chair Campbell presiding.

1. **Announcements/Introductions**
   Guests were introduced.

2. **Approval of Minutes**
   The minutes from August 26, 2013 were approved as amended.

3. **Chair’s Remarks (R. Campbell)**
   Chair Campbell charged the Senate Committee on General University Policy (GUP) to review the Shared Governance survey and make recommendations on items for action.

4. **Chancellor’s Remarks (B. Wilson)**
   Wilson distributed printed copies of the Campus Strategic Plan booklet. A massmail was sent out today from the Chancellor announcing the Campus Strategic Plan. There are metrics listed at the end of the strategic plan. This document was also distributed to the Chancellor’s Strategic Advisory Group which includes several accomplished alums and other outside stakeholders. The advisory group has praised the document. The Chancellor and Provost hope to have SEC and Senate members assist in distributing information about the Campus Strategic Plan.

   Diversity is a very important issue for both the Provost and Chancellor. TOP, or Targets of Opportunity Program, is a program designed to support recruitment of outstanding faculty members who will enhance our institution’s strategic goals and build on our reputation as a leading public research university. The goal of the program is to attract leading faculty members among groups that are underrepresented by race, ethnicity, gender, disability, and veterans’ status in specific units on campus. Campus support of TOP has been increased from $75,000 to $85,000. And if a second faculty member is hired from the same initial search, the funding has increased from $40,000 to $60,000.

   An Inclusive Illinois initiative called Illinois EDGE – Enhancing Diversity, Guiding Excellence – is a four member faculty group tasked with 1) initiating a listening and learning tour with executive officers, directors of graduate programs, department heads, and chairs to understand the challenges and opportunities related to diversity; 2) developing an action plan to institutionalize a culture of diversity and excellence on campus through the development of a structure and culture...
of responsibility, incentive, and accountability; 3) evaluating progress on the action plan and recommend adjustments to the chancellor and the provost based on their findings to facilitate the achievement of the goals and objectives; and 4) ensuring that their efforts interconnect with the Visioning Future Excellence initiative. There is brand new group called DRIVE that will concentrate on faculty recruitment. Cluster hiring around the six Visioning Future Excellence initiatives will first focus on three of the six clusters. Natural clusters seem to be forming when colleges submit their hiring plans.

Wilson also noted that the Chancellor and Provost just received the Task Force on Faculty Issues and Concerns report and they are enthusiastic about the report.

5. Updates/Follow-up on Academic Professional Exemption Authority, Civil Service Audit Process, and Other Related Matters (M. Madsen)
Madsen noted that this topic was originally discussed on May 13, 2013. A stakeholders group was to be formed that would include faculty members, union representatives, and SUCSS (State Universities Civil Service System) Merit Board members. The Urbana campus has no representation in this stakeholders group even though members of campus have asked numerous times.

When the SUCSS Merit Board that preserved the exemption authority took their vote, SUCSS indicated that the vote was not the end of discussion on the issue. Those academic professionals (APs) that spoke before the Merit Board in support of retaining the exemption authority are now undergoing the audit process. First job descriptions are collected, and then a sub-set of this group goes through a desk audit. The June 2011 audit report was not released until August 2012. This did not give enough time for audit findings to be reviewed and addressed before the data for the next audit was due so audit findings continue to be found. Aminmansour suggested that FAC-IBHE (Faculty Advisory Council to the Board of Higher Education) be approached and made aware of this situation.

6. Task Force Report on Faculty Issues and Concerns (N. Burbules/R. McCarthy/J. Tolliver)
Burbules noted that the task force report is the larger document, and the other document distributed is a listing of only the recommendations. This task force stemmed from a letter authored by Burbules and McCarthy at the end of the 2012-13 academic year. One goal of the task force is to strengthen shared governance. The task force was broken into three sub-committees and those sub-committees met regularly over summer to review solutions together. When meeting with administration to gain additional information, administration was forthcoming with the requested information.

McCarthy began by discussing salary equity. Administration has done an exercise to review individual departments. Illinois is behind in salary among our peers and would approximately $10 million is need to bring Illinois in line with our peers. The task force found that the reason for salary inequity is varied. The task force’s first recommendation is to continue past efforts to bring all faculty members up to competitive wages. Senate and Senate sub-committees should work together to formulate a solution. Salaries are only part. There needs be a comparison model that includes all benefits so the whole package can be evaluated.

The task force recommends the formation of a permanent standing committee called the Compensation Review Committee (CRC). This committee would be similar to the CBOC (Campus Budget Oversight Committee). The CRC would work with administration to identify issues, set goals, and make recommendations of priorities.

Pension issues are a process in which the University has limit input. The task force supports IGPA (Institute of Government and Public Affairs) plan. The plan is flawed, but is better than the alternative. A long-term plan needs to be put into place and two tier program needs to be addressed. Changes are inevitable to the program.
Health benefits, workplace health and wellness, and the tuition waiver program. It is difficult to locate the resources for benefits that faculty members can enjoy. A process should be set-up that defines what benefits are available and lists those benefits in a single place.

The Senate Committee on the Budget would work to make the budget documents user friendly. This would include a website with a single place to access all budget information. Most people do not know that there is a statutory requirement to share budget information and include departments in the budget process.

The key metric in determining deferred maintenance is the facility condition index which is the ratio of deferred maintenance to the current replacement value. An index of 10% is the borderline between a well maintained campus and one that is deteriorating. In 2007, the campus index was at 23% but through a combination of bonds, the introduction of a student fee and money from administration; it was down to 16% by 2012. It will take over $200 million in additional funds to reach an index of 10%. However, the only recurring money dedicated to deferred maintenance is the student fee. The campus needs at least $20 million more per year in recurring funds to maintain current facilities and the task force recommends that a realistic plan be developed to restore and maintain the campus.

The decision making process for promotion and tenure was reviewed for fairness, transparency, and consistency. In general the process is healthy at the campus level, but there are some areas where improvement is needed. There could be a fair decision made, but it could be inconsistent. Experiences from one faculty member to the next might not be the same. In some smaller colleges, there may only be one level of review while in larger colleges we found that there could be as many as four levels of review. The variance should not be this great. Each college should make a decision based on a policy, the policy should be published, and the policy should be enforced.

Another area of promotion and tenure that was reviewed is the process of recruiting faculty members who would come to the campus already with tenure. This would warrant an off-cycle review. There are not any current processes in place for off-cycle reviews. The task force recommends that an off-cycle review process be documented. Wilson added that there is a practice, but it has not been codified.

Another aspect of promotion and tenure is when a recommendation for denial of promotion or tenure is appealed. The default procedure is that the appeal is heard by the same committee that issued the denial. The current process does allow the candidate to make a compelling case that the appeal should be heard by a different committee. The task force concluded that the process would be fairer if the default and the exception were reversed.

The task force did not find a clear appeals process for other academic staff that are issued non-reappointments. The task force would like to see a best practice manual in order to ensure faculty members have a successful promotion and tenure process.

Sometimes the Senate needs to be more nimble. The Senate needs to discuss how to make more timely decisions without jeopardizing transparencies and shared governance. The task force recommends that the Seventh Senate Review Commission consider this issue.

Reallocating of resources could result in transferring faculty members between departments. There needs to be a formal review of programmatic implications when faculty members transfer from one unit to another. Transfers should not be used as a means to close units.

There is a sense that shared governance is strong on this campus. Improvements can always be made. The task force recommends that the Senate take a larger role in communicating the processes of shared governance. The task force recommends that the Senate work with the Office
of the Provost on shared governance and units need to follow the University Statutes. Making sure information is more widely available.

Most of the task force recommendations imply some coordination with the Senate, administration, and colleges. These recommendations are not action items, but issues to discuss further. Burbules would like SEC consider endorsing this report. He would also like to see SEC decide how best to bring this to the full Senate. Burbules feels that it would be helpful to have a discussion about how to move forward on some of these recommendations. All of the recommendations are going to need follow-up.

McCarthy added that some of the recommendations that were identified require large amounts of funding. There is no way the recommendations can be addressed without taking money from another source. Kalita suggested making the task force report available to everyone on this campus.

Lear suggested taking the task force report to the full Senate as a committee of the whole discussion before any action is taken. Chair Campbell agrees that a committee of the whole discussion should be held at the next Senate meeting.

Aminmansour made a motion that SEC endorse the task force report and forward the report to the Senate by placing it on the September 16, 2013 Senate agenda. The motion was seconded and approved by voice with no members opposed and no abstentions.

7. **Student Discipline Review Committee Update**
   Romano offered to become responsible for organizing this committee.

8. **Setting of the Senate Agenda**
   The Senate agenda for September 16, 2013 was approved as amended.

9. **New Business**
   No new business.

10. **Adjournment**
    The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Jenny Roether
Clerk of the Senate