

**Minutes**  
**Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting**

November 1, 2010

A special meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:15 p.m. on the 3<sup>d</sup> floor of the Levis Faculty Center with Interim Chancellor/Provost Robert Easter presiding and Professor Emeritus Kenneth Andersen as Parliamentarian.

**Senate Executive Committee Report**

Senator Joyce Tolliver (LAS), Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), delivered the following report.

Thank you for coming to the final special Senate meeting to discuss the restructuring proposals presented by President Hogan on behalf of the Board of Trustees.

First, an overview of the proposals on the table and the process for giving our advice on them:

You have all studied the document sent forward on behalf of the Board by President Hogan. It proposes the following changes, which require amending our governing documents:

1. Re-title the chancellor to include the title vice president: University Vice President and Chancellor of the Urbana campus, for instance. This requires a change to the *Statutes*, which is analogous to changing the *Constitution* of the University. Proposals to change the *Statutes* cannot be made without the advice of each of the campus Senates.

2. Create the new position of Vice President of Health Affairs. This requires a change to the *General Rules*, which is a university-wide governance document based on the policies outlined in the *Statutes*.

3. Change the title of the current Vice President of Technology and Economic Development to that of Vice President of Research, Technology, and Economic Development. This also requires a change to the *General Rules*.

4. Amend the language of the *General Rules* so that every time the term “provost” appears, it is changed to read “provost or equivalent officer.”

These last three changes to the *General Rules* cannot be made without the advice of University Senates Conference, which is the twenty-member advisory board made up of representatives of the three campus senates. The USC has exercised its prerogative to seek the advice of its respective senates in generating its own advice.

It is important to consider these proposals in the context of a series of proposed restructuring changes to upper administration, which also include the creation of the position of executive officer of enrollment management, the creation of the position of executive officer of Human Resources, and the broadening of the portfolio of the Vice President of Academic Affairs to include coordination of academic programs among the three campuses.

These last three changes can be made without seeking the advice of Senate representatives, but they have always been discussed as part of the same general reorganization.

The three campus senates must forward their advice to the University Senates Conference. If the advice of the senates conflicts, USC must try to seek agreement among the senates. If that is not possible, USC must forward the advice of each of the senates to the Board, along with its own recommendation.

Given a complex document with profound institutional implications, and a very short time for response, I did not think a full review would be possible in the time we were given. Nevertheless, we did everything in our power to respond to the request. In the past four weeks, our campus has held three extra meetings in addition to the Annual Meeting of the Faculty. In addition to this, the Senate Executive Committee has scheduled three special meetings. That's 8 meetings in a little over a month devoted largely or entirely to this issue. No one can say we have not taken our charge very seriously, and made our best effort under what seemed to be impossible time constraints.

University Senates Conference will also hold a special meeting later this week--in addition to our usual day-long meeting last week, which was dedicated almost exclusively to discussing the proposals among ourselves as well as with the president and Chair Kennedy. (I will ask Matt Wheeler, who chairs USC, to briefly summarize what USC is doing to generate its advice. I will clarify, though, that, in contrast to what you might have read in the papers, USC has not made any public statements about this issue.)

Through these extraordinary efforts, then, we do have a report that responds fairly comprehensively to the proposals. That is what we are discussing today.

You have in your meeting packet a 13-page document, numbered SC.11.05 and titled "Response to the Proposed University Reorganization: University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign Senate Executive Committee." This is the response of the Senate Executive Committee to the proposals. SEC produced this document for two reasons:

First, we thought that having a document to refer to would help to organize the discussion on the Senate floor. Secondly, and equally importantly, the Statutes Committee drew our attention to a clause in the Senate *Bylaws* stipulating that a proposal to amend the *Statutes* must be forwarded to the Senate only after an appropriate Senate committee has examined the substance of the proposal and given its advice. I suggested that SEC might be the appropriate committee in this case, and that suggestion was accepted.

As a basis for this long document, your Senate leadership listened carefully to members of the campus community at the October 11 town hall and read the comments on the public website; we noted carefully the concerns that were raised on October 18 and October 25; and we paid attention to comments expressed to us individually. We also carefully considered the responses that had been given to the questions and concerns raised thus far. Our aim in writing the SEC statement was to synthesize the comments and questions we had heard expressed across the campus. Because time was short, we also asked for help from some individual colleagues in carefully reading the Rationale for the proposals. The document before you represents the comments and words of many members of the campus community. It is intended to be synthetic—a document that represents the general sense of the Senate as we understand it.

The key point of the Senate Executive Committee response is that we invite a conversation about how these proposals could be clarified, and in some cases modified. By finishing our work not just on time but early, we have made it possible for one more round of exchange before the Board has to vote on November 18.

While some answers have been provided to our questions, key details about the proposals' implementation, cost, and consequences have not been answered at all, and sometimes we have received unclear or conflicting answers. For this reason, we hope this conversation can continue, and we have gone out of our way not to draw any final or irrevocable conclusion. We say that these changes, based on what we have been told, are not acceptable in their present form; but we hold out the possibility that a revised and clarified set of changes might be viewed differently. We are absolutely committed to continuing the conversation, and we hope the Board is, too.

A word now about the short, three-page document that is in your Senate packet. This is numbered SC.11.06, and titled "Response to the Proposed University Reorganization: University of Illinois Urbana Champaign Senate." This is a document prepared by SEC that represents a condensed version, or a distillation, of the general thrust of the longer SEC document. We prepared it

with the expectation that there might be a desire on the part of Senators to attend only to the main points of the longer document. There is nothing in the short document that is not in the long document. What is missing from the short document, inevitably, is the reasoned logic, the nuance, and the details of the advice.

The short document is being presented for your approval. It may be amended, but the proposed Senate Report was designed to address the relevant questions at a much higher level of generality than the longer SEC Report.

Some colleagues have pointed out that a danger of modifying the Senate statement is that we might end up introducing two statements—SC.11.05 and SC.11.06—that might give conflicting advice. If Senators are concerned about that, we can talk about ways around that issue.

I want to leave time for changes that do help make the document a reflection of the Senate's will, but we all know that endless wordsmithing from the floor doesn't work very well. Given adequate time, we would have circulated this earlier and allowed everyone time for prefiled amendments to be sent in. Unfortunately, we didn't have that time. So I ask you to limit yourselves to significant changes – especially any possible misstatements or errors of fact – and I ask that at some point we need to stop and assess the document as a whole. I think we should aim to do this around 4:30 or so.

After we have made a decision on the Senate statement, we still have the USSP Report to review. It points out several key passages of the proposed amendments that contain wording that might result in ambiguities or unintended interpretations. We want to be sure that the Board receives these suggestions, so we are asking you to approve that document as well.

In closing, I'd like to say a few words about the spirit in which we offer our response. Some might consider our questioning of the proposals and our request for more information as “negativity.” I think it is quite the opposite. Indeed, our intense engagement in this process of consultation, the careful attention we have paid to the proposals and to the information we have received about them, and the many hours we have spent discussing them are the clearest indication of how much we care about our professional home. They are a sign of our dedication and commitment to our campus and to our university. I hope our comments will be received in that spirit.

There are two (2) handouts at the door – a packet of meeting materials (including agenda) and a single page document highlighting the key points from the responses to the proposed university reorganization

Tellers for today's meeting are Senators Harry Hilton (ENGR), Mary Mallory (LIBR), and Rolando Romero (LAS).

### **Report for Discussion**

11/01/10-01 Chancellor Easter presented for discussion SC.11.05\*, Senate Executive Committee Response to the Proposed University Reorganization. SEC Chair Joyce Tolliver (LAS) stated that the SEC believed that the proposals were not acceptable in their present form, but the SEC would like to continue the dialogue.

Senator John Kindt (BUS) asked if SC.11.05 could be appended to SC.11.06, Senate Response to the Proposed University Reorganization, one of the action items that appears later on today's agenda. Senator Tolliver replied that the SEC would like the Trustees to see SC.11.05, since it includes much of the rationale for the shorter document (i.e., SC.11.06).

Senator George Francis (LAS) did not agree with some of the tone in SC.11.05, referring to some passages as inflammatory, adding that we should make recommendations to the Board and not simply tell them what to do.

### **Proposals for Action**

11/01/10-02 Chancellor Robert Easter presented for action SC.11.06\*, Senate Response to the Proposed University Reorganization. SEC Chair Tolliver referred to some of the key points highlighted in the summary document distributed at the door, and moved approval of the measure.

A motion to substitute the text of SC.11.05 for that of SC.11.06 was defeated by voice vote.

Senator Kindt moved to append SC.11.05 to SC.11.06. In response to a query about amending SC.11.05, Parliamentarian Kenneth E. Andersen ruled that SC.11.05 had been filed as an information report and ergo, unamendable.

By unanimous voice vote, the Senate approved Senator Kindt's motion to append SC.11.05 to SC.11.06. Senator William Maher (LIBR) moved to replace the first sentence of the penultimate paragraph with the following language he credited to Professor Abbas Aminmansour (FAA), Educational Policy Committee Chair and SEC member:

"We are not opposed to change. Indeed we may support some of the proposed changes if they are further developed in a careful way. We cannot

however support the proposed changes in their current form at the present time.”

By voice, the Senate approved this substitution.

11/01/10-03 By voice vote, SC.11.06\* was approved, as amended.

11/01/10-04 Chancellor Easter presented for action SP.11.04\*, Proposed Amendments to the *Statutes* and the *General Rules*. Senator Maher, Chair of the Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures, described technical problems associated with the proposed amendments the campuses received from the President through the University Senates Conference. He expressed the view that this document was complementary to the issue-oriented proposals from SEC.

Concerns were raised about sending a mixed or diluted message to the President and the Board on the proposed university reorganization if SP.11.04 was also forwarded.

A motion by Senator David Olsen (BUS) to postpone consideration of this item until the November 8 Senate meeting was approved by a show of hands.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Robert C. Damrau, Senate Clerk

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