

**AGENDA**

Senate of the Urbana-Champaign Campus

March 9, 2015

3:10 pm

**Illini Union Ballroom**

- I. **Call to Order** – Chancellor Phyllis Wise
- II. **Approval of Minutes** –February 9, 2015 and February 16, 2015
- III. **Senate Executive Committee Report** – Chair Roy Campbell
- IV. **Chancellor’s Remarks** – Chancellor Phyllis Wise
- V. **Questions/Discussion**
- VI. **Old Business**

**A. Proposals**

RS.15.07	Concerns about Shared Governance and Academic Freedom	B. McCall & K. Sanders	1
----------	---	------------------------	---

**B. Reports (enclosed)**

EP.15.39	Administrative Approvals – January 26, 2015	Educational Policy <i>(G. Miller, Chair)</i>	3
EP.15.40	Administrative Approvals – February 2, 2015	Educational Policy <i>(G. Miller, Chair)</i>	5
HE.15.04	FAC/IBHE Report – December 12, 2014	A. Aminmansour	7
HE.15.05	FAC/IBHE Report – January 16, 2015	A. Aminmansour	9
SC.15.07	BOT Observer Report – January 15, 2015	G. Miller	11
UC.15.05	USC Report – December 12, 2014	J. Tolliver	15
UC.15.06	USC Report – January 22, 2015	J. Tolliver	17
SC.15.08	Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Report	Senate Exec. Committee <i>(R. Campbell)</i>	19

**VII. Consent Agenda**

*These items will only be distributed via [www.senate.illinois.edu/20150309.asp](http://www.senate.illinois.edu/20150309.asp). If a senator wishes to move an item from the Consent Agenda to Proposals and have copies at the meeting, they must notify the Senate Office at least two business days before the meeting. Any senator can ask to have any item moved from the Consent Agenda to Proposals.*

EP.15.29	Proposal from the College of Education to establish a concentration in Digital Environments for Learning, Teaching & Agency in the B.S. in Learning & Education Studies	Educational Policy <i>(G. Miller, Chair)</i>
----------	---	---

EP.15.31	Proposal from the College of Engineering to Establish a Major in Electrical and Computer Engineering in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering for the Degree of Masters of Engineering	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.32	Proposal from the College of Engineering to Establish a Combined Bachelor of Science - Master of Engineering Degree in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.34	Proposal from the College of Business to add the Graduate Concentration in Business Data Analytics in the Department of Business Administration	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.41	Proposal from the College of Fine and Applied Arts to Rename and Revise the Undergraduate Minor in Urban Planning	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.43	Proposal from the College of Engineering and the Graduate College to Terminate Two Options, the Online MS and the Non-Thesis Option, in the Master's in Electrical and Computer Engineering	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.45	Proposal from the College of Agricultural, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences (ACES) to Terminate the Bachelor of Science in Horticulture	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)

### VIII. Proposals (enclosed)

RS.15.08	Resolution Endorsing the Final Report of the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee	M. Steinberg, et. al.	39
CC.15.07	Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate	Committee on Committees (P. Kalita, Chair)	41
CC.15.08	Nominations to the Athletic Board	Committee on Committees (P. Kalita, Chair)	43
CC.15.09	Nominations for Membership on the University Senates Conference	Committee on Committees (P. Kalita, Chair)	47
SP.15.14	General Revisions to the <i>Statutes</i> Motion #3	University Statutes & Senate Procedures (W. Maher)	49

### IX. 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.*

### X. Adjournment

**Minutes**  
**Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting**  
February 9, 2015

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

**Approval of Minutes**

02/09/15-01 The minutes from December 8, 2014 were approved as written.

**Senate Executive Committee Report**

Roy Campbell (ENGR), faculty senator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) reported that the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Report is listed for review, but SEC anticipates bringing an action item forward at the next regular Senate meeting on March 9, 2015. Provost Communications #2, #3, and #9 are in the process of review. Campbell noted that various Senate committees will be involved in the review and recommendation will come before the full Senate. The College of Medicine proposal is on today's agenda after it was approved by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC). The agenda also contains important proposed changes to the *Statutes*. Chair Campbell presented his suggested time schedule for each agenda item and asked that the Senate adhere to the schedule in order to complete all the business.

02/09/15-02 The following floor privileges were granted as requested without objection.

To speak to EP.15.33: Proposal to Create a College of Medicine at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in Partnership with Carle Health System:

1. Dr. Joseph Barkmeier: Carle Foundation Hospital
2. Stephanie Beever: VP, Strategic Business Development, Carle Foundation Hospital
3. Rohit Bhargava: Department of Bioengineering
4. Jeff Brown: Prof of Finance, Prof of Economics, IGPA Prof, Director Center for Business & Public Policy
5. Marty Burke: Chemistry, Dept Affiliate Biochemistry
6. John Caughlin: Professor and Acting Head, Department of Communication
7. Neal Cohen: Prof of Psychology
8. Mike DeLorenzo: Associate Chancellor
9. Jennifer Eardley: Associate Vice Chancellor for Research
10. John Erdman: Prof Emeritus, Beckman Food Science and Human Nutrition
11. Laura Frerichs: Director Research Park, Director Economic Development
12. Nancy Greenwalt: Executive Director Promise Healthcare/Frances Nelson Clinic and SmileHealthy
13. Vicky Gress: Associate Provost for the Budget
14. Dr. Graham Huesmann: Research Assist Prof, Dept of Molecular & Integrative Physiology & Neurologist, Carle Hospital
15. Eric Jakobsson: Prof Emeritus of Biochemistry & Urbana City Council Member
16. Hillary Klonoff-Cohen: Director, MPH program, AHS
17. Susan A. Martinis: Professor and Head of the Biochemistry Department
18. Susan Schantz: Comparative Biosciences, Veterinary Medicine
19. James M. Slauch: Professor of Microbiology; Director, Medical Scholars Program

20. Dr. William Olivero: Prof of Medicine, UI College of Medicine at Urbana & Neurosurgeon, Carle Hospital
21. Normand Paquin: Associate Director for Research, Coordinated Science Lab & College of Medicine Project Lead
22. Barry Jay Riskin: Clinical Assistant Professor, College of Medicine; Board of Directors, Christie Clinic; Chief Medical Officer, Sun Health Technologies, LLC
23. Gene Robinson: Director, Institute of Genomic Biology
24. Molly Tracy: Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement
25. Dr. John Wang: Asst Prof of Medicine, UI College of Medicine at Urbana & Neurosurgeon, Carle Hospital
26. Jeff Woods: Prof of Kinesiology

To speak to LB.15.01, RS.15.05, RS.15.06, RS.15.07, AF.15.01, and SC.15.08:  
Richard Laugesen: Department of Mathematics

02/09/15-03 Tellers for the meeting were faculty senators Shawn Gilmore (LAS) and Stephen Moose (ACES), and student senator Calvin Lear (GRAD).

#### **Chancellor's Remarks**

Chancellor Wise asked for moment of silence for Vicente Mundo, a sophomore that was recently killed.

Wise welcomed everyone back to the spring semester and noted that there is a great deal of business on today's agenda. Wise thanked the Senate and other members of campus for the frank discussions and comments, and the opportunity for open debate about academic freedom and freedom of speech. The hiring process and procedures have been reviewed and recommendations have been made to improve them. Wise expressed her desire to improve communication about campus issues.

Wise expressed her excitement to discuss the proposed College of Medicine (COM). She noted that the reviews by the Senate Committee on the Budget, Senate Committee on University Statutes and University Procedures (USSP), and the EPC have made the COM proposal even better. This is a historic moment for the university. New colleges are not created very often and when colleges are started, it is done with careful thought and deliberation. The COM will create a convergence of health sciences and engineering.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

None

#### **Consent Agenda**

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

02/09/15-04 EP.15.27 \* Proposal from the College of Fine and Applied Arts and the Graduate College to establish a Graduate Minor in Dance

02/09/15-05 EP.15.28 \* Proposal from the College of Fine and Applied Arts and the Graduate College to revise the M.F.A. in Dance

02/09/15-06 EP.15.38 \* Proposal from the College of Agricultural, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences (ACES) to Revise the Bachelor of Science in Agricultural and Consumer Economics (ACE) with a Concentration in Agri-Accounting.

Chair Miller announced that the title of proposal EP.15.38 listed on the proposal itself is incorrect, but the title listed on the agenda is correct.

**Proposals (enclosed)**

02/09/15-07 EP.15.33\* Proposal to Create a College of Medicine at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in Partnership with Carle Health System

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC), Chair Miller introduced and moved approval of proposal EP.15.33. Miller noted that extensive work has been done by the EPC along with input from the Senate Budget committee and the USSP committee. A letter of support from all of the Academic Deans is included. Miller invited Provost Adesida to come forward to lead additional discussion.

Adesida expressed his support of the Urbana COM. The COM will create healthcare for more people; from wellness to prevention. The new COM takes a systems approach. All of our current colleges have potential of contribution. Illinois has made an upfront investment and so has Carle. The risk of not moving forward with the creation of a COM is unimaginable. A COM will make Illinois more competitive for NIH (National Institutes of Health) funding. The COM is good for the community, the state, and the nation. It is our duty to ensure that greatness continues.

Some of the individuals that spoke in support of the COM include:

- Joseph Barkmeier: Radiologist at Carle Health System
- Stephanie Beever, Senior Vice President for System Strategic Business Development at Carle
- Rohit Bhargava: Professor in Bioengineering and the Beckman Institute Bioimaging Science and Technology Group
- Neal Cohen: Interdisciplinary Health Sciences Initiative (IHSI) Director
- Hillary Klonoff-Cohen: Professor in Kinesiology and Community Health, AHS
- Michele Mariscalco: Regional Dean of the College of Medicine at Urbana-Champaign
- Susan Martinis: Professor of Biochemistry and Medical Biochemistry, and Center for Biophysics and Computational Biology.
- James Slauch: Professor of Microbiology and Director of the Medical Scholars Program
- Jon Thaler: Professor of Physics
- Senators Anastasio (LAS), Francis (LAS), Gollin (ENGR), Hellman (AHS), Hill (LAS), Kar (LAW), Kindt (BUS), and Ordal (MED)

Several senators, Gilmore (LAS), Riedel (LAS), Romero (LAS), and Thaler (ENGR), expressed concerns about Carle as a solid partner, possible less expensive alternative programs, loss of property tax revenue for Urbana, and sustainable funding sources.

Barkmeier responded that Carle continues to improve and implement changes, and will be looking at changes in medicine to be proactive rather than reactive. Adesida noted that the curriculum in the proposed Urbana COM will differ from the current offerings at the Chicago campus. Beever replied that the property tax issue is not a community issue, but rather a more complicated state and federal issue. Beever added that Carle provided \$44 million in charity care to the surrounding community. Wise pointed to the review of the Senate Committee on the Budget to address and funding questions.

To recording of the proposed College of Medicine discussion, and the entirety of the Senate meeting, can be found at: <http://www.senate.illinois.edu/video.asp>.

02/09/15-08 The motion to approve EP.15.33 passed by voice.

- 02/09/15-09 SP.15.12 Proposed Revisions to the *Bylaws*, Part D.18 – Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures
- 02/09/15-10 On behalf of the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP), Chair Maher introduced and moved approval of proposal SP.15.12. This proposal would allow anyone from the Senate electorate to serve as a parliamentarian rather than only faculty from the Senate electorate. No further discussion.
- 02/09/15-11 The motion to approve SP.15.12 was passed by voice.
- 02/09/15-12 SP.15.13 General Revisions to the *Statutes*  
Motions #4 and #5
- On behalf of the USSP, Chair Maher introduced and moved approval of recommendation one on proposal SP.15.13. Craig Koslofsky, current member and previous chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), requested lines 395-398 not be removed.
- 02/09/15-13 On behalf of Koslofsky, Chair Maher made a motion to amend by reinserting lines 395-398. The motion was seconded and a short discussion followed. Burbules noted that the language was moved to lines 344-347. Koslofsky responded that the word “on its own initiative” is not included in the text on lines 344-347.
- 02/09/15-14 The motion to amend by restoring lines 395-398 was approved.
- 02/09/15-15 By voice, recommendation one of SP.15.13 was approved.
- 02/09/15-16 On behalf of USSP, Chair Maher introduced and moved approval of recommendation two of proposal SP.15.13. Burbules noted that this motion provides consistency throughout the *Statutes*.
- 02/09/15-17 By voice, recommendation two of SP.15.13 was approved.
- 02/09/15-18 LB.15.01 Resolution on Intellectual Freedom and the University Library
- On behalf of the Senate Committee on the Library, Chair Mallory introduced and moved approval of resolution LB.15.01. Mallory discussed the issue of censorship and librarians being brought to court. Censorship is an ongoing problem in the Library.
- 02/09/15-19 Steinberg (LAS) supported the resolution and moved to include endorsement of the “Intellectual Freedom Principles for Academic Libraries: An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights” as stated in the eighth “whereas”. The motion was seconded.
- The final paragraph of the resolution would read:
- “**THEREFORE** be it resolved that the Senate of the Urbana-Champaign Campus endorse this resolution and the “Intellectual Freedom Principles for Academic Libraries: An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights” in support of intellectual freedom, the Library, and the Library faculty and staff.”
- 02/09/15-20 The motion to amend resolution LB.15.01 was approved by voice.
- 02/09/15-21 By voice, resolution LB.15.01 was approved.
- 02/09/15-22 RS.15.05 Resolution Regarding the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure Report
- 02/09/15-23 Levine (LAS) made a motion to have AF.15.01: Report on the Investigation into the Matter of Steven Salaita presented prior to the introduction of resolution RS.15.05. The motion was seconded and AF.15.01 was presented by Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AFT) Chair David O’Brien.

O'Brien summarized the findings in report AF.15.01. O'Brien stated that serious violations of Salaita's academic freedom had occurred. The AFT committee recommended the Chancellor and BOT withdraw statements of civility and that Salaita's candidacy be remanded to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS). O'Brien noted that the committee felt Salaita was more than an applicant, but less than an employee. Because AFT did not consider Salaita to be an employee, the committee did not feel Salaita was due a hearing before AFT.

Levine (LAS) noted that in the fall semester campus members were urged not to make any statements on the Salaita situation. Levine felt those that asked members of the Senate to wait for the AFT report to be finalized before making any statements are now trying to discredit the AFT report.

02/09/15-24 Levine (LAS) moved approval of RS.15.05, the motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Nelson (LAS) noted that at the final meeting of the AFT, AFT decided to delete some passages. AFT member Matthew Finkin had written and shared two letters with the AAUP (American Association of University Professors), Chancellor, and present and past Senate leaders. Nelson suggested that both letters written by Finkin go before the Senate as they relate to this resolution.

Nelson (LAS) felt that the first step should be amending the statement on civility rather than withdrawing the statement. The second step should be the BOT considering faculty appointments prior to faculty beginning work. Nelson felt that no matter what the Senate does, the AAUP will probably still sanction the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Graber (AHS) opposed the resolution citing the pending lawsuit between Salaita and the university.

Gilmore (LAS) was troubled that fellow senators were opposed to forming an LAS review committee and voiced his support of the resolution as a co-author. SEC member Mallory also spoke in favor of the AFT report and in the name of shared governance, urged others to support the AFT report.

02/09/15-25 Chair Campbell moved to extend adjournment of the meeting to 5:40pm. The motion was seconded and passed by voice.

02/09/15-26 Burbules (EDUC) moved to divide the motion into two parts having one vote on the issue of the civility statement and one vote on remanding the Salaita case to the College of LAS. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Senate members questioned if the motion could be divided.

02/09/15-27 Burbules withdrew his motion to divide.

Burbules (EDUC) felt remanding this case to LAS was not appropriate and may only inflame the campus.

02/09/15-28 Graber (AHS) moved the previous question. By a show of hands, 50 yea/43 nay, the motion to end debate failed to pass by the required two-thirds vote. Discussion continued.

Steinberg (LAS) stated that the resolution is worded that all of the AFT recommendations in the AFT report should be support and urged colleagues to support the AFT report and resolution.

Finkin, an AFT member, wanted to note that Salaita's life was upended and he should receive recompense. Salaita was not an employee and therefore not entitled to a hearing, but he is entitled to protection of his academic freedom and freedom of political speech. Salaita's academic freedom and political freedom was violated by the BOT based on Salaita's political speech. The report states that Salaita's academic fitness should be remanded to LAS for review to

see if his scholarship was up to the level expected at Illinois and to see if his political utterances also characterize his academic fitness. Finkin felt that remanding the review of Salaita's scholarly fitness was a process that could still have a meaningful effect.

02/09/15-29 Benson (LAW) made a motion to close debate. The motion to close debate was seconded and approved by voice.

02/09/15-30 By a show of hands, 51 yea/41 nay, the motion to approve resolution RS.15.05 passed.

**Adjournment**

In accordance with *Standing Rule 13*, the meeting was adjourned at 5:46pm and will reconvene next Monday, February 16, 2015.

The following agenda items will appear on the agenda of the reconvened meeting on Monday, February 16, 2015.

**Proposals**

RS.15.06 Recommendations about Shared Governance and Academic Freedom

RS.15.07 Concerns about Shared Governance and Academic Freedom

**Reports**

EP.15.39 Administrative Approvals – January 26, 2015

EP.15.40 Administrative Approvals – February 2, 2015

HE.15.04 FAC/IBHE Report – December 12, 2014

HE.15.05 FAC/IBHE Report – January 16, 2015

SC.15.07 BOT Observer Report – January 15, 2015

SC.15.08 Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Report

UC.15.05 USC Report – December 12, 2014

UC.15.06 USC Report – January 22, 2015

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

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



**Minutes**  
**Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting**  
February 16, 2015

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

**Senate Executive Committee Report**

Kim Graber (AHS), faculty senator and Vice Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) welcomed everyone. Vice Chair Graber stated that in this time of disagreement respect should be given to each other on the floor and everyone should have a chance to speak.

02/16/15-01 Tellers for the meeting were faculty senators Gay Miller (VMED) and John Hart (ENGR), and student senator Kendall Hellman (AHS).

**Chancellor's Remarks**

Provost Ilesanmi Adesida thanked everyone for the participation and positive response in approving the College of Medicine proposal at the February 16 Senate meeting.

**Questions/Discussion**

None

**Proposals**

02/16/15-02 RS.15.06 Recommendations about Shared Governance and Academic Freedom

Faculty senator McCall (LAS) noted that resolution RS.15.06 is a forward looking resolution that aims to prevent a case similar to the Salaita case. Administration made decisions that were not made in the usual manor. Recommendation 1 is to clarify Provost Communications #2, #3, and #9 on the authority of the President, Chancellor, and Provost in hiring decisions.

Recommendation 2 is to have the provost's office develop explicit procedures for consultation with unit administrators, and with relevant faculty committees, to be followed during reviews by the Chancellor. These procedures should be reviewed by relevant campus governance bodies. Recommendation 3 is to review the *Statutes* and *General Rules* to ensure that they are clear on academic freedom and freedom of speech.

02/16/15-03 Faculty senator McCall moved approval of RS.15.06, and Faculty senator Burbules seconded the motion. Discussion followed.

02/16/15-04 Faculty senator LeRoy (LER) made a motion to amend the resolution by striking the last sentence of paragraph one: "The Senate is equally concerned about the potential for threats to academic freedom created by public statements made by the administration during this time." And replacing the last sentence with the following text: "The Senate also reaffirms its commitment to academic freedom, including controversial ideas or positions within legitimate scholarly debates."

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Faculty senator McCall added that this resolution is in place of a previous resolution (RS.15.04) that was postponed last semester. That resolution (RS.15.04) was withdrawn and replaced by RS.15.06. Faculty senator McCall urged against approval of the amendment.

02/16/15-05 By voice, the amendment failed.

02/16/15-06 Faculty senator Ribot (LAS) made a motion to amend the resolution by adding the following text at the end of paragraph two of Recommendation 2: "Prior to finalization of any decision

such a detailed statement should be made public, debated in an open forum, and presented to the Senate for approval.” The amendment was seconded, and discussion followed.

- 02/16/15-07 Faculty senator Burbules (EDUC) made a motion to amend the amendment by substituting the word “review” for “approval” at the end of the sentence and also striking the phrase “debated in an open forum”. The motion to amend the amendment was seconded and discussion followed.

With proposed text in brackets and proposed deleted language struck through, the amended amendment would read:

“Prior to finalization of any decision such a detailed statement should be made public, ~~debated in an open forum,~~ and presented to the Senate for approval [review].”

- 02/16/15-08 Hearing no objections the amendment to the amendment was approved by unanimous consent.

- 02/16/15-09 By voice, the amended amendment failed.

Faculty senator Burbules clarified that the committee would be created as an *ad hoc* one-time committee.

Faculty senator Steinberg (LAS) questioned the lack of an action item for SC.15.08: Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Report. Vice Chair Graber responded that the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Report would be a discussion item at the March 9 Senate meeting.

- 02/16/15-10 Faculty senator Sanders (LAS) moved the following amendment. In Recommendation 3, the phrase “in accord with the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as well as” should be inserted after “...the language in which they are expressed, are clear, consistent, and”. The word “other” should be inserted after the phrase “informed by”. With the proposed text in brackets, Recommendation 3 would read:

The *Statutes* and *General Rules* should be reviewed by a university-wide committee to ensure that our policies on academic freedom and extramural speech, and the language in which they are expressed, are clear, consistent, and [in accord with the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as well as] informed by [other] relevant AAUP policy statements on the subject.

- 02/16/15-11 The amendment was seconded and discussion followed.

- 02/16/15-12 By voice, the amendment passed.

SEC member Tolliver noted that *Statutes* and *General Rules* are not campus documents. Anyone offering amendments to the Statutes and/or General Rules, must to go through all three campus Senates via the University Senates Conference (USC).

- 02/16/15-13 Faculty senator Sanders (LAS) moved the following amendment. In the last sentence of paragraph three, strike the phrase “In the absence of such allegations,” capitalize the “I” in “Lack”, and insert the word “itself” after the word “civility”.

With proposed text in brackets and proposed deleted language struck through, the amendment would read:

~~In the absence of such allegations,~~ Lack of civility [itself] should not be considered legitimate grounds for dismissal of a faculty member.

- 02/16/15-14 The motion was seconded and hearing no objections, the motion to amend the proposal was approved.
- 02/16/15-15 Faculty senator Steinberg (LAS) moved the following amendment. Insert the text “, with representatives of each campus’s Academic Freedom and Tenure Committees,” after “The Statutes and General Rules should be reviewed by a university wide committee”.
- With proposed text in brackets, the amendment would read:  
RECOMMENDATION 3: The *Statutes* and *General Rules* should be reviewed by a university-wide committee, [with representatives of each campus’s Academic Freedom and Tenure Committees,] to ensure that our policies on academic freedom and extramural speech, and the language in which they are expressed, are clear, consistent, and in accord with the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as well as informed by other, relevant AAUP policy statements on the subject.
- 02/16/15-16 The motion to amend was seconded and approved.
- 02/16/15-17 The amended proposal RS.15.06 was approved by a show of hands 60 yea/24 nay.
- 02/16/15-18 Student senator Seymour (GRAD) called for a quorum count and it was determined that a quorum was no longer present.
- 02/16/15-19 Vice Chair Graber (AHS) made a motion to postpone any remaining business until the regularly schedule Senate meeting on March 9, 2015. The motion was seconded and discussion followed.
- 02/16/15-20 The motion passed and all unfinished business will be postponed until the March 9, 2015 regularly scheduled Senate meeting.

### **Adjournment**

Due to the lack of quorum, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

The following agenda items will appear on the agenda of the regular Senate meeting on Monday, March 9, 2015.

### **Proposals**

RS.15.07 Concerns about Shared Governance and Academic Freedom

### **Reports**

EP.15.39 Administrative Approvals – January 26, 2015  
 EP.15.40 Administrative Approvals – February 2, 2015  
 HE.15.04 FAC/IBHE Report – December 12, 2014  
 HE.15.05 FAC/IBHE Report – January 16, 2015  
 SC.15.07 BOT Observer Report – January 15, 2015  
 SC.15.08 Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Report  
 UC.15.05 USC Report – December 12, 2014  
 UC.15.06 USC Report – January 22, 2015

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

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



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE  
Prefiled Resolution

RS.15.07      **Concerns about Shared Governance and Academic Freedom**

The Academic Senate of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign expresses very serious concerns about significant violations of the principles and best practices of shared governance in the decision to reject the recommendation to appoint Dr. Salaita to a tenured position in American Indian Studies. The Senate is equally concerned about the potential for threats to academic freedom created by some of the public statements from Chancellor Wise, President Easter, and the Board of Trustees, as set out in the “Report on the Investigation into the Matter of Steven Salaita” prepared by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT). Finally, the Senate is concerned about damage done to our campus by external responses to this decision, including statements of condemnation from various professional societies, boycotts by numerous scholars, and possible censure by the American Association of University Professors.

In expressing these concerns, the Senate takes no position on the merits of any legal claims made by Dr. Salaita in his recently filed lawsuit against various administrators of and donors to the university. The concerns expressed herein regarding shared governance and academic freedom as they relate to administrators and current faculty are entirely independent of any questions regarding the legal authority for, or permissibility of, the actions taken by the Chancellor, President, or Board of Trustees in Dr. Salaita’s case.

The initial recommendation to appoint Dr. Salaita was thoroughly reviewed and approved by his proposed home unit, the college-level promotion and tenure committee, and a campus committee that included the chair of the campus committee on promotion and tenure, the dean of the graduate college, the vice chancellor for research, the Provost, and the Chancellor.

Then, in July 2014, the Chancellor became informed about a series of controversial comments on Twitter by Dr. Salaita (reproduced in part in the CAFT report), many posted after these original recommendations were made. At a subsequent meeting with the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor came to believe that the President and the Board would not approve the proposed hire that she had previously approved. In her Aug. 1, 2014 letter to Dr. Salaita she informed him of her decision not to forward the recommendation to the Board of Trustees. According to the CAFT report and the Chancellor’s public statements, this decision was taken without consulting any authorized faculty review committees, the relevant academic officials in American Indian Studies, the Office of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS), or the Provost. This lack of consultation was inconsistent with both Illinois’ tradition of shared governance and the longstanding guidelines of the American Association of University Professors.

As the AAUP “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” clarifies, the primary responsibility for appointments, the granting of tenure, and dismissal lies with the university’s faculty, and administrators should act in opposition to faculty recommendations in these and other areas of its purview only “in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail” (<http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>). The Senate reaffirms its commitment to these central principles of shared governance as they relate to faculty hiring practices at the University of Illinois.

Without discussing the reasons for her decision with the LAS dean or the director of AIS, the Chancellor issued a public statement on Aug. 22, 2014, asserting that her rejection of the recommendation to hire Dr. Salaita was based upon concerns, raised by his controversial Twitter comments, that students holding opposing views might not feel free to express those views or might not be treated respectfully in his classroom (Mass email to campus, Aug. 22, 2014, reproduced in <http://illinois.edu/blog/view/1109/115906>).

In justifying that view, Chancellor Wise made the following statement:

What we cannot and will not tolerate at the University of Illinois are personal and disrespectful words or actions that demean and abuse either viewpoints themselves or those who express them. We have a particular duty to our students to ensure that they live in a community of scholarship that challenges their assumptions about the world but that also respects their rights as individuals.

The Board of Trustees, joined by President Easter and other university officials, echoed the Chancellor's rationale in a subsequent massmail sent on the same date. Like the Chancellor, they invoked norms of civility in explaining their reasons for not accepting the hiring recommendation:

The University of Illinois must shape men and women who will contribute as citizens in a diverse and multicultural democracy. To succeed in this mission, we must constantly reinforce our expectation of a university community that values civility as much as scholarship. Disrespectful and demeaning speech that promotes malice is not an acceptable form of civil argument...There can be no place for that in our democracy, and therefore, there will be no place for it in our university.

(<https://www.uillinois.edu/cms/One.aspx?portalId=1324&pageId=136970>)

The Chancellor has asserted that she never intended her statement on civility to be interpreted as policy. However, because such sweeping claims do not distinguish between prospective hires and current employees, or between extramural and professional contexts, they are at odds with the AAUP's statement that when University professors "speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline" (1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure; <http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure>).

The Academic Senate therefore rejects as unacceptably broad the claim that the University of Illinois "cannot and will not tolerate ... disrespectful words or actions that demean or abuse either viewpoints themselves or those who express them" and the notion that the university should value "civility as much as scholarship." The Senate believes that these statements should be corrected or clarified to reassure faculty that a lack of civility itself is not a basis for a decision to discipline or dismiss a faculty member.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ben McCall  
Kirk Sanders

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

EP.15.39 Report of Administrative Approvals through the January 26, 2015 meeting of the EPC.

**Graduate Programs**

**Master of Accounting Science (MAS)** – Require ACCY 517 (4 credit hours), Financial Statement Analysis, instead of ACCY 511 (4 credit hours), Risk Measurement/Reporting I.

**Undergraduate Programs**

**LAS—BS in Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering** – CHBE 121 (1 credit hour) — Revise footnote in Academic Catalog listing to state “For students entering the curriculum after the freshman year, 1 additional hr of credit from the list of approved engineering technical electives may be substituted in place of CHBE 121” to provide clarity so all students know they must complete 129 total hours for the major.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
Gay Miller, Chair





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

EP.15.40 Report of Administrative Approvals at the February 2, 2015 meeting of the EPC

**Graduate Programs**

**Master of Science in Bioinformatics-Animal Sciences Concentration** – Addition of a required comprehensive examination.

**Master of Science and Ph.D. in Animal Sciences** – Naming specific course (ANSC 590) required for Graduate Seminar in the Academic Catalog (previous wording just said “Graduate seminar enrollment is required every semester...”; updated wording to state “Graduate seminar (ANSC 590) enrollment is required every semester.”

**Ph.D. in Animal Sciences** – Naming specific course (ANSC 590) required for Graduate Seminar in the Academic Catalog (previous wording just said “Graduate seminar enrollment is required every semester...”; updated wording to state “Graduate seminar (ANSC 590) enrollment is required every semester.”

**Undergraduate Programs**

**FAA – Bachelor of Music Education** – Revision of General Education requirements for BME students to eliminate the Public Speaking requirement and remove specification that one course in the 6 hours of Humanities and the Arts must be outside the School of Music (see grid below; proposed revisions are in *italics*). These proposed revisions have been endorsed by the Council on Teacher Education.

<b>Current BME Gen Ed Requirements</b>	<b>Proposed BME Gen Ed Requirements</b>
Composition I	Composition I
Advanced Composition	Advanced Composition
<i>Public Speaking</i>	
<i>Humanities &amp; the Arts – 6 hours, one course must be outside the School of Music</i>	<i>Humanities &amp; the Arts – 6 hours</i>
Cultural Studies – 6 hours	Cultural Studies – 6 hours
Natural Science & Technology – 6 hours	Natural Science & Technology – 6 hours
Social & Behavioral Science – 3-4 hours	Social & Behavioral Science – 3-4 hours
PSYC 100	PSYC 100
Quantitative Reasoning I and II – 6-9 hours	Quantitative Reasoning I and II – 6-9 hours
Foreign language	Foreign language

**FAA – Minor in Theatre** – Add THEA 410, Dramaturgs Workshop, and THEA 452, Principles of Arts Management, to the list of elective options for the Minor in Theatre.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
Gay Miller, Chair



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

HE.15.04      Report on the December 12, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE

The [Faculty Advisory Council \(FAC\)](#) of the [Illinois Board of Higher Education \(IBHE\)](#) held a regularly scheduled meeting at the facilities of the Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB) in Springfield. The meeting was hosted by the IBHE staff.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM with introductions of those present. Mr. Roger L. Eddy, IASB Executive Director and former State Representative welcomed the group to his facility.

Aminmansour reported on an extensive conversation he had with Dr. James Applegate, the IBHE Executive Director.

Dr. Applegate gave a presentation on Guided Pathways to Success (GPS) and its potentials on how it can help students with challenges complete their college education. He referred to the Public Agenda for College and Career Success (2009) and the “60 by 2025” goal. He reported that college attainment levels have gone up by about 2%. However, he added, affordability has dropped. Applegate expressed concern over the widening gap in college attendance for underrepresented group of students. He stated that there needs to be an aggressive effort to increase adult students’ college completion. He expressed concerns about the fact that about 20% of the workforce has some college education, but no credentials.

Dr. Applegate also spoke about Complete College America’s GPS game changing strategies for states and colleges. They include performance-based funding based on completion rather than enrollment; co-requisite remediation; increased state funding; and the concept of “15 to finish,” which emphasizes 15 credits per semester for improved college completion. Applegate pointed out that he is trying to establish a higher education caucus of stakeholders including legislators, to push higher education issues at the state level.

Dr. Alan Phillips, IBHE Executive Deputy Director for planning and budgeting, offered the Council an update on the prospects of state funding for higher education. He stated that State appropriations to SURS are now about the same as total funding for public universities and community colleges. Phillips added that a 10-15% budget reduction for higher education is a very real possibility for the upcoming fiscal year. He added that a rescission during the remainder of FY 15 is also a real possibility.

David Tretter, President of the Federation of Illinois Private and Independent Colleges and Universities addressed the Council and offered his take on the State’s appropriation situation noting that there is much

uncertainty in the future. He added that we, as the higher education community, need to make the case to the State for higher education issues including funding.

The three caucuses of the Council (four year public universities; community colleges and private/independent institutions) met separately and reported back to the Council. Topics discussed by the caucuses included shared governance; academic freedom; impact of the State's decreasing funding for higher education; MAP funding; hiring retired faculty and GPS.

Dr. Jennifer Delaney, a faculty member from UIUC College of Education and recent IBHE Faculty Fellow, gave a presentation on her research as an IBHE Faculty Fellow on the impacts of guaranteed tuition policies. She reported that it appears that the practice front-loads tuition. Professor Delaney reported that guaranteed tuition practices lead to tuition costs of about 24% higher over the four years.

In the Business portion of the meeting, the minutes of the November 21 FAC meeting at Oakton were approved. The Council approved a statement on shared governance to be publicized.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM. The next FAC meeting is scheduled for January 16, 2015 at the Illinois Institute of Technology.

This report is prepared based on the draft minutes of the FAC meeting minutes prepared by the FAC Secretary, Professor Steve Rock of Western Illinois University (WIU). Much credit is owed to him.

Respectfully submitted  
Abbas Aminmansour

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

HE.15.04          Report on the January 16, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE

The [Faculty Advisory Council \(FAC\)](#) of the [Illinois Board of Higher Education \(IBHE\)](#) held a regularly scheduled meeting at the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) with 34 members present.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM with introductions of those present. Professor Russell Betts, Dean of the Illinois Tech College of Science welcomed the Council to his campus. He reported that enrollment is up at IIT, but deferred maintenance is an issue. He added that IIT's admission is highly competitive and their programs are very rigorous. He felt that this situation may disadvantage local area students. However, he added that IIT has received an NSF grant which will target middle school teachers to improve this situation

The three caucuses of the Council (four year public universities; community colleges and private/independent institutions) met separately and reported back to the Council. Topics discussed by the caucuses included President Obama and the City of Chicago's community initiatives for free college; Governor Rauner's Executive Order on non-essential expenses and what it means for higher education institutions; PARCC; Common Core; decline in enrollment at some community colleges; professional development and student financial aid.

Eric Zarnikow, Executive Director of the Illinois Student Assistance Commission (ISAC) addressed the Council. He reported on recent legislation affecting ISAC. He added that 24 states are interested in "pay it forward" plan which offers students free tuition like a loan and expects students to pay back the loan as a percentage of their income with a certain number of loans forgiven. Zarnikow also spoke about an advisory committee mandated by legislation to offer recommendations on MAP funding. It recommended that if an institution's completion rate drops below 80%, that their completion must improve by 5% and to reduce achievement gaps by income levels by 25%. He added that the recommendations will be implemented through ISAC rules.

Zarnikow spoke about college affordability and added that cost of higher education has gone up considerably more than family income has which has led to higher student debts. He noted that despite speculations, college education is still well worth the cost and offered statistics on higher income for people with post-secondary education.

In the Business portion of the meeting, the minutes of the December 12, 2014 FAC meeting in Springfield were approved. The Council also discussed topics to discuss at its meeting with the Board in April.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 PM. The next FAC meeting is scheduled for February 20, 2015 at Robert Morris University.

This report is prepared based on the draft minutes of the FAC meeting minutes prepared by the FAC Secretary, Professor Steve Rock of Western Illinois University (WIU). Much credit is owed to him.

Respectfully submitted  
Abbas Aminmansour



**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**  
**URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**  
Urbana Senate Observer  
(Final; Information)

**SC.15.07** Report on the January 15, 2015 meeting of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois at the Chicago campus

Mr. Edward McMillan convened the meeting of Wolcott, Wood and Taylor with Board Secretary Susan Kies calling the Roll.

The BOT entered Executive Session.

Open Session resumed following the Executive Session.

Mr. McMillan introduced Ms. Mary Gale Tan who sang the State song Illinois accompanied on the piano by Ms. Marlena Keller, IUC.

President Easter introduced various participants at today's BOT meeting.

Mr. McMillan welcomed new President Killeen.

Mr. McMillan recognized the January meeting as the annual meeting which means certain activities occur at only this meeting, including electing BOT officers.

Mr. Edward McMillan was elected to Chair the BOT. He continued to chair the meeting.

Mr. Jim Montgomery was elected to the BOT Executive Committee.

Ms. Karen Hasara was elected to the BOT Executive Committee.

Susan Kies, Walter Knorr, Lester McKeever, and Thomas Bearrows were re-elected into their positions of Board of Trustees Secretary, Comptroller, Treasurer, and University Counsel respectively.

UIC Interim Chancellor and Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost Gislason welcomed BOT members and meeting attendees to the UIC campus. Chancellor Gislason shared information about awards and grants received by UIC.

Vice President Walter Knorr gave a financial report, highlighting the Legislative Audit Commission accepting the 2013 Audit; IBHE cautions public universities to plan for probable budget reductions in FY 2015 and 2016; the State legislature has taken no action on the income tax extension and it has lapsed; Sangamon County Court ruled that the pension changes were unconstitutional. The Governor will make his budget address on Feb 18, 2015. Seeing the end of stimulus grants. We had a successful NSF grant audit and so no dollars to recover. Nominal increases in NSF and NIH funding anticipated. Continue to adjust to the Affordable Care Act. Substantial drop off in the last 10 years of Department of Defense grant funding. So we anticipate that grant funding will be even more competitive. Anticipated \$4-5 billion loss from the loss of the tax revenue. State backlog of bills has increased and is estimated at \$6.5 billion. We have seen reduced Medicare reimbursement rates. SURS unfunded liability exceeds \$20

billion estimated at June 30, 2014. U of I share of estimated unfunded pension obligation for SURS is estimated at \$8.2 billion. As of Jan 5, 2015, the State of Illinois owes the University of Illinois \$357 million. In 2015, current revenues are estimates as Tuition of \$1,098 million and General Tax Funds \$643 million. Deferred maintenance continues to be a major concern, and hovers near \$1.7 billion. University Federal Grants and Contracts for FY2014 just over \$675 million.

Chairman McMillan called for Committee reports:

BOT committee reports:

- Chairman and Trustee McMillan: Presented the items handled by the Audit, Budget, Finance and Facilities Committee.
- Trustee Hasara: Academic and Student Affairs Committee.
  - Vice President, Christophe Pierre shared:
    - Tuition – no increase in base rate of undergraduate tuition for 2015-16 academic year. Inflation related increases for graduate, professional and non-resident students and for fees.
    - So this means that for Urbana, the base rate is \$12,036, plus student fees of 3,018 (\$34 increase – 1.1%). Health insurance fee of \$582. So total is \$15,636 for tuition and fees.
    - First zero% increase in tuition in more than 20 years at UI. Follows two years of consecutive increases of 1.7% which were themselves the lowest tuition rate increases in nearly two decades.
    - Comment from Trustee Koritz – by state law, our tuition is guaranteed for the 4 years while a student is here; that is different than for most other competing institutions. This makes UI more competitive because it helps families plan a budget.
    - Comment from Trustee Estrada – this information makes us need to work harder with our State legislature to make sure they understand the value of UI education.
  - Trustee Hasara: Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Trustee Hasara gave the basics of items 4-16 on the BOT agenda, plus highlights of some presentations given to the ASAC meeting including how academic and the combatting of sexual violence.
- Trustee Koritz: University Healthcare Systems Committee. Addressing nursing shortage will be a collaboration between UI- Chicago and UI-Springfield. Safety standards falling short causing a decrease in Medicare payments of 1-2% which is substantial. UI-Chicago hospital has made substantial improvements in areas such as decreased central-line infections in patients. Trying to limit UI financial risks associated with the UI hospital.
  - Comment from Chancellor Koch at Springfield about the new nursing school collaborations. This is very important because health care is now the number one employer in Springfield now. Illinois students now have a new opportunity to earn a degree.
  - Question from Trustee Montgomery – how to mitigate Medicare losses? Dr. Jerry Bauman responded that they anticipate increased funding this spring. These payments will have to come from the State of Illinois and also from the Affordable Care Act.



Public Comment was received from:

Angelica Alfaro:

- She is excited to be a part of improving the relationships with the Latino/a populations of Chicago and UI. She attended Nobel Elementary school in Chicago, a part of the Chicago public schools system. She also attended and is a UI graduate. Currently there are over 500 Nobel students attending UI. The Pritzker Foundation and The Pritzker Traubert Family Foundation have provided \$3 million in scholarship endowments. They are funding \$12,000 per student annually for four years, and asking the state to match their scholarships. They have relationships with many universities and colleges in the State committed to the work, and they look forward to developing more fully UI relationships.

The BOT approved by voice vote the BOT regular agenda items 01 through 16. All passed with no discussion and no dissenting and no abstention votes.

The BOT approved the BOT roll call agenda items 17 through 25. All passed by roll call vote with some abstention votes, and with no dissenting votes.

Comments from President Killeen: He was very interested in item 4 of the regular agenda which was "Election of Timothy L. Killeen as Twentieth President, University of Illinois". He is happy to use the word 'We' in relation to the UI. We can succeed and we can be good stewards and wonderful advocates for higher education. We have a chance to reinvent public higher education. He will take all hands on the tiller. He expressed sincere thank you for the BOT confidence in hiring him.

BOT had no old or new business.

The BOT meeting was adjourned at 11:25 am.

Details of the meeting can be found at: <http://www.bot.uillinois.edu/multimedia> and at: <http://www.trustees.uillinois.edu/trustees/agenda/January-15-2015/0000-UIBOT-January-15-2015-meeting-notice.pdf>

The next BOT will be on Thursday, March 12, 2015, in Urbana.

Respectfully yours,

Gay Y. Miller



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE  
University Senates Conference  
(Final; Information)

**UC.15.05** Report on the December 12, 2014 Meeting of the University Senates Conference at the Chicago Campus

The Conference membership list for 2014-15 can be found here:

<http://www.usc.uillinois.edu/membership.cfm>

The agenda for this meeting can be found here:

<http://www.usc.uillinois.edu/documents>

The Conference was joined by Vice-President of Academic Affairs Christophe Pierre, Associate Vice-President for Human Resources Maureen Parks, and Assistant Vice-President for Human Resources Jami Painter

Conference members present: Don Chambers (chair), Shar Fadavi (phone), Sandra DeGroote, Kouros Mohammadian, Jorge Villegas, Xiaoqing Li, George Francis, Kim Graber, Nicholas Burbules, Prasanta Kalita, Roy Campbell, Joyce Tolliver, Sally Jackson (phone), Carol Leff (phone), Catherine Vincent (ex officio as chair of UIC senate)

**MEETING WITH VICE PRESIDENT PIERRE**

Vice President Pierre discussed the transition to the new presidency and the new Board composition. He noted that President-Designate Killeen considers himself a “congenital optimist,” and that he has a steep learning curve, given that our institution is complex, and it is very important that new president understand the workings of University Administration and of the three campuses.

The vice-president told the Conference that Dr. Killeen will be visiting the campuses and the offices of University Administration several times before he takes office officially.

Regarding the budget, Vice President Pierre stated that, in general, the University is in good shape financially, although some areas could be improved, such as fund-raising. His assessment was that in the short term, we will be able to cope with budget reductions. However, we have been asked to model a plan for dealing with a 20% decrease in General Revenue Funds, about \$132 million. At this point, it is not clear how much the budget will have to be cut. The Vice-President also mentioned that there is discussion at the State level of gradually transferring pension costs to the university.

**MEETING WITH ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT PARKS AND ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT PAINTER**

The Conference held an extended discussion with Ms. Parks and Ms. Painter regarding changes to the University’s policies and procedures regarding pre-employment criminal background checks, which will take effect at some point during 2015.

In the context of a nation-wide discussion regarding criminal background checks that was prompted by the recent issues at Penn State, the Office of Human Resources surveyed current practices at peer institutions and concluded that it would be advisable to expand our current practices. Ms. Painter and Ms. Parks co-chair a university working group on background checks.

Currently these policies and procedures are set by each individual campus and by UA for its own employment processes. Currently the University does background checks only for security-sensitive positions; each campus decides which positions are security-sensitive. Each campus also determines for itself how to respond when a background check results in a “positive hit,” that is, a conviction of a misdemeanor or felony crime.

The new policy being considered by the Office of Human Resources would involve implementing background checks for all new hires of faculty members, staff members, and residents. In cases of “findings,” each case would be handled individually. The Office of Human Resources does not anticipate having to hire new staff to deal with new policy.

The Urbana campus already has a committee that reviews the results of background checks for potential hires in security-sensitive positions. This committee currently meets once a month. The Conference emphasized the importance of faculty members being strongly represented in any committee that would review the results of “positive hits” for potential faculty hires.

#### **BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair remarks: Chair Chambers remarked on the multiple transitions the University is undergoing (a new president, a new UIC chancellor and, eventually, a new provost; new Board composition, and new governor.) He proposed two resolutions, thanking outgoing Board members Chris Kennedy and Pamela Strobel for their service.

Statutes revision process (Nicholas Burbules, Chair, USC Statutes and Governance Committee)

Prof. Burbules reported that the UIC senate has now forwarded its advice on all the proposed revisions to the Statutes. The Urbana senate had only discussed the first two of eight groups of revisions, and it was estimated that the Urbana senate would need at least two more meetings to discuss all the proposed revisions and forward its advice.

In preparation for the Feb. 26, 2015 meeting of the Board, the USC Statutes committee plans to meet on Feb. 13 to process the advice it has received by then, for discussion at USC’s next meeting on Feb. 25. That advice will then be reconciled, if necessary, and forwarded to Board. The rest of the senates’ advice will be forwarded when the Urbana senate has forwarded all of its advice on all proposed revisions.

USC White Paper: At its fall retreat, the Conference agreed to compose a white paper expressing its view of shared governance at the University level. The Executive Committee will begin drafting the document, with an eye toward including portions of it in the briefing materials for President-Designate Killeen.

Respectfully submitted by Joyce Tolliver, USC Liaison to the Senate

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**  
**URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**  
University Senates Conference  
(Final; Information)

**UC.15.06** Report on the January 22, 2015 Meeting of the University Senates Conference at via videoconference

The Conference membership list for 2014-15 can be found here:

<http://www.usc.uillinois.edu/membership.cfm>

The agenda for this meeting can be found here:

<http://www.usc.uillinois.edu/documents>

The Conference was joined by President Bob Easter, President-Designate Tim, Killeen, Vice-President of Academic Affairs Christophe Pierre, and Special Assistant to the President Mike Devocelle

**MEETING WITH PRESIDENT EASTER, PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE KILLEEN, AND VICE PRESIDENT PIERRE**

President-Designate Killeen expressed to the Conference his gratitude for the ease of the transition toward the new presidency and commented on the many hours he had spent speaking with President Easter and many other members of the University community and other key groups, such as state legislators. He noted in these conversations a “deep loyalty” to the University of Illinois, and said that members of the University must convert that loyalty to institutional shared visions and to narratives of opportunity. An important part of that shared vision, according to Dr. Killeen, will depend upon an examination of the land grant mission in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Such an exercise would begin, he said, with an inclusive “visioning” exercise to generate a University-wide strategic plan. Such a plan would, he said, be focused on the goal of being “best in breed”—not changing individual campus directions, but rather considering how synergies among campuses might improve each campus. He stated that he expected such a process to be initiated by the Board of Trustees and to last about 10 months process.

Dr. Killeen emphasized the importance of avoiding “fear-based” decision making, of getting into the habit of using the word “and” more than the word “but,” and of avoiding false dichotomies.

Conference members reminded Dr. Killeen that an important part of the strategic plan would be an examination of the role of University Administration; and careful thinking about how to make a University of Illinois education more accessible while maintaining our standards of excellence. It was also pointed out that we should be mindful of the gap between the initial excitement about the exercise itself and the decreased energy that might accompany the implementation phase.

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

Proposed revisions to the *General Rules*: The Conference approved a motion from Nicholas Burbules, Chair of the USC Statutes and Governance Committee that the proposed revisions to the Intellectual Property sections of the General Rules be forwarded to all three senates, given that the UIC and UIS senates have forwarded their advice on all the proposed revisions of the Statutes. A second motion, that the Conference propose that the entire section on Intellectual Property be moved from the General Rules to the Statutes, was also discussed and approved unanimously by the Conference.

Campus update from UIS: Each academic unit at UIS is now tracking its productivity through a standardized “dashboard.” UIS Senate chair Jorge Villegas reported that there is great concern at UIS about the state of the budget, particularly because UIS depends more on state funding than the other two campuses do. Dr. Villegas also reported that the tenure-system faculty will soon have a union.

Campus update from UIC: The newly appointed Chancellor, Michael Amiridis, will assume his post in March. In the meantime, Interim Provost Eric Gislason is also acting as Interim Chancellor. The campus had just begun the search for a permanent provost, and had also initiated a search for a new Vice-Chancellor of Health Affairs.

Respectfully submitted by Joyce Tolliver, USC Liaison to the Senate

**OFFICE OF THE PROVOST  
AND VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**HIRING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REVIEW COMMITTEE**

FINAL REPORT

December 12, 2014



**ILLINOIS**  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	COMMITTEE CHARGE.....	3
II.	COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.....	3
III.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
IV.	COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND PROCESS .....	5
V.	GUIDING PRINCIPLES .....	5
VI.	ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT HIRING PROCEDURES .....	8
VII.	FINDINGS .....	12
VIII.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17



## I. COMMITTEE CHARGE

The committee, which was jointly charged by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Professor Ilesanmi Adesida, and the Chair of the Academic Senate, Professor Roy Campbell, was asked “to review policies and processes for faculty hiring on the Urbana-Champaign campus, including a review of pertinent sections of the University Statutes and related policies and processes” and to submit findings and any recommendations for changes or clarifications in the faculty hiring process. The committee focused on hiring processes for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

## II. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Professor Eric Johnson, Law, *Chair*

Professor Amy Ando, Agricultural and Consumer Economics

Professor Dorothy Espelage, Educational Psychology

Professor Edward Feser, Dean, College of Fine and Applied Arts

Professor Charles Gammie, Physics and Astronomy

Professor Jean-Philippe Mathy, Director, School of Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics

Professor Michael Rothberg, Head, English

Associate Director Sandy Jones, Academic Human Resources

Associate Provost Katherine Galvin, *Ex-Officio*

## III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Charged with reviewing and making recommendations regarding faculty hiring policies and procedures at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the committee first identified the principles that ought to guide faculty hiring and against which policies and procedures should be measured. The four guiding principles that must form the foundation for all faculty hiring policies and procedures are:

- **Effective review:** Policies and procedures should ensure that the university hires tenured and tenure-track faculty who are well qualified for their positions.
- **Competitiveness:** Hiring policies and procedures should enable the campus to compete successfully with other universities to attract top candidates.
- **Responsibility:** The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign should strive for responsible and principled behavior in hiring, not just to act narrowly within the law.
- **Shared Governance:** Hiring processes at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign should adhere to the principles of shared governance as they are articulated in relevant university policies and *Statutes*.

The committee finds that these principles, to a large degree, are reflected in the current faculty hiring practices followed on the Urbana campus. In particular, the current hiring

practices rely on judgment of the department faculty and administrators who have the level of expertise necessary to thoroughly evaluate candidates' qualifications. Additionally, a key strength in the existing policies and practices is that all tenured or tenure-track faculty appointments are subjected to a second level review. This second level scrutiny is conducted by the deans or, in some cases, the provost.

Although the University *Statutes* indicate that final approval authority for academic appointments resides in the board of trustees, in practice the board has not engaged in substantive review of faculty qualifications. Rather, the board has relied upon the substantive reviews conducted by faculty within the academic unit, second level review by the college or provost, and tenure reviews by the campus off-cycle tenure committee. Through this practice of relying upon the academic and professional judgment of the faculty and faculty administrators, the board has successfully exercised its authority over faculty appointments. Specifically, the board has ongoing oversight of the performance of the chancellor, provost and deans through its power to appoint and reappoint those high-level campus administrators. The success of this longstanding appointment process is seen in the world-class faculty that the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has been able to attract.

Although the hiring practices rely upon this effective delegation of substantive reviews to the campus, the formal hiring policy set forth in the University *Statutes* states that the board has final approval of tenured and tenure track faculty appointments. Until very recently, the board exercised this authority through a single board item that **confirmed** all academic appointments **approved** by the campus (including those with administrative appointments below the level of dean). This practice honors the board's role as a policy maker, is consistent with the board's schedule of meeting every two months, and most importantly, defers to and relies upon the academic judgment of the faculty and faculty administrators. If the board were to conduct substantive reviews of candidates' qualifications, such a change in our process would be fundamentally incompatible with the board's deliberative, policy-formulating role and the competitiveness of the campus would be seriously damaged. Competitiveness would be damaged because of substantial delays in the hiring process, loss of faculty candidates' trust and confidence in offers extended by the campus, and competitor universities having more nimble hiring practices. Most fundamentally, such a process would be contrary to the commitment to shared governance and to having hiring processes that are responsible and fair to faculty candidates.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the committee finds that the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's goal of attracting the very best faculty would be best served by amending the

formal hiring policies to align them with the current and historical hiring practices followed by the Urbana campus. Specifically, the committee makes the following three recommendations:

- **Recommendation No. 1:** The board should continue its oversight of faculty hiring through the review and approval of all faculty administrative appointments at the level of deans and above.
- **Recommendation 2:** The board of trustees should formally delegate its responsibility for tenured and tenure-track academic appointments that do not involve administrative positions at the level of deans and above to the president, who in turn should continue the existing policy of delegating to the chancellor and provost.
- **Recommendation 3:** The campus should review its procedures for off-cycle tenure review to ensure that those processes continue to operate both rigorously and expeditiously.

#### IV. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND PROCESS

The committee met seven times between October 14, 2014 and December 5, 2014. As part of its review, the committee examined the following policies:

- University of Illinois *Statutes*
- The General Rules Concerning University Organization and Procedure
- Provost Communication No. 2, Offering Academic Appointments
- Provost Communication No. 3, Appointments of Faculty and Academic Professionals

Additionally, the committee reviewed the policies and procedures for faculty appointments at peer institutions. The committee submitted its final report to Provost Adesida and Professor Roy Campbell, Chair of the Academic Senate, on December 12, 2014.

#### V. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The committee began its work by outlining core principles that it believes should underpin the university's hiring policies and procedures. Collectively these principles served as a standard against which the committee evaluated current policies and procedures and identified recommendations for changes.

**Effective review: Policies and procedures should ensure that the university hires tenured and tenure-track faculty who are well qualified for their positions.**

Sufficient review must be carried out by qualified people to ensure that candidates are carefully and appropriately screened. The University *Statutes* describe the appropriate criteria to be used in such a process: “The basic criteria for employment and promotion of all university staff... shall be appropriate qualifications for and performance of the specified duties” (University *Statutes*, Article IX, Section 1). “Appointments shall be made solely on the basis of the special fitness of the individual for the work demanded in the position” (*Statutes* article IX, Section 3b).

**Competitiveness: Hiring policies and procedures should enable the campus to compete successfully with other universities to attract top candidates.**

In order to compete with other universities, Illinois must be able to move deliberately but promptly when a strong candidate is identified. The best candidates are likely to have other offers of employment with pressing deadlines. The duration of candidate uncertainty about whether an offer will translate into an actual job must be minimized, lest Illinois be unable to compete with more nimble universities.

**Responsibility: The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign should strive for responsible and principled behavior in hiring, not just to act narrowly within the law.**

The campus’s hiring policies and procedures should be highly principled and responsible. First, hiring decisions should be free of discrimination and consistent with the campus commitment to diversity. Not only do the law and our *Statutes* provide that “employees are to be selected ... without regard to political affiliation, relationship by blood or marriage, age, sex, race, creed, national origin, handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era” (University *Statutes*, Article IX, Section 1), but the successful achievement of our mission also requires a diverse faculty and staff. Second, hiring decisions should be consistent with principles of academic freedom. Third, hiring processes should ensure that candidates are not required to take costly actions in reliance on a promise of employment that does not represent a final commitment.

**Shared Governance: Hiring processes at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign should adhere to the principles of shared governance as they are articulated in relevant university policies and *Statutes*.**

A defining characteristic of higher education is the principle that governance of universities should be shared between the administration and the faculty. At the University of Illinois, the structure of shared governance is set forth throughout the University *Statutes*, starting in the Preamble where it states:

The educational policy, organization, and governance of the University as delegated by the Board of Trustees are promulgated in these *Statutes*. When acting on such matters, the board relies upon the advice of the university senates transmitted to it by the President of the University. In these matters each senate has a legitimate concern which justifies its participation in the enactment and amendment of the *Statutes*. The Board of Trustees reserves the power to initiate and make changes in the *Statutes*, but before making any change it will seek the advice of the senates.

In discussing the legislative organization of the University and the faculty role in governance, the statutes additionally provide: “As the responsible body in the teaching, research, and scholarly activities of the University, the faculty has inherent interests and rights in academic policy and governance. Each college or other academic unit shall be governed in its internal administration by its faculty . . .” (*Statutes*, Article II, Section 3b). At every level of the University, the *Statutes* require that faculty advisory bodies exist and call upon administrators to consult with faculty regarding matters of educational policy. *See* Article II, Section 1 (creation of campus senates), Article II, Section 2 (creation of University Senates Conference), Article II Section 3 (outlining faculty role in governance); Article II Section 4 (creation of the campus faculty advisory committee); Article III Section 2f (requirement for executive committees to advise deans on formulation and execution of policies); Article III Section 3d (college deans required to consult with faculty); Article III Section 4d(3) (schools required to have advisory committees); Article III, Section 5b (school deans or directors required to consult with faculty); Article IV, Section 1d (chaired departments required to have executive committees); and Article IV, Sections 3b & 3d (department heads required to consult with faculty). In affirming this principle, Provost Communication No. 27 asserts: “In a shared governance system, decisions are made through a process that rests upon collegial and collaborative consultation.” Such principles of faculty responsibility and collaborative consultation should guide the hiring process.

## VI. ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT HIRING PROCEDURES

Current hiring procedures for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign are established by the University *Statutes* (particularly Article IX, Section 3d) and by two provost communications: Provost Communication No. 2, which addresses the subject of “Offering Academic Positions,” and Provost Communication No. 3, which addresses the subject of “Appointments of Faculty and Academic Professionals.” All three documents contemplate a regular, sequential hiring process that usually begins with a recommendation by the department and ends with formal approval by the board of trustees.

**Origin in department/first level of review.** The first step in the hiring process ordinarily occurs at the department level. As provided in Article IX, Section 3d of the University *Statutes*, “[r]ecommendations to positions on the academic staff shall ordinarily originate with the department.” Some schools and colleges are not subdivided into departments. In those academic units, the recommendation to a position on the academic staff originates at the school or college level “with the officers in charge of the work concerned” (University *Statutes*, Article IX, Section 3d). In either event, the principle at work is the same: the hiring recommendation ordinarily originates with those faculty members and administrators who, by virtue of their first-hand knowledge of the candidate’s discipline, are best equipped to evaluate his or her qualifications.

**Second level of review.** After originating at the department level, recommendations undergo a second level of review, usually at the college level. As provided in Article III, Section 3d of the University *Statutes*, a department’s recommendation must “be presented to the dean.” After receiving the recommendation, the college dean must first confirm that “intra-departmental consultation procedures have been satisfied” in relation to the appointment, and then must consult with the department in deciding whether to approve or disapprove the appointment. The dean may not delegate responsibility for deciding whether to approve or disapprove the appointment (see Provost Communication No. 3 at p. 3).

When the recommendation originates not in a department but in an undivided college, the recommendation must be transmitted by the dean “to the campus for prior approval by the Provost” (Provost Communication No. 3 at p. 2). That requirement of approval by the provost implements the broader requirement that every academic appointment to a permanent position be approved “at two administrative levels, including the level from which the appointment is proposed” (*Id.*). Where undivided colleges are concerned, the provost is responsible for providing this second “level” of review.

**Additional review for tenured appointments.** Appointments with tenure must undergo additional scrutiny before an offer is extended. According to Provost Communication No. 3, the provost first “solicits comments [on the appointment] from the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Research, Dean of the Graduate College, and the Chair of the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure.” (As a matter of custom, the chancellor also asks an associate chancellor to review the tenure packet and both the associate chancellor and the chancellor vote on the tenure case.) After consulting with this de facto off-cycle promotion and tenure committee, the provost “acts on the case and notifies the unit” (Provost Communication No. 3 at p. 8). In conducting this review, the provost demands “evidence justifying tenure that is comparable to the evidence required internally for the granting of tenure” (*Id.*). The review is described in Provost Communication No. 3 as taking five to ten days but the review can take longer in practice.

**Additional review for appointments to named chairs and professorships.** Appointments to named chairs and professorships also must be approved by the provost before an offer is extended, regardless of whether the appointment is with or without tenure (See Provost Communication No. 6 at 2, 6-7). For these appointments, the provost seeks the advice of the Committee on Endowed Appointments as part of the normal review process. Campus-wide chairs and professorships are awarded by the chancellor upon recommendation of the provost and the Committee on Endowed Appointments.

**Extension of an offer.** After the recommendation for appointment has been approved through the appropriate channels, the dean sends “a letter of invitation” to the candidate (Provost Communication No. 2 at p. 2). That letter of invitation, like all other interactions with the candidate, “must indicate that the final appointment requires Board approval” (*Id.* at p. 4). Specifically, the letter must include “[a] statement that the invitation is contingent upon approval by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois” (*Id.* at p. 6).

**Transmittal to Academic Human Resources.** After the candidate accepts the campus’s offer of employment, the department where the offer originated is responsible for forwarding the candidate’s curriculum vitae to the Office of Academic Human Resources (AHR) “so that office can develop the required Board of Trustees agenda item and biographical sketch, and provide a copy to the Board of Trustees” (Provost Communication No. 2 at p. 4).

In practice, substantial delay often occurs between the candidate’s date of acceptance and the date that the required information is transmitted to AHR. The reason for this delay is that departments are required to secure compliance with a variety of technical conditions related

to employment (for example, that the candidate has completed mandatory ethics training) before forwarding the candidate's information to AHR for payroll application. This information is used to compile a biographical sketch—a short narrative about the candidate—for the board of trustees. Compliance with those technical requirements, although not difficult, often takes considerable time.

**Board of trustees approval.** In accordance with Provost Communication No. 2, AHR develops an “agenda item” for the board of trustees, along with the biographical sketch. The biographical sketch consists of the candidate's name, a description of the position, the salary, the candidate's former position, and the candidate's education. On the basis of the information in the sketch, the board votes on the candidate at a regularly scheduled meeting. Tenure system faculty appointments that do not include high level administrative appointments (deans or above) are submitted to the board as one collective item for review and approval. Until the September 2014 board meeting, the language of the board item for such appointments indicated that “[t]he following new appointments to the faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above, and certain administrative positions, **have been approved since the previous meeting of the Board of Trustees and are now presented for your confirmation**” (emphasis added). Each appointment of an administrator at the level of dean and above, which in most cases is a tenure-track appointment also, is submitted as single board item that is individually reviewed and approved by the board. Approval by the board marks the end of the hiring process.

As for timing, Attachment No. 1 to Provost Communication No. 3 provides that for tenure-track faculty, faculty on Q appointments, and new hires with tenure—excluding administrators at the level of dean and above—“Board approval is required...via a brief biosketch; however, approval is not required prior to the effective date of an appointment...” Attachment No. 1 is a reference document issued from the board of trustees' office in December 2011. As a matter of administrative efficiency in appointment processing, departments transmit to AHR the new tenure system faculty appointment information for each new hire at the time all other contingencies for employment have been met, e.g., federal I-9 confirmation of eligibility to work and state required ethics training. Hence, at the time AHR forwards the biosketch to the board of trustees, the only remaining contingency for permanent appointment is the final board of trustees' approval. In practice, it has become commonplace for the board to approve new hires at the September meeting following the August in which those individuals began work.



**Role of the president.** The statutes specifically provide that “All appointments, reappointments, and promotions of academic staff, as defined in Article IX, Section 4a, shall be made by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the chancellor/vice president concerned and the president.” On the Urbana campus the president has delegated this authority to the chancellor. This delegation is reflected in Provost Communication No. 3, which states that “The President has delegated administrative authority over academic appointments on this campus to the Chancellor . . .”

**Role of the chancellor.** The chancellor usually does not, however, exercise directly the authority delegated to her/him by the president. Rather, as explained in Provost Communication No. 3, the chancellor “has in turn delegated [administrative authority over academic appointments] to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.” The chancellor’s only direct, non-delegated role in routine academic appointments is as a member of the committee that advises the provost on the subject of off-cycle tenure reviews, as explained above. The chancellor is directly responsible, however, for awarding campus-wide chairs and professorships.

**Role of the provost.** Although provost review and approval is required to conduct a search for assistant professor positions, the provost does not review and approve appointment offers to successful assistant professor candidates except when necessary to satisfy the requirement for second-level review. Thus, in cases where provost review is not necessary to satisfy the requirement for second-level review, the provost in effect has delegated his/her authority over appointments at the level of assistant professor to the college deans. In the usual case, then, the provost approves the assistant professor *position*, but not the individual who is appointed to that position.

**Procedures in challenged cases.** The University *Statutes* articulate a procedure for deans to challenge appointment decisions by higher-level administrators. Article III, Section 3d of the University *Statutes* provides that “[i]n case a [hiring] recommendation is not approved by the chancellor/vice president, the dean may present the recommendation to the president and, if not approved by the president, the dean with the consent of the Board of Trustees may present the recommendation in person before the Board of Trustees in session.” As noted above, in practice neither the president nor the chancellor exercises direct authority over appointments; both have delegated their powers to the provost. Therefore, the combination of statutes and campus procedures mean that the effect of the Article III, Section 3d provision is to permit a dean to present a case for hiring directly to the board of trustees, when the board consents, in instances when the provost disapproves a particular appointment.

## VII. FINDINGS

**The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign’s status as one of the world’s premier research universities has been achieved through current hiring practices that rely on the judgment of the department faculty and administrators and the requirement for second level review for all faculty appointments by campus level faculty administrators.**

A primary strength of the existing practices and procedures is their reliance on the judgment of those who are best equipped to evaluate the candidate’s qualifications, namely, faculty and administrators from a candidate’s discipline. Article IX, Section 3d of the University *Statutes* provides that “[r]ecommendations to positions on the academic staff shall ordinarily originate with the department.” That allocation of responsibility is in keeping with the department’s statutory role as “the primary unit of education and administration within the University” (University *Statutes*, Article IV, Section 1a). It also is in keeping with the role of departments as repositories of expertise in “particular field[s] of knowledge” (*Id.*). Those who participate in research and instruction in a particular field of knowledge usually are best equipped to evaluate others in the same field.

Yet it is also a strength of the existing policies and procedures that all appointments are subjected to a second level of review. All tenured and tenure-track hiring decisions have significant long-term financial and scholarly implications for the success of the university as a whole, not just the individual discipline and academic unit. Accordingly, under Provost Communication No. 3, all academic appointments to permanent (i.e., non-visiting) positions “require prior approval at two administrative levels, including the level from which the appointment is proposed.” In the usual course, the required second level of review will be afforded when the department’s recommendation “is presented to the dean of the college for transmission with the dean’s recommendation to the chancellor/vice president” (University *Statutes*, Article IX, Section 3d). In other cases, as where recommendations originate in undivided colleges, schools, or institutes, the second level of review is afforded by the provost (Provost Communication No. 3, at page 3). What is critical in either event is that recommendations from departments are subjected to scrutiny by faculty administrators who, though generally less familiar with the candidate’s particular field of knowledge, are able to bring a broader perspective to the review of the candidate’s qualifications and value to the institution.

In many respects, the campus’s existing procedures are consistent, expeditious, and non-duplicative. Although the University *Statutes* situate responsibility for appointments in the

president and chancellor (see Article IX, Section 3a), both the president and the chancellor have delegated those responsibilities to the provost (Provost Communication No. 3 at page 1). Those delegations have the effect both of eliminating needless duplication of effort and of concentrating ultimate responsibility over appointments in the campus's chief academic officer and its academic deans. They also have the effect of expediting the process leading up to the university's formal offer of appointment, thus helping the university compete effectively with other universities for top candidates.

**The board of trustees plays a foundational and critically important, albeit indirect, role in current hiring practices through its appointment and oversight of campus-level administrators.**

The campus's hiring practices are strengthened by the oversight of the board of trustees. The most direct and effective way that the board ensures the excellence of the faculty hired is through its appointment and oversight of campus faculty administrators who conduct the substantive review of faculty appointments. Through its review and approval of the appointments to key campus administrative positions (e.g., chancellor, provost, deans), the board has ensured that the right leadership is in place to build and maintain a first class faculty. Specifically, the board is responsible for the appointment (and annual reappointment) of the chancellors and provosts. On the Urbana campus, the provost is in turn responsible both for conducting reviews of all tenured appointments and for conducting "second-level" reviews of some tenure-track appointments (University *Statutes*, Article III, Section 1g). The board also is responsible for the appointment (and annual reappointment) of college deans, each of whom is responsible for reviewing all appointments to his or her college's faculty (University *Statutes*, Article III, Section 3b).

In appointing high quality administrators and delegating carefully, the board of trustees exercises its authority over appointments very effectively, albeit somewhat indirectly. Indeed, current review procedures and approval processes are robust. Even at the level of assistant professor, an offer of employment is extended only after the candidate's qualifications have been subjected to at least two levels of review—usually by the department and then by the college. For tenured positions, the review that precedes the offer is even more searching. After the college dean approves an appointment with tenure, the provost "solicits comments from the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Research, the Dean of the Graduate College, and the Chair of the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure" (Provost Communication No. 3 at p. 8). The provost then relies on the guidance received in deciding whether to approve the proposed offer. Deans of colleges typically review the entire

tenure dossier in making a tenure recommendation. The provost's review of tenured hires makes use of the contents of a full tenure dossier, including letters from external evaluators.

**Even now, the board of trustees does not participate directly in substantive review of the qualifications of individual faculty candidates.**

Current procedures technically require board approval of all tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments. In practice, however, the board does not conduct substantive reviews of faculty appointments that do not include administrative responsibilities. Rather, the board relies upon the substantive reviews conducted by the faculty and administrators in the relevant departments and on the second-level review conducted by the deans or the provost.

This practice is reflected in the language of the board agenda items for faculty appointment, which until recently stated that such appointments “**have been approved** since the previous meeting of the Board of Trustees **and are now presented for your confirmation.**” (emphasis added). This practice also is reflected in the fact that such appointments are collectively submitted to the board as one item for review and approval. Finally, this practice is reflected in the character of the information provided to the board. The biographical sketches that, in the usual case, provide the exclusive basis for the board's review include only the candidate's name, a description of the position, the salary, the candidate's former position, and the candidate's education. The sketches include no outside reviews of the candidate's academic work, or the work itself, and thus they provide no basis for real scrutiny of the candidate's qualifications. Although the board may request additional information from Academic Human Resources, it rarely has the information at its disposal to motivate such a request.

**If the board of trustees were to conduct substantive reviews of candidates' qualifications, the Urbana campus would be unable to compete with other universities for the best faculty.**

Direct participation by the board in substantive review of candidates' qualifications would introduce substantial delays into the hiring process. Under the current hiring practices, the campus's two-level substantive review of faculty candidates' qualifications is completed before the campus extends an offer of employment. Unlike the participants in this current two-level review process—the department, the dean, and sometimes the provost—the board would be unable, as a practical matter, to complete its review of the candidate's qualifications before the campus extends an offer.

Nor, probably, would the board be able even to complete its review of the candidate's qualifications within a few weeks after the candidate's acceptance of the offer. The board currently meets only once every two months. This meeting schedule is consistent with the deliberative role assigned to the board by the University *Statutes*. The first sentence of the *Statutes*—in Article I, Section 1—states that “[t]he Board of Trustees formulates university policies but leaves the execution of those policies to its administrative agents, acting under its general supervision.” To require board members to review promptly the substantive qualifications of every candidate for faculty appointment not only would be onerous, it would be fundamentally incompatible with the board's deliberative, policy-formulating role.

Realistically, if the board were to conduct substantive reviews of candidates' qualifications, its review would occur several months after the candidate had accepted the campus's offer of employment, as does the board's current formal “confirmation” of candidates. But it is unrealistic to suppose that strong candidates for faculty positions would be willing to wait until several months *after* their acceptance of the campus's offer to learn whether they actually would be appointed. Because the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is one of the world's premier research universities, candidates for its faculty positions are highly sought-after. It is unusual when candidates are *not* faced with a choice between the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a competing top university. If the Urbana campus were to condition every offer of employment on the uncertain outcome of a substantive board review process months later, the campus would be at a strong competitive disadvantage in relation to its peers, particularly those that—like the University of California system—have formally delegated the making of faculty appointments to campus or university administrators.

Moreover, requiring faculty candidates to endure months of uncertainty after their acceptance of the campus's offer would be inconsistent with the requirements of principled hiring and respect for current and future employees. In the interval between the candidate's acceptance of the university's offer and approval by the board of trustees, candidates routinely must relinquish existing tenured or tenure-track positions; turn down other offers of employment; and uproot their families. It is important to note that exposing recruited job candidates to financial risk in this manner is not typical in either the private sector or other areas of the public sector. It is true that candidates are on notice that the board of trustees might eventually reject their appointment; Provost Communication No. 3 requires that every candidate be advised that his or her employment is contingent on board of trustees' approval. However, in practice, Illinois has long relied on the assumption that board approval is *pro*

*forma*; that assumption has allowed Illinois to appear to be more nimble in hiring than its formal policies and procedures actually imply.

**The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign’s goal of attracting the very best faculty would be best served by amending the formal hiring policies to align them with the current and historical hiring practices followed by the Urbana campus.**

The campus’s past success in attracting strong faculty candidates is attributable, in part, to the fact that candidates have assumed that the board’s approval of their appointments is *pro forma*. Recent actions have called that assumption into question. In theory, the board could remedy this by somehow reestablishing confidence among candidates that extended offers would not later be rescinded by board action. Yet even if the board could succeed in reestablishing such confidence, the board would need to minimize its role in a way that is, in practical terms, indistinguishable from delegation to administrators: the board technically would retain its power to disapprove appointments but only at the price of promising never to exercise this power. This sort of de facto delegation has nothing to recommend it over formal delegation.

The better alternative is to align the university’s formal hiring *policies* with the current and historical hiring *practices*. If the board were formally to delegate its authority over appointments to campus administrators, faculty candidates would not have to face even a theoretical risk that their appointments would be reversed months after their acceptance of the campus’s offer. Nor would campus administrators need to reassure candidates that their offers of employment, despite technically being conditioned on board approval, are actually unconditional for all practical purposes. At the same time, formal delegation would preserve all the strengths of the existing hiring processes. After delegation, departments and colleges—and where appropriate the provost—would continue to conduct rigorous substantive reviews of candidates’ qualifications. The board, in turn, would continue to oversee the appointments process through its power to appoint and reappoint the campus administrators—college deans and the provost—who ultimately are responsible for this substantive review.

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation No. 1: The board should continue its oversight of faculty hiring through the review and approval of all faculty administrative appointments at the level of deans and above.**

Currently, both the hiring policies and the actual practices involve the board in a substantive review of administrative appointments at the level of deans and above. Each such appointment is submitted to the board as an individual agenda item and the board reviews and approves each appointment separately. Moreover, the board exercises ongoing oversight over the performance of administrators through the reporting line that extends up through the president, as well as through the annual re-appointment of those high-level administrative posts. The deans and provost perform the critically important role of ensuring that broader institutional interests are considered and honored through the mechanism of second level review of the originating department's appointment recommendations. This has proven to be a highly effective mechanism for the board and the university to ensure that the best faculty are recruited, as evidenced by the high stature and level of accomplishment of the faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Therefore, the committee recommends that the board continue its effective oversight of faculty hiring through its review and approval of administrative appointments at the level of deans and above.

**Recommendation 2: The board of trustees should formally delegate its responsibility for tenured and tenure-track academic appointments that do not involve administrative positions at the level of deans and above to the president, who in turn should continue the existing policy of delegating to the chancellor and provost.**

Formal delegation by the board of its authority over appointments to the president would ensure that the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign retains its ability to recruit and hire the very best faculty. The practices in place, which include a delegation of the presidential approval authority to the chancellor and to the provost, already ensure an appropriate and rigorous review of candidate qualifications by the faculty and department level administrators with the necessary expertise and include an effective second level review process by campus faculty administrators for whom there is a built-in accountability mechanism to the board. Moreover, if the board actually were to exercise its existing authority over appointments—by occasionally rejecting an appointment months after the candidate had accepted the campus's offer of employment—the consequences for the campus's ability to compete with other universities for strong faculty candidates would be

severe. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the board align the hiring policies and actual practice by delegating to the president, who in turn delegates to the chancellor and the provost, the authority to approve tenure system faculty appointments that do not involve administrative positions at the level of dean and above.

This recommendation is consistent with practices at the university's peer institutions. Although some of the university's peer institutions do require formal board approval of all appointments, others empower presidents and chancellors to make appointments deliberately but swiftly. In the University of California system, for example, "[c]hancellors are authorized to approve all appointments, reappointments, merit increases, and promotions of academic personnel under their jurisdiction" (see University of California Academic Personnel Manual § 200-24, found at <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/appointment-and-promotion/index.html>). Likewise, Pennsylvania State University delegates authority over all appointments to the university president, who in turn delegates that authority to hire assistant professors to the deans.

<https://guru.psu.edu/policies/ohr/hr13.html>. At Penn State, faculty appointments with tenure, dean appointments and other executive positions are reviewed by the provost, with the president having final appointment approval.

<http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/p%20and%20t/immed%20review.htm>. Thus, in the California and Penn State systems, governing boards have opted to exercise their hiring oversight via the appointment of top administrators, thus creating more agile institutions.

**Recommendation 3: The campus should review its procedures for off-cycle tenure cases to ensure that those processes continue to operate both rigorously and expeditiously.**

When candidates are considered for appointments with tenure, timing issues preclude application of the usual "on-cycle" tenure-review procedures articulated in Provost Communication No. 9. Still, appointments with tenure at the associate professor and professor levels require careful scrutiny of the candidates' qualifications. They require, in the words of Provost Communication No. 3, "evidence justifying tenure that is comparable to the evidence required internally for the granting of tenure" (Provost Communication No. 3, at page 8).

The procedures governing "off-cycle" tenure reviews were considered in the Report of the Senate Executive Committee Task Force on Faculty Issues and Concerns, which was issued by the task force on September 16, 2013 and later was adopted by the faculty senate. In this



review, the task force identified the “[l]ack of explicit procedures for off-cycle P&T reviews” as a reason for concern, but also acknowledged that it was “not aware of any abuses of [the off-cycle tenure-review process].” The task force’s concerns about the “lack of explicit procedures” appear to be focused primarily on reviews at the department and college level.

At the campus level the procedures for off-cycle reviews are specifically prescribed. Provost Communication No. 3 provides that the provost, before approving an appointment with tenure, “solicits comments” from what amounts to a de facto off-cycle promotion and tenure committee, composed of “the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Research, Dean of the Graduate College, and Chair of the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure.” Like the Senate Task Force, this committee is unaware of any abuses of the off-cycle tenure-review process. The committee also is unaware of any case where the review process has failed to operate rigorously and expeditiously.

Still, in light of the critical role of off-cycle tenure review in the appointments process, and in light of the concerns raised by the Senate Task Force, the committee recommends that the campus examine the current procedures for off-cycle review. In particular, the campus should consider expanding the off-cycle promotion and tenure committee to include a broader spectrum of senior faculty with experience on the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure, with a view to ensuring that off-cycle reviews partake of the same rigor as on-cycle reviews.

This recommendation is in keeping with the committee’s recommendation that the board of trustees delegate its responsibility for appointments both at the assistant-professor level and at the tenured level. This recommendation is also in keeping with the principles of shared governance and in particular with the faculty’s responsibility to maintain academic excellence and the high professional standards appropriate to one of the world’s premier research universities.



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE  
Prefiled Resolution

RS.15.08    **Resolution Endorsing the Final Report of the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee**

*WHEREAS*, Provost and Vice Chancellor Ilesanmi Adesida and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee Roy Campbell, on October 1, 2014, jointly charged a special committee “to review policies and processes for faculty hiring” and to submit a report of their “findings and recommendations for changes or clarifications” in these procedures; and

*WHEREAS*, the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee’s Final Report of December 12, 2014 concludes that the principles of “effective review,” “competitiveness,” “responsibility,” and “shared governance” are well served through established hiring practices, which “rely on judgment of department faculty and administrators who have the level of expertise necessary to thoroughly evaluate candidates’ qualifications”; and

*WHEREAS*, the report shows that the Board of Trustees effectively exercises its “final approval authority” over appointments by relying on and deferring to “the academic and professional judgment of the faculty and faculty administrators,” specifically by appointing and delegating responsibility to chancellor, provost, and deans; and

*WHEREAS*, “the success of this longstanding appointment process is seen in the world-class faculty that the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has been able to attract”; and

*WHEREAS*, changing these procedures so that the Board of Trustees would conduct “substantive reviews of candidates’ qualifications,” would damage the competitiveness of the University in hiring the best faculty and undermine shared governance, “in particular the faculty’s responsibility to maintain academic excellence and the high professional standards appropriate to one of the world’s premier research universities”;

*BE IT RESOLVED* that the Senate of the Urbana-Champaign Campus endorses the recommendations in the Final Report of the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee that policies be amended where necessary to “align them with the current and historical hiring practices followed by the Urbana campus.” Specifically:

- “1) The board should continue its oversight of faculty hiring through the review and approval of all faculty administrative appointments at the level of deans and above;
- 2) The board of trustees should formally delegate its responsibility for tenured and tenure-track academic appointments that do not involve administrative positions at the level of deans and above to the president, who in turn should continue the existing policy of delegating to the chancellor and provost;
- 3) The campus should review its procedures for off-cycle tenure review to ensure that those processes continue to operate both rigorously and expeditiously.”

*Submitted February 19, 2015 by senators*

Mark Steinberg (History)

Christopher Higgins (Education Policy, Organization, and Leadership)

Erik McDuffie (African American Studies and Asian American Studies)

Harriet Murav (Slavic Languages and Literatures)

Dana Rabin (History)

Jesse Ribot (Geography)

Rolando Romero (Latina/Latino Studies)

Gabriel Solis (Music)



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE  
Committee on Committees  
(Final; Action)

**CC.15.07** Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate

**Conference on Conduct Governance**

To fill one student vacancy created by the resignation of Mitch Dickey (LAS).

Sarah Hochman	ACES	Term Expires 2016
---------------	------	-------------------

**Educational Policy**

To fill one faculty vacancy created by the resignation of Charles Roseman (LAS).

David Miller	ACES	Term Expires 2015
--------------	------	-------------------

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

Prasanta Kalita, Chair

Lisa Monda-Amaya

Sara Benson

Mitch Dickey

William Gropp

Sarah Hochman

Calvin Lear

Randy McCarthy

Jenny Roether, *ex officio*

Nominations from the floor must be accompanied by the nominee's signed statement of willingness to serve if elected. The statement shall be dated and include the name of the position to be filled. If present, the nominee's oral statement will suffice.



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE  
Committee on Committees  
(Final;Action)

CC.15.08 Nominations to the Athletic Board

**Background**

The Athletic Board consists of seven faculty members, appointed by the Chancellor from nominations by the Senate, and two students appointed by the Chancellor from a slate of four candidates from the Illinois student government.

Terms of faculty ordinarily shall be four years; terms of students ordinarily shall be one year, with the possibility of reappointment for an additional year. Continuing faculty members of the Athletic Board and the expiration of their terms are as follows:

Kathryn Clancy	LAS	2018
<i>Cleo D'Arcy</i>	<i>ACES</i>	<i>2015</i>
Vicente Diaz	LAS	2017
Adrienne Dixson	EDUC	2016
Michael LeRoy	LER	2018
<i>Michael Raycraft</i>	<i>AHS</i>	<i>2015</i>
Thomas Ulen	LAW	2017

The Committee on Committees recommends approval of the following slate of nominees.  
(Submitted interest statements from nominees are attached.)

**Nominations**

The following faculty are nominated to fill two (2) faculty positions for four-year terms expiring in 2019. If no additional nominations are made, the nominees below will be forwarded to the Chancellor.

Kelly Bost	ACES
JJ Pionke	LIBR
Jay Rosenstein	MDA
F. William Simmons	ACES

The following students are nominated to fill two (2) student positions for one year terms expiring in 2016. If no additional nominations are made, the nominees below will be forwarded to the Chancellor.

Sarah Hochman	ACES
Maggie Klinge	SSW
Hannah Taylor	ENGR

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

Prasanta Kalita, Chair  
Lisa Monda-Amaya  
Sara Benson  
Mitch Dickey  
William Gropp  
Sarah Hochman  
Calvin Lear  
Randy McCarthy  
Jenny Roether, *ex officio*

Nominations from the floor must be accompanied by the nominee's signed statement of willingness to serve if elected, and a statement of interest. The statement shall be dated and include the name of the position to be filled. If present, the nominee's oral statement will suffice.

## **FACULTY NOMINEES**

### **BOST, Kelly (AHS: Human and Community Development)**

I am writing to self-nominate for one of the vacancies on the Athletic Board. I am a professor of Human Development and Family Studies in the College of ACES. I have had a long-standing interest in athletics as my father played in the NFL (1957 – 1962) and was a defensive line coordinator at Auburn University for over 10 years. I was also a competing gymnast for many years. As a faculty member, I strive to help student athletes recognize how the discipline and cognitive skills they learn through their sport can be used to reach their educational goals as well. I have taught a variety of undergraduate and graduate courses at the UI, and have served on committees related to curricula development and change. I have also served as a mentor for students involved in the Research Apprentice Program (RAP) which is specifically designed to recruit minority/underrepresented students. Finally, building my research program has involved creating, maintaining, and managing diverse budgets.

I would welcome the opportunity to serve on the Athletic Board to address issues related to student welfare and education.

### **PIONKE, JJ (LIBR: Kinesiology)**

I would like to nominate myself for the Athletic Board. My interest in the Athletic Board is multifold. As the Applied Health Sciences Librarian, one of my areas of responsibility is Kinesiology, of which many of our athletes major in. I am also responsible for purchasing research materials that will assist our teams in coaching and understanding the sports that they participate in. While I am a longtime fan of sport, I have also been an athlete myself and I understand the pressures that they face. As a tenure track faculty member, my research interests revolve around disability and the library, of which athletes are a segment, including our disabled athletes. Part of our values here at the University center on excellence, accountability, and inclusivity – whether that is in terms of education or athletics, we have a responsibility to help all students, including athletes, fulfill those values and be the best students and athletes that they can be. In terms of business and financial responsibility, I manage the funds for the purchase of materials for the University Library for the College of Applied Health Science. I take this responsibility seriously and aim to take a middle road approach – using my funds to make purchases that my faculty and students have expressed an interest in, as well as auditing the current spending in order to be more fiscally responsible. I believe in innovation and experimentation, but I also believe in making well thought out and wise decisions, especially financially.

### **ROSENSTEIN, Jay (MDA: Media and Cinema Studies and Journalism)**

Professor Rosenstein holds bachelors and masters degrees from the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and has long followed Illini sporting teams as a fan. He is sensitive to minority participation in the intercollegiate athletic program, and his documentary “In Whose Honor? American Indian Mascots in Sports” (1997) aired nationally on PBS. Professor Rosenstein has spoken out in person and on social media about the ways in which athletics could help the university meet its educational and academic objectives, and the uses to which athletic revenue could be put.



**SIMMONS, F. William** (ACES: Crop Sciences and Natural Resource and Environmental Sciences Departments)

I would be happy to serve the University if selected to fill a four-year term on the University of Illinois Athletic Board. I would bring interest, enthusiasm, institutional knowledge, and experience to such a role. I have been on faculty at the University of Illinois in the College of ACES since 1987, and just recently retired to an emeritus appointment where I continue some teaching and research on campus.

I closely follow most of the Illinois athletics portfolio and have done so since arriving on campus. My children have participated in many of the summer camps offered by our intercollegiate coaching staff and I have a son, Bradley Simmons, who was a high jumper on the Track Team a decade ago. Through him I learned about and came to respect the strong institutional structure surrounding athletic achievement. I firmly believe that Brad's academic foundation put in place by DIA counselors put him in a strong position to graduate (which he did). As an instructor I have had numerous athletes in my classes and have provided them with flexibility and understanding as they split their time between athletics and academics.

As an ACES assistant dean (2005-2014) I became even more familiar with the academic-athletic interface. I worked with DIA to evaluate transfer courses for athletes coming into our programs. I was the main contact for NCAA certification and "progress toward graduation" metrics, working with Chris Byron in DIA. On occasion I represented the College at CASA meetings where we evaluated academic strengths of recruit/applicants. I took advantage of opportunities to become familiar with academic counselors and some coaches. I am sensitive to the delicate balance of academic and athletic achievement and am proud of The Illinois tradition.

I have viewed Illinois athletics as a professor, Assistant Dean, father, social friends of coaches, and most of all a fan. If I could be of service I would be happy to fill this role.

## **STUDENT NOMINEES**

### **Hochman, Sarah (ACES)**

I am a junior in the College of ACES and have been an active member of the campus from student government to going to many sporting events since my Freshman year. Freshman year I was a member of Block I and every year since I have been a member of Illini Pride. I believe there is a lot to be done in revamping the game day experience and get more students to come to the game. There is no reason that there is an empty seat in the student section during football games. Illinois is about tradition and I want to be apart of it.

### **Klinge, Maggie (SSW)**

My name is Maggie Klinge, and I am a sophomore in the School of Social Work. I have been an active member in the Champaign-Urbana community during my time so far at the University of Illinois. I have attended many Illini football and basketball games and make an effort to show my strong school spirit. I believe that our athletics hold a great tradition at the university, and I think it is important to get more students to come out and support Illinois athletics.

### **Taylor, Hannah (ENGR)**

My name is Hannah Taylor. I am a junior studying Materials Science and Engineering, and I would love to serve on the Athletic Board during the upcoming school year.

For the past three years, I have been an active member in Illini Pride and, more specifically, Orange Krush. I am currently the President of the Orange Krush Foundation and will act as a Senior Advisor for Illini Pride next school year. I have worked closely with the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics to restructure ticketing for both football and basketball as well as work to improve the fan experience at all intercollegiate athletics. My knowledge of the behind-the-scenes gameday experience and the fan perspective would be my main contribution to the board. I have attended every Division 1 sport that the university sanctions, and can speak as a fan for all of them. I stay up to date with NCAA and Big Ten changes and would love to have more of a voice in that regard. I can also provide ways in which we have worked towards diversifying Illini Pride as whole. I think athletics are essential to the success of a university such as ours both financially and in terms of campus atmosphere and student involvement, but the focus of the university should be on academics and creating the best people possible. I am a passionate, hardworking individual that wants to make a difference in many ways, and I hope that I can provide that to next year's Athletic Board.

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**  
**URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**  
Committee on Committees  
(Final;Action)

CC.15.09 Nomination for Membership on the University Senates Conference (USC)

**Background**

The *University of Illinois Statutes*, Article II, Section 2. a. (1) state:

The University Senates Conference shall be made up of twenty members. The basic representation shall be two members from each senate. Additional members shall be apportioned to each senate, at least one from each senate, in numbers proportional to the number of faculty members on each campus. The apportionment shall be recalculated every five years. Each senate shall elect its own representatives from its membership.

The Urbana-Champaign campus has ten (10) representatives to the University Senates Conference. Current members of the Urbana delegation to the USC, and the years their terms expire:

Nicholas Burbules	EDUC	2017
Roy Campbell	ENGR	2015
George Francis	LAS	2015
Kim Graber	AHS	2017
Sally Jackson	LAS	2017
Prasanta Kalita	ACES	2016
<i>Carol Skalnik Leff</i>	<i>LAS</i>	<i>2017</i>
William Maher	LIBR	2016
Gay Miller	VMED	2016
Joyce Tolliver	LAS	2015

**Nominations**

The following faculty member is nominated to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Carol Skalnik Leff, expiring in 2017. A bio-sketch of the nominee is included below.

Bettina Francis	LAS	2017
-----------------	-----	------

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

Prasanta Kalita, Chair  
Lisa Monda-Amaya  
Sara Benson  
Mitch Dickey  
William Gropp  
Sarah Hochman  
Calvin Lear  
Randy McCarthy  
Jenny Roether, *ex officio*

Nominations from the floor must be accompanied by the nominee's signed statement of willingness to serve if elected and a short bio-sketch in hard copy form. The statement shall be dated and include the name of the position to be filled. If present, the nominee's oral statement will suffice.

**Bettina Francis (LAS)**

I am an associate professor in the Department of Entomology (LAS); my research is in environmental toxicology, focusing especially on chemicals that cause birth defects. I have served on numerous Senate committees (Educational Policy, Library, Student Discipline, Outreach, Benefits, and Committee on Committees); I have also chaired the campus Committee on Commencement. I have also served on the General Education Board of both the campus and LAS, as well as on various committees in Integrative Biology and am currently chair of the Graduate College Fellowship Committee. These varied committee assignments – and 35 years spent on campus, first as an academic professional and now as a faculty member – have given me a wide knowledge of the university, its needs, and its culture.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures  
(Final; Action)

SP.15.14 General Revisions to the *Statutes* Motion #3

**BACKGROUND**

In August 2012, the Governance, Personnel, and Ethics Committee of the Board of Trustees requested an overall review of the *University Statutes*. The Board authorized an ad hoc committee to conduct this review. That committee consisted of faculty from all three campuses, as well as various University administrators. The Statutes and Governance subcommittee of the University Senates Conference (USC) also participated in the review process. The Board's committee on Governance, Personnel, and Ethics reviewed the proposed changes, and this October, asked USC to seek the approval of the changes from the campus senates. At the October 20, 2014 Senate meeting, item UC.15.03 communicated a redline/strikeout version of the *Statutes* for consideration. To correct for a clerical error, the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP) was later provided with an October 24, 2014 updated version of the proposed revisions.

As mandated by the *Bylaws* of the Urbana-Champaign Senate, USSP has conducted its own review of these recommended revisions, prior to their being submitted to the Senate to vote on its advice to the Board, as provided by Article XIII, Section 8 b of the *Statutes*. The suggested changes are extensive, affecting every Article of the *Statutes*. Some of them are simply editorial adjustments, clarifying ambiguous language, for example, but some proposals would make more substantive changes.

In the course of its review, USSP found the vast majority of the changes to be appropriate and advisable, but it had specific concerns about some of the proposed changes, and these are identified with this motion. In a similar vein, at the December 8, 2014 Senate meeting, USSP presented its recommendations on the first two batches (Motions 1 and 2) of proposed revisions, and at the February 9, 2015 Senate meeting, USSP presented its recommendations on the second two batches (Motions 4 and 5).

For the Senate to consider these amendments in an orderly way, USSP will offer several resolutions covering different sections of the revisions. Because of the extent of the changes being proposed, USSP has not yet completed its review of all of the proposed changes. However, to ensure progress, it wishes to bring those sections which it has readied for action to the Senate for discussion and action, and USSP now presents a third batch (Motion 3). We hope to have the final items ready for the April Senate meeting. At the end of the process, the USSP or the Senate may return to any earlier batches if issues in the later ones would affect the content of earlier ones.

Attached is the text of the *Statutes* related to this portion of the review with redline/strikeout markings to illustrate the revisions emerging from the Board of Trustees review and below are USSP's recommendations for action to be taken by the Senate.

## RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends approval, subject to any later amendments that may be necessary, of the revisions to the *University Statutes* as contained in Motion 3 (lines 252-324, i.e., Article II, Section 3 [Faculty Role in Governance]) with the exceptions identified below. For these exceptions, we note the Board's proposed change, followed by USSP's recommendation. Text to be added is underscored and text to be deleted is indicated by ~~strikeout~~ (e.g., ~~sample text for deletion~~).

1. Lines 250-320...Revise the wording from “tenure-track” and “non-tenure-track” to “tenure-system” and “non-tenure-system” in each instance where it is used. The term “system” more clearly incorporates both probationary faculty and those with indefinite tenure and it also reflects existing human resources practices at the University. (Note that the terms “tenure-track” and “non-tenure-track” do not appear anywhere in the current *Statutes*.)
2. Lines 279-282...USSP noted that the sentence in lines 280-282 (“The bylaws of any academic unit may further mandate a minimum percent faculty appointment in that unit for specified faculty privileges, such as voting privileges.”) should not be deleted unless the suggested revisions to lines 291-292 are also accepted.
3. Line 285...Add a period (.) after “University.”
4. Lines 285-289...Revise the wording to read: “They include members of the academic staff of the unit or of other units who have the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor modified by the terms enumerated in Article IX, Section 3c or the term “emeritus” or the titles of “instructor” or “lecturer” with or without modification.” This avoids enumerating all the possible modifiers in multiple places within the *Statutes*.
5. Lines 291-292...USSP recommends retaining the wording as proposed, but after the word “units” to insert a period, delete the word “and,” and insert the words “The bylaws may also mandate a minimum...”. Doing so would avoid confusion that is created in the proposal's lines 291-293 which joins two separate circumstances for faculty participation. The revised sentences would read: “The bylaws of any academic unit may grant specified unit governance privileges to selected faculty of other units. The bylaws may also mandate a minimum percent faculty appointment in that unit for specified governance privileges, such a voting privileges.”

### UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

William Maher, Chair  
H. George Friedman  
Wendy Harris  
Scott Jacobs  
Calvin Lear  
Anna-Maria Marshall  
Mark Roszkowski  
Cheyenne Wu  
Sandy Jones, *Ex officio (designee)*  
Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*  
Dedra Williams, *Observer*

252 Rationale: The current definition of “faculty” includes only tenure-track faculty members,  
253 which excludes non-tenure-track faculty members from those who are “the responsible  
254 body in the teaching, research, and scholarly activities of the University” and thus those  
255 who have “inherent interests and rights in academic policy and governance.” The Statutes  
256 specify that the bylaws of a unit may extend specified privileges to unit colleagues who are  
257 not on the tenure track, implying but not specifying that the exercise of such privileges is  
258 limited to the academic unit.

259  
260 This revision explicitly includes non-tenure-track faculty members in the body of  
261 employees who enjoy rights related to academic policy and governance, while maintaining  
262 the distinction between the rights and privileges of tenure-track faculty and of non-tenure-  
263 track faculty. It specifies that the privileges that units may grant to non-tenure-track  
264 faculty members may be exercised only within the unit. It also revises the term “rank or  
265 title” to refer only to rank, given that there is no University-wide standard or control for  
266 the use of courtesy titles.

### 267 **Section 3. Faculty Roles in Governance**

268  
269 a. (1) The tenure-track faculty is, in academic matters, the primary governing body  
270 of the University, and it has a fundamental interest in all issues of university policy. The tenure-  
271 track faculty consists of those members of the academic staff in any academic unit, except for the  
272 Graduate College, with the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor who are  
273 tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure. ~~The faculty of the University and any of~~  
274 ~~its units except for the Graduate College consists of those members of the academic staff with~~  
275 ~~the rank or title in that unit of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor who are~~  
276 ~~tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure,~~ and those administrators in the direct line  
277 of responsibility for academic affairs (persons who hold the title director or dean ~~in~~ of an  
278 academic unit, provost or equivalent officer, chancellor/vice president and president).  
279 Administrative staff members not in the direct line of responsibility for academic affairs are  
280 ~~members of the faculty~~ included only if they also hold tenure-track faculty appointments. ~~The~~  
281 ~~bylaws of any academic unit may further mandate a minimum percent faculty appointment in~~  
282 ~~that unit for specified faculty privileges, such as voting privileges.~~

283  
284 (2) Non-tenure-track faculty provide specialized contributions to the teaching and  
285 research of the University They include members of the academic staff of the unit or of other  
286 units who have the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor modified by the  
287 terms “research,” “teaching,” “adjunct,” “clinical,” “visiting” and/or “emeritus” (e.g., “research  
288 professor,” “adjunct assistant professor,” “clinical associate professor,” “visiting professor”), or  
289 the titles “instructor” or “lecturer.”

290  
291 (3) The bylaws of any academic unit may grant specified unit governance  
292 privileges to selected faculty of other units, and may mandate a minimum percent faculty  
293 appointment in that unit for specified governance privileges, such as voting privileges. The  
294 bylaws of any academic unit may also grant specified unit governance privileges to non-tenure-  
295 track faculty (as defined by Section 3a (2) above). Voting on these provisions of the bylaws is  
296 limited to those tenure-track faculty named in subsection (1) above. At the campus level, the  
297 Senate constitution and bylaws may grant specified governance privileges to non-tenure-track  
298 faculty (as defined by Section 3a (2) above), subject to the approval of the Senate. ~~The bylaws of~~

299 ~~a unit may grant specified faculty privileges to selected faculty of other units. The bylaws may~~  
300 ~~also grant specified faculty privileges to members of the academic staff of the unit or of other~~  
301 ~~units who are not included in subsection 1 above (i.e., neither tenured nor receiving probationary~~  
302 ~~credit toward tenure), and who have the rank or title of professor, associate professor, assistant~~  
303 ~~professor, instructor, or lecturer. The bylaws may also grant specified faculty privileges to~~  
304 ~~members of the academic staff of the unit or of other units who have the rank or title of~~  
305 ~~professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer modified by the terms~~  
306 ~~“research,” “adjunct,” “clinical,” “visiting” and/or “emeritus” (e.g., “research professor,”~~  
307 ~~“adjunct assistant professor,” “clinical associate professor,” “visiting professor”). Only~~  
308 ~~academic staff with titles listed above may be extended faculty privileges. Voting on these~~  
309 ~~provisions of the bylaws is limited to those named in subsection (1) above.~~

310  
311 **b.** As the responsible body in the teaching, research, and scholarly activities of the  
312 University, the faculty, ~~both tenure-track and non-tenure-track, have has~~ inherent interests and  
313 rights in academic policy and governance; ~~however, these interests and rights are not identical,~~  
314 ~~and the status of tenure-track faculty grants them a distinct governance role.~~— Each college or  
315 other academic unit shall be governed in its internal administration by its tenure-track faculty, as  
316 defined in Section 3a (1) above, with additional unit governance privileges for non-tenure-track  
317 faculty as may be explicitly provided under Section 3a (3) above.— Governance of each academic  
318 unit shall be based on unit bylaws established and amended by the tenure-track faculty of that  
319 unit, which may include specific unit governance privileges designated in the bylaws for non-  
320 tenure-track faculty.— The bylaws shall provide for the administrative organization and procedure  
321 of the unit, including the composition and tenure of executive or advisory committees, ~~—E~~except  
322 that they may not conflict with these *Statutes*, or other specific actions of the Board of Trustees,  
323 or with the bylaws of a unit which encompasses it, ~~the details of the bylaws are left to the faculty~~  
324 ~~of the unit.~~

325  
326 Rationale: This section was revised to reflect the current functions of the Faculty Advisory  
327 Committees (FACs) on the campuses where they are active. It was also reorganized in  
328 order to explain all aspects of the FAC’s function first, and then to describe its operation.  
329 Finally, details about the precise composition of the committee on each campus were  
330 deleted, to allow the campuses to set their own policies, except for two general provisions:  
331 that the FAC not include those holding administrative posts (the definition of such having  
332 been refined to specify those who are likely to be in a supervisory position over potential  
333 grievants); and that no more than two members of the FAC may belong to the same  
334 college.

#### 336 **Section 4. Faculty Advisory Committee**

337  
338 At each campus the faculty shall elect a Faculty Advisory Committee, which shall  
339 provide a means for the orderly voicing of grievances or related concerns about the governance  
340 and procedures of academic or administrative campus units. A member of the academic staff or  
341 a retired member shall be entitled to a conference with the committee or with any member of it  
342 on any matter properly within the purview of the committee. Academic employees who are  
343 members of the Professional Advisory Committee electorate shall use the procedures outlined in  
344 Section 5 of Article II. In addition, the committee may make confidential reports on personnel  
345 matters at the request of the provost, the chancellor/vice-president, or the president. In