

(first Senate Review Comm.)

[1]

## REPORT OF THE SENATE REVIEW COMMISSION

### I.

#### THE COMMISSION'S CHARGE AND PROCEDURES

Article V, Section 9 of the Senate Constitution provides:

"Periodically the Senate shall provide for a comprehensive review of its size, organization, structure, and operation by a commission composed of members of the faculty and student electorates, and administrative officials. Such commission shall report its findings and make appropriate recommendations. The report of the commission shall be made public and distributed as all other reports. The first report shall be submitted not later than three years after the first election held under this Constitution."

This Commission was elected at the end of the 1972-73 academic year. As originally constituted, the Commission consisted of three members of the faculty, three students, three persons with administrative appointments and a faculty chairman. One faculty member resigned from the Commission on February 25, 1974. One of the student members graduated at the end of the first semester. Neither of these persons was replaced because the work of the Commission was so advanced that bringing in new members was not feasible.

During the early weeks of the fall semester, the Commission met with members of the faculty of each college or other organization which comprise the faculty electorate. In addition, it met with representatives of various student organizations, with the Chancellor and his staff, with the Professional Advisory Committee, and with the present and three past chairmen of the Senate Council. In addition, written comments from the faculty, from the chairmen of all Senate committees and from the student body were solicited and several were received. These written communications have been indexed and filed with the Clerk of the Senate.

The aforesaid meetings and written communications not only informed the Commission as to the relevant issues to be considered but also gave valuable input on those issues. Perhaps the most significant conclusion of the Commission from these discussions is that the work of the Commission was premature in the sense that the new Senate had not been operating long enough to allow a critical and detailed evaluation of its performance. There was a general feeling that the new organization is progressing satisfactorily and should be given time to evolve, but that after a suitable period there should be another detailed review. We therefore recommend that another review commission be elected to commence its work during the fall of 1976.

As a part of our study, the attendance at Senate meetings during the first two years of operation was analyzed. The computer print-outs and the charts and exhibits relating to attendance as prepared from data obtained have been filed with the Clerk of the Senate. These charts and exhibits include breakdowns by academic rank and by college. The following are some of the facts obtained from this analysis:

1. The mean attendance during the two year period at all meetings was 61.1%.
2. The mean attendance at regular meetings was 66% and at special meetings it was 49.3%.



3. The attendance during the second year was higher than during the first year.
4. During the academic year 1971-72, the faculty had a mean attendance of 58% and students had a mean attendance of 49%. During the 1972-73 academic year, the faculty mean attendance rose to 68% and the student mean increased to 63%.

We attempted a detailed analysis of the cost of the Senate. It was extremely difficult to determine the cost of operating the Senate even when the salaries of the senators were ignored. Information relative to the cost of operating the Senate from the standpoint of the campus administration was solicited from Vice Chancellor Briscoe. In addition, each committee chairman was asked for information relative to the cost of operating the various Senate committees. The information obtained has been filed with the Clerk of the Senate as a part of this report. From it we were able to conclude that no one knows even the approximate cost of operating the Senate each year. However, even if the salaries and the cost of secretarial assistance of the senators are ignored, the cost of the Senate would exceed \$25,000 per year.

The remainder of this report is divided into four additional sections. Part II discusses the functions of the Senate and its role in the University. This discussion is essentially background material illustrating the various points of view as to the proper function to be performed by the Senate on this campus.

Part III reviews the structure of the Senate. At the time of its creation, the Commission members generally anticipated that this subject would be highly controversial and that there would be substantial demands for change in the composition of the Senate. This anticipated controversy did not develop to any significant degree and, with the exception of the professional staff, there were only a few persons advocating any significant change in the makeup of the Senate. There was little advocacy for the elimination of students from the Senate and no strong effort to increase the proportion of student representation.

Part IV discusses several aspects of current operating procedures with special attention to the terms of service on Senate committees. Some of these matters have been considered by the Senate during this academic year.

During the course of our investigation, there were several ideas or suggestions that were deemed desirable by one or more Commission members but which were rejected by the Commission as a whole. In order for the Senate to have these ideas collected in one place for further consideration, they are summarized in Part V. This part is in effect a cumulative minority report.

Before turning to the detailed aspects of this report, we would like to point out what we consider to be a major weakness in the environment in which the Senate operates. The current system for rewarding faculty members in terms of pay or promotion does little, if anything, to encourage participation in the work of the Senate. Faculty members below the rank of full professor justifiably believe that it is not in their best interests to devote time and effort to the affairs of the Senate. As a result, there is little interest and practically no participation by assistant and associate professors in the work of the Senate. At present there is no system for familiarizing junior faculty with the Senate and its operations. Today there is little interest in the Senate even by full professors and steps need to be taken to reduce the level of apathy toward this important body.



For the student electorate, it seems apparent that most students have little or no knowledge of the Senate's role and function or its structure, procedures, and composition. Since most students are uninformed on these matters, they do not appreciate the present and possible effects of Senate actions on their own lives. Thus many problems concerned with the student representation on the Senate, such as unfilled seats, lack of candidates, sparse voter turnout, and resignations or frequent absences of student senators, can be traced to this lack of awareness of the Senate on the part of students. Furthermore, many student organizations, such as UGSA, the college councils, and the Daily Illini, do not seem to be as fully knowledgeable or aware of the Senate and its actions as they could be. Finally, those students who are aware of the Senate, including the student senators, often become disillusioned with the Senate because their expectations of what the Senate is and does conflicts with the actual situation. These several factors contribute to a substantial amount of apathy on the part of students which is certainly deleterious to the well-being of the Senate as it is now constituted.

We believe that faculty and students will be less apathetic if they are kept fully informed on the issues before the Senate. At the present time most constituencies are not kept advised by their senators. Accordingly, we recommend that senators as a routine matter report to their constituencies on the work of the Senate at departmental meetings or other appropriate forums. We further recommend that additional publicity, either through the campus news letters or a separate publication, be given to the actions of the Senate.

Perhaps nothing will contribute more to the elimination of apathy than for the Senate to be concerned with matters of substantial interest to the academic community. There was a general consensus throughout the campus that the Senate in the past has spent too much time on procedural matters and trivia and not enough time on those matters which have a substantial bearing on the quality of education and research on the campus. While recognizing that this concern is difficult to transform into a working policy and that there are matters such as the detailed budget which cannot realistically be considered by the Senate, we are taking this opportunity to convey to the Senate a sense of urgency and the real concern of their colleagues that the Senate ought to be more involved in more substantive matters and less concerned with procedural matters. While the Senate cannot "govern" the University, in the future it should play a greater role in the development of policy than in the past.

## II.

### FUNCTIONS AND ROLE OF THE SENATE

Basic to any comprehensive review of the Senate is consideration of its functions and role in the University. Unless there is general agreement about what the Senate should be doing, there can be little agreement about how well or how poorly the Senate is functioning or how one might seek to improve it. Also, and this is very important, if there is agreement, at least within the Senate, as to what its functions should be, but if the Senate does not have the authority (or credibility) to perform these functions, then the problem is beyond the Senate's power to resolve by itself. Therefore, at the risk of restating the obvious, we begin with a resume of the Senate's powers and functions, and conclude with some aspects related to current functions.

#### A. The Powers and Nature of the Senate

The University is governed by its elected Board of Trustees and beyond that by the State Legislature. In turn, the Board has delegated substantial authority and



responsibility to the administrative officers and faculty, via the University Statutes. In 1970-71, when the Senate was reconstituted in its present form, the Board in effect authorized the faculty to share its senatorial powers with students by including them in the Senate membership to a specifically limited degree. The role of the Senate, as perceived by the Board, is perhaps best described by the following sentence from the Preamble of the Statutes:

"When acting on matters having to do with educational policy and organization of the University, the Board relies upon the advice of the University Senates, as transmitted to it by the President of the University."

This view of the Senates reflects the Statutes themselves, which state in part: Article II. Legislative Organization, Section 1, Campus Senates --

"A Senate shall be constituted at each campus of the University. The basic structure of a Senate, including its composition, shall be provided for in its Constitution. The Constitution and any amendments thereto shall take effect upon adoption by the Senate concerned and approval thereof by the Board of Trustees.

"Each Senate may exercise legislative functions in matters of educational policy . . . including but not limited to: requirements for admission to the several colleges, schools and other teaching divisions; general requirements for degrees and certificates; relations between colleges, schools and other teaching divisions; the academic calendar; and educational policy on student affairs."

The first paragraph of this quotation was added to the Statutes in 1970-71 as an essential part of our Senate's reconstitution. Previously, the Statutes entitled all professors to membership in the Senate, along with many administrators, and each Senate was authorized to add others of academic rank and administrators at its option, provided such persons held at least a half-time, salaried appointment. The effect of this paragraph is to continue the Board's control over the composition of the Senates.

Although the Statutes emphasize the legislative functions which are vested in the Senates, in practice the Senates have performed two other major functions. They exercise a good deal of influence upon campus and University policies via advisory rather than legislative functions, with the advice often being of an informal rather than formal character. The other major function is that the Senate serves as a forum in which many issues can be and often are given a useful public airing.

Traditionally, the Senate has done its most important work in the areas of educational policy and academic freedom for faculty and students, and certain other subject matters directly relating to instructional and research programs. Examples include the academic calendar, admissions, continuing education, and aspects of student life, such as conduct governance and educational opportunities. In recent years, the Senate has expanded the scope of its concerns to include public service, external affairs, faculty-staff benefits, and general university policy. It has also originated nominations for the award of honorary degrees, elected the committee which administers student discipline and given advice (through Senate Council) to the Chancellor and (through its Committee on General University Policy) to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.



## B. What is the "Proper" Role of the Senate?

In the hearings held by the Commission, most participants seemed to accept the current image of the Senate as a body devoted largely, though not exclusively, to "matters of educational policy," and performing the functions just outlined. However, some persons, particularly students and academic professionals, did propose that the Senate should become a truly representative, broadly based governing body with "real powers" extending to all aspects of campus life, rather than being limited to an educational policy role. Nonetheless, while criticizing the limitations of the present Senate, some students argued for increased representation in it, and the representatives of the academic professionals strongly requested a share in the action.

On the other hand, some faculty members and administrators were nostalgic about the "old" Senate which spoke in effect only for the faculty. They stated that many of the issues now taken up by the present Senate are not of interest to the faculty, citing as examples those dealing with extracurricular student affairs. Also, there is apprehension that with the inclusion of students in the Senate, and especially if their ratio is increased or other groups added, the Senate's actions are no longer truly representative of the faculty's interests.

To a large degree, these views are contradictory and, in our opinion, they tend to cancel out. Certainly, there is no pronounced dissatisfaction with the predominantly educational policy emphasis of the Senate by large numbers from any of the constituencies (faculty, students, academic professions, administrators, and nonacademics) which might make up a broadly based governing body. Therefore, it does not seem appropriate for us to propose making any basic modifications in the role of the Senate.

However, many faculty and students expressed a desire for a more effective Senate. It is the Commission's opinion that the current Statutes do provide the basis for a more active Senate role in University policy development and implementation. The Senate has the capacity and opportunity to involve itself in broader areas of concern if it wishes to do so.

## C. The Senate as a Faculty Voice

Decades of development were required to achieve the de facto consignment of decision-making on educational policy by University governing boards to organic faculty units such as the Urbana-Champaign Senate. The result is salubrious. Here is where the expertise should lie; no other persons are as well qualified to make these decisions.

When students were admitted to Senate membership three years ago, the new composite Senate took on a different aspect in the eyes of many persons. Inclusion of students in numbers equalling twenty percent of the faculty is viewed by many faculty as diminishing appreciably the credibility and effectiveness of the Senate as a faculty voice. The fact that there is no organ of the University that is the faculty voice alone is a major concern to many who recall occasions in the past when the Senate had to act in an advocacy role vis-a-vis the administration and the Board of Trustees. The Senate's effectiveness on those occasions is open to question, but it is the view of some that the Senate did in the long run have its way on important issues of academic freedom and educational policy. The Board of Trustees and the administration did not wish to be in the position, for extended periods at least, of opposing and overturning the voice of the faculty.



It is an unanswerable question as to whether the composite Senate could, if the occasion should arise, speak as effectively and as forcefully as did the old Senate. And there is no other organic body which can speak as a faculty voice alone. However illogical it might be to discount the voice of a Senate which is 80 percent faculty because it also contains 20 percent students (especially if its action should be taken by a unanimous or nearly unanimous vote in which the student participation did not significantly affect or change the result), there is concern that the voice of a composite Senate could be more easily disregarded, not only by the Board of Trustees and the administration, but by the other publics to which the University is answerable, and even within the University.

The concern expressed by several faculty members as to the effectiveness of the new Senate as a faculty voice is based in part on the manner in which faculty Senators are chosen. Originally membership in the old Senate was via entitlement. It included all professors, and they by experience and identification with the University, could and did serve as an effective voice of the faculty, speaking for what they considered to be best for the faculty and for the University as a whole. The election of faculty senators has introduced the view that each senator has a constituency to whom there is responsibility and who must be represented. However, many faculty believe that most of the educational policy issues which come before the Senate do not require for resolution a representative political process. While there is some uneasiness about this aspect of the new Senate, it does not seem to be strong enough to warrant considering a return to an entitlement Senate.

It is our judgement that the level of dissatisfaction with the Senate as a faculty voice does not support a change in direction without further experience in the new mode. At the same time, the concern of the faculty about their having an effective voice should not be discounted. It seems unlikely that the faculty would accept any further change in structure or role of the Senate which would further reduce its credibility as an effective voice for them.

It is desirable that the Senate be a voice of the entire academic community, while at the same time preserving its traditional role as a voice of the faculty. This dual role is feasible and workable as long as the faculty retains its dominant membership in the Senate.

#### D. Issues Related to Current Functions

At the Commission's hearings a wide variety of comments were offered in connection with one or another of the Senate's current functions. Most of these more properly fall within the subsequent sections on "Structure" and on "Procedures and Operations." However, it seems appropriate to consider two of them in this section -- the role of the Senate in budget formulation and the role of the Senate in student affairs.

1. Budget Formulation -- In discussions of the effectiveness of the new Senate, several persons asked whether there wasn't some way in which the Senate could have a voice in the major budgetary decisions by which educational policy is largely determined. This is a recurring complaint which also applied to the old Senate. The root of the difficulty is that most budgetary decisions involve trade-offs, which require detailed information for analysis and are time consuming. It is seldom that a Senate committee member will have the time and background needed for the purpose.



We have not found any remedy to the problem. The Committee on General University Policy and, to a lesser degree, the Council, are seeking to provide effective input to the campus and University administration on the more general budgetary questions. Also, if the Committee on Educational Policy is split into two parts as later suggested, both may begin to consider the budgetary as well as the educational aspects of the proposals before them.

2. Student Affairs -- In the May 17, 1972 revision of the Statutes, Section 1a of Article XI on Student Affairs and Discipline provides that:

"The Senates shall be responsible for development of appropriate recommendations regarding policies on student affairs at their respective campuses."

Nonetheless, there is presently no Senate committee which includes this responsibility within its charge. Some student-related matters are handled by the Conference on Conduct Governance, others by the Discipline Committee and still others by the Committee on Educational Policy. But there are some matters of substantial importance which presently find no home for their proper resolution, such as advising student affairs administrators and serving as a liaison between the various groups interested in student affairs.

For many years the Senate had a Committee on Student Affairs, which was renamed in the late '60's as the Policy Committee on Student Affairs (PCSA). This committee was inactivated a couple of years ago upon its own recommendation, in part because it was thought that the Conference on Conduct Governance had removed the need for PCSA. However, this has not proved to be the case, and student attitudes on the matter have changed and a number of persons have suggested that there is a need for a means to introduce policy questions relating to student affairs into the legislative and advisory functions of the Senate. Therefore, we recommend that the Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures study the relative merits of reconstituting the Policy Committee on Student Affairs or expanding the charge of the Conference on Conduct Governance to include a standing Subcommittee on Student Affairs. The charge of the new committee or subcommittee would include advising student affairs administrators, facilitating liaison between students, faculty and administration and the preparation and introduction of legislation on student affairs matters. The Committee on Statutes and Senate Procedures should report the results of its study at an early date, including any necessary proposals for implementation, preferably for consideration no later than the December 1974 Senate meeting.

### III.

#### STRUCTURE OF THE SENATE

##### A. Membership

1. General Comments -- The Commission was confronted with a variety of issues relative to the structure of the Senate. Most of these issues were related to the composition of the membership of the Senate and others were related to the terms of office of senators.

In reviewing the various arguments relating to the composition of the Senate, it was the Commission's view that the central core of Senate concerns (educational



policy) should continue to be the subject of decision by a predominantly faculty group. We take this view in spite of the fact that some students view their participation in the Senate as tokenism. Some students argue for a 50-50 Senate dealing with a wider range of issues, especially those related to students and community affairs. This view also recognizes that the academic professionals, who number several hundred, claim that although their contributions are essential to the educational programs of the campus, they have little or no effective voice in establishing policy. These persons have requested that the Senate should be expanded to include representatives from their ranks.

To some it seems impossible to accommodate all of these diverse and often conflicting interests and objectives in one body. In fact, a number of persons have suggested that we should go to a bicameral structure, with separate bodies and roles for faculty and students, or even to a tricameral system. However, there is little or no evidence that such an approach would be an improvement over the present Senate, and such an approach is unworkable in the opinion of the Commission.

A multi-cameral legislative arrangement on this campus has at least two major kinds of difficulties: first is the matter of definition. How would one define those issues and policies of which a faculty senate should have the final advisory say? Which for a student senate? And as to what sorts of matters should a body consisting primarily of representatives drawn from the non-faculty professional staff have the predominant say? No satisfactory answers have been or probably could be articulated.

The other major difficulty has to do with coordination of separate bodies' work. As to many matters, faculty and student and non-faculty academics might all have legitimate concern and capacity for input and decision. How could the actions of two or three senates be coordinated? Conference committees and groups would have to be established; the experience indicates that these groups would tend to become the kind of representative composite Senate we now have for faculty and students. It is the opinion of the Commission that the current representative compromise can be said to be workable, which is more than can be said or demonstrated for any alternatives.

2. Faculty -- In a previous section (IIC), the problems related to the Senate's role as the voice of the faculty were discussed. Some faculty members did request a return to the entitlement Senate, but they were clearly in the minority. The Commission cannot state with assurance whether the work of the Senate is as well-known or as well-respected now as it was before the Senate was reconstituted three years ago.

Passage of time will dim fond memories of past entitlement. But the complaints about the wisdom of excluding a large majority of the full professors do point out a need to report and publicize the work of the Senate and of its committees more effectively. Also, the participation by junior faculty members may be expected, by normal conversational transmission, to result in wider awareness of the Senate's work within their ranks.

The Commission recommends no change in faculty representation in the Senate.



3. Deans and Directors -- When the Senate was reconstituted three years ago, deans and directors were excluded from membership or representation and were given voice without vote in the composite Senate. They have complained only mildly about their disenfranchisement, but they have been conspicuously absent from Senate meetings. They have requested that members of their administrative staffs be enabled to attend Senate meetings and speak on their behalf on matters affecting their colleges.

The Commission is divided on the issue of voting membership for deans and directors of degree granting units. Several Commission members believe that major advisory inputs of deans and directors can be made through administrative channels. They believe that the Senate is most valuable as a vehicle of communication and advice for those members of the University community who do not have access to the campus administration, the central administration, and the Board of Trustees through those channels. Yet, they recognize that knowledge and expertise of deans and directors and their administrative staff members are valuable to the Senate and should be retained. These members of the Commission would prefer that deans and directors of degree-granting units continue to have the right to participate in Senate meetings on a non-voting basis. The Commission is in agreement and recommends that a dean or director of such a unit be allowed to appoint an administrative or faculty colleague to participate ex officio in a Senate meeting if the dean or director does not attend.

Other members of the Commission believe that the prestige and effectiveness of the Senate would be greatly enhanced if deans and directors were involved in all deliberations and actions of the Senate. These members take the position that deans and directors possess knowledge that is indispensable to the decision-making process and feel that this is especially true if the Senate expands its areas of activity. Two facts of life seem apparent to these members: (1) most deans and directors will not attend regularly unless they are full-fledged members, and (2) the mere presence of deans and directors will have no restrictive effect on either the debate of faculty members or tend to influence their votes. In other words, a dean or director is not able, simply because of his position, to control the votes of his faculty and the ideas of such persons will be weighed on their merits. These Commission members believe that it is in the best interests of the Senate to have the deans and directors of the degree-granting academic units as full-fledged Senate members by virtue of their positions. Since the Commission is so divided on this issue, we recommend that the matter be placed on the Senate agenda for debate and decision.

4. Students -- It has come to be recognized that students, as consumers and as persons vitally interested in the successful operation of the educational enterprise, have contributions to make to the development of educational policy. This recognition does not, however, carry with it automatically or unquestionably the conclusion that students should therefore have a voice in making the decisions. It is possible that their contributions could be made by way of expression of opinion and communication of information to a faculty decision-making body.

When the Senate was reorganized three years ago, a compromise figure of 20 percent of the membership was assigned to students. If the students are to choose some members of the Senate, it is difficult to argue from any premise that a specific percentage figure is the correct one and the only correct one.



There is a general consensus that students have made a valuable contribution to the work of the Senate. If students are to continue to elect a portion of the Senate membership, the Commission can say on the basis of experience that the 20 percent figure appears to have worked well in terms of the desired goals of student participation and faculty acceptance, with retention of faculty decision-making. Students are numerous enough in the Senate so that their numbers produce articulate spokesmen, but they are not so numerous that faculty members sensitive about their prerogatives feel threatened that students will overcome the considered voice of their seniors in deciding important educational policy and academic freedom matters.

Students were added to the Senate electorate only three years ago. During the Senate Review Commission hearings this past year, few complaints were heard regarding this new student representation. However, a few students and some faculty-staff members suggested that a separate student governing body could be more beneficial and efficient than the present incorporation of students in the Senate. However, there was no significant groundswell for eliminating, changing, or increasing student representation in the Senate. Many feel, and the Commission concurs, that it is too early to assess student participation in the Senate fully at this time.

The Commission recommends no change in the student membership at this time.

5. Emeritus faculty -- No good reason appears for changing emeritus faculty voting or representation in the Senate. The Commission recommends no change in the status of emeritus faculty in the Senate as outlined in the present Constitution and election procedures.

6. Teaching Assistants -- A few arguments for Senate representation from the teaching assistant ranks were heard by the Commission. However, since teaching assistants are for the most part graduate students, it was generally agreed that they have some opportunity for representation through student election channels. The Commission sees no particular value in creating a separate electorate of teaching assistants, most of whom occupy their part-time positions for only a year or two. Nor does the Commission find any justification for increasing the representation of faculty from colleges where assistants bear a larger than average share of the instructional load.

The Commission does not recommend Senate membership or representation for teaching assistants other than their present access through membership in the student electorate.

7. Academic professional and administrative staff -- The Commission has been strongly urged to support expansion of the Senate to include some form of representation from the non-teaching academic professional and administrative staff. Broadly defined, this group includes all those staff members who occupy positions of academic appointment that are not defined either as "faculty" or "Civil Service" (non-academic) and that carry no access to the tenure track of teaching faculty.

The argument has been advanced forcefully that many resident staff members at the Urbana-Champaign campus, who are not included in the Senate's faculty electorate, have duties which relate significantly to the instructional and research missions of the campus, and that they therefore have a legitimate and genuine interest in many of the issues considered by the Senate and considerable expertise to contribute to Senate deliberations and decisions.



The Professional Advisory Committee (PAC), elected as a grievance committee for this group, several members of the professional staff, and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who has direct responsibility in this area, have strongly recommended that the Senate expand the electorate to include representation for the academic professionals on this campus. According to Article II, Section 1, Subsection C of the Senate Constitution, it is currently possible for some but not all of these people to be included in the faculty electorate. According to the aforesaid provision, members of the academic staff who do not hold 50 percent or greater administrative appointments may be included in the faculty electorate "on the basis of their participation in and responsibility for the educational function of the University." The administrative appointment provision prevents many academic professionals from qualifying for the faculty electorate. In any event, the vast majority of these people are not in the current faculty electorate.

The problem of providing Senate representation for the academic professional has two significant aspects. First of all, it is difficult to identify those persons who are actually directly involved in the educational programs of this campus. The constituency of the PAC includes persons who are within this definition, but it also includes many who are not, such as the staff of the Cooperative Extension Service. Many persons whose responsibilities are purely administrative have only indirect involvement in the teaching and research functions of the University. On the other hand, some academic professionals are involved with important aspects of student life and thus affect directly the conditions under which successful educational or research programs can be conducted. Membership in a Senate electorate is appropriate for only those whose functions directly or significantly affect the conduct of the educational programs of the University.

The second aspect of the basic problem is to determine the extent to which the academic professional should be represented. The policy in favor of a predominantly faculty Senate and the need to keep the Senate at a workable size indicates that their representation should not be in the same proportions as that of the faculty electorate. While these individuals have contributions to make to the successful resolution of numbers of issues of educational policy which come before a Senate, this contribution can be made by adequate representation on Senate committees and by the election of some senators. At the present time, academic professionals serve as non-voting members of several Senate committees.

We recommend that all academic professionals who are nominated by the Committee on Committees and approved by the Senate as members to Senate committees (not ex officio members) have full standing as committee members and be entitled to vote in committee on all matters before their respective committees.

We further recommend that the Elections and Credentials Committee carefully screen the academic professional staff to insure that all those who qualify under the existing guidelines are included in the appropriate faculty electorate units.

This inclusion of non-faculty academic professionals in faculty electoral units, according to the departments and inter-departmental units with which they are associated, will modify the relative size of some of these electoral units and their representation in the Senate. Upon reapportionment, some faculty electoral units will elect additional senators and others will elect fewer.



The adoption of the foregoing recommendation still would leave a sizable cadre of academic professionals not in the faculty electorate, many of whom are in administrative units that are not specifically academic in terms of teaching and research, e.g., personnel in student services, admissions and records, counseling, health and medical services, offices of the Chancellor, etc. From among those persons, we propose to define a new Senate electorate which includes those individuals whose duties are directly concerned with the instructional or research functions of the campus or with the conditions of student life on the campus. Excluded from this academic professional electorate should be members of the central University administration as distinguished from the campus administration, because they are not a part of the campus, and all those whose appointments involve their performing the major portion or all of their duties away from this campus, such as the Cooperative Extension Service county staffs.

After a list of those eligible is prepared, the persons included should be divided into eight functional electoral units, for the purpose of electing one senator from each.

We recommend that the Statutes be changed to provide for the election of eight senators from the academic professional electorate as determined by the Committee on Elections and Credentials.

#### B. Terms of Office

1. Length - Many arguments were advanced regarding lengthening the term of Senate office for students from one to two years and for faculty from two to three years.

Persons who have served for any length of time in the Senate, on Senate committees, or on other University bodies were in agreement that the first year's service in some groups often is relatively unproductive. For the Senate in particular, a newly-elected senator must learn a large quantity of procedural detail, historical background, aspects of various issues, etc. before becoming truly effective.

Also, the effort and expenses to some colleges of running elections has become a frequent complaint. As a solution, many persons have suggested lengthening the terms of both students and faculty by one year. Such action would improve the efficiency of the Senate and the resulting increase of continuity would be a very positive change.

Some persons might not serve on the Senate if terms were longer. However, this objection is really part of the more general problem of increasing the relevance and interest in the Senate. It is possible for someone to run for a term with the intention of not serving for the entire term, as long as sufficient provisions are made for filling vacancies. There should be no official or unofficial policy of discouraging persons from running for the Senate who do not intend to serve the entire term. In particular, a student who is a junior should not be precluded or discouraged from running for the Senate. Of course, it is assumed that a candidate for a Senate seat would be at a disadvantage if that person was demonstrably not likely to serve out a full term while an opponent was. But it seems clear that the number of persons "hurt" by this change would be no greater than the number "helped," and that the Senate itself would clearly benefit.



The Commission recommends that student senatorial terms be increased from one to two years.

The Commission recommends that faculty senatorial terms be increased from two to three years.

If the new professional academic electorate previously recommended is created, the Commission recommends that the terms of such senators be three years.

2. Filling Vacancies -- In the past a number of vacancies, particularly in student seats, have been left unfilled. Since elections are held in the spring semester, it is possible that a student will change plans during the summer and become unavailable to serve. In such cases, it seems advisable for the appropriate college to take the necessary steps to fill that vacancy. Furthermore, if student terms are lengthened to two years, the present rule that seats not filled in an election are not considered vacancies is no longer valid.

The Commission recommends that student senatorial seats left unfilled by a regular election be considered vacant seats to be filled at the next regular Senate election.

#### C. Election Procedures

1. Absentee Ballots -- In some faculty electoral units, strenuous effort is made to furnish absentee ballots to members of the electorate who are away on leave, or on temporary duty; in other units no such effort is made. The Commission has not been made aware of the dimensions of this problem except by way of complaint from a few departments as to how burdensome absentee voting has become. The Commission has no information as to how many ballots are distributed to absentees, nor as to what difference absentee voting -- or lack thereof -- would make in the conduct of elections or as to who is elected. (It is known that some units elect as senators those who are away during the term in which the election is held.) It is therefore recommended that use or nonuse of absentee voting procedures remain a matter for determination by college or other faculty electoral unit committees on elections and procedures.

2. Coordination of campus elections -- Several student leaders have suggested that the elections of students to the Senate be held in conjunction with the elections of the student representative to the Board of Trustees and the elections of UGSA and GSA. It is pointed out that the logistics of each election have the common attribute of written secret ballots cast at polling places dispersed throughout the campus, with each student required to present his I.D. card to be punched. The economic advantages of combining these elections may be of some significance, and voter and candidate interest might be increased if one common election day becomes an institutionalized process. Of course, the current election days are separated by at least a month, and considerable thought must be given as to the feasibility of this proposal. It remains the initiative of the various student governmental groups to pursue this proposal further.

### IV.

#### SENATE PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONS

##### A. Committees

The present Senate lists 20 standing committees and three groups of Senate representatives to other bodies, representing approximately 225 individual memberships.



Student members of committees normally serve a one year term of appointment, with the exception of the students on the Conference on Conduct Governance; and faculty members are appointed to two-year committee terms with the exception of Senate Council, the Committee on Committees (each one-year terms), and the three-year terms of the University Senates Conference. The "New Senate" has experienced difficulty in committee continuity because of frequent changes in membership. New committee members need time to acquaint themselves with the mission of the committee and current committee affairs. Each year the change of membership causes a "lag" time for the committee, reducing its effectiveness. Both student and faculty groups have indicated a desire for longer periods of service on committees. However, any action taken to lengthen committee terms should be in agreement with length of terms of Senate membership. Therefore, it is recommended that student Senate committee terms be for two years and that faculty and non-faculty professional staff Senate committee terms be for three years unless otherwise stipulated in the charge to the committee.

In the formulation of the "New Senate," committees were kept small purposely in the hope of improving communication and efficiency. Normal committee membership was comprised of five faculty members and two student members. Experience indicates that a slightly larger faculty group would be desirable to lighten the duties of individual committee members and to gain a larger representation of views in committee matters. There was no substantial indication on the part of either faculty or students that an increase in student membership was needed, but the same arguments apply and there will be a natural tendency on the part of students to feel that their representation should be increased if the faculty representation is increased. Several committees (Senate Council, Committee on Admissions, Committee on Educational Policy, and Committee on Student Discipline) already have larger memberships than the five and two representation and there was no indication of change needed within these committees. The Commission recommends that the basic representation of faculty members on Senate committees be increased to seven. The Commission is divided on whether the basic number of students on committees should be two or three. For purposes of Senate debate on this issue, we note that a seven and two relationship (22.2%) more closely approximates present student Senate membership (20%), whereas the seven and three relationship more closely approximates the current committee structure (28% student membership). A further complicating factor on some committees arises from membership for the academic professional staff. If these academic professionals are included in a separate electorate as previously recommended, the Commission recommends that the Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures study the probable contributions of academic professionals to the various Senate committees and provide for inclusion of academic professionals on appropriate committees. (See the prior recommendation on page 11 relative to the status of such committee members.)

It has been suggested that provision be made for the inclusion of both undergraduate and graduate professional students on committees. This would insure a better representation from the various levels of student groups within the University. Representation from both graduate/professional and undergraduate students would reflect the distinction made between the two in the Senate Constitution (Article 3, Section 4). We therefore recommend that student committee membership include at least one undergraduate and at least one graduate or professional student.

The Senate committee membership should seek to include in the membership of each committee knowledgeable persons who might provide an expertise not found in general Senate membership. Within the diverse University community, there is a fine



line between the teaching and administrative faculty membership where the Senate in its definition of the electorate uses a percentage of time appointment basis (50%). Within this group of academic faculty members who are barred from the electorate by virtue of their administrative appointments are a number of middle management and junior executive types having expertise in academic and procedural matters. Senate actions would be strengthened by input and support from such faculty members and would insure better working relationships between the faculty and administrative personnel. Their eligibility to serve as Senate committee members would enhance the work of the Senate. Therefore, it is recommended that the Senate Bylaws be changed to allow academic staff holding faculty rank who would otherwise be eligible for the Senate electorate, except by virtue of their administrative appointments, to be elected members of Senate committees.

In selecting non-Senate student members for committee assignments, efforts should be made to insure that all students interested are notified and have an opportunity to express their interest before appointments are made. Several methods of informing students are available but, where possible, we should also seek the cooperation of student governmental groups in making known to students these opportunities. An effort should be made by the Senate to work with student organizations not only to inform students of the availability of the appointments but also in making suggestions of nominations to the various committees. Therefore it is recommended that the Committee on Committees develop more effective procedures for electing qualified non-Senate students to Senate committees.

Of all the Senate committees, that on Educational Policy consistently has the heaviest work load. Much of what it does relates to specific courses and curricula and is relatively routine, though central to our educational mission. A periodic complaint is that the committee has inadequate time to take up some of the broader, long-range concerns with which it should deal. Also, in spite of the budget stringencies under which the campus labors, the committee has not usually involved itself with the budgetary aspects of the proposals which it does consider.

It has been suggested that both concerns could be addressed by splitting the committee -- forming a new Committee on Courses and Curricula (which would deal with only those matters) and a Committee on Educational Policy (which would not handle courses and curricula but would deal with everything else in that broad view).

Another possibility would be for the Educational Policy Committee to form a Subcommittee on Courses and Curricula to serve the same role. The committee would be answerable to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy but could, effectively, function on its own. Many courses and curricula matters are relatively routine. Through the process of handling courses and curricula matters through a subcommittee, it is probable that more questions related to educational policy will arise than if a separate committee is developed to discuss only educational policy concerns. Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee on Educational Policy conduct a study of the pros and cons of dividing its functions into two parts -- either two separate committees or a major Educational Policy Committee with a Subcommittee on Courses and Curricula responsible to it.

#### B. Length of Debates

Considerable concern has been expressed with regard to limiting debate on the Senate floor. It is possible that certain techniques or procedures could be adopted to shorten presentations made by Senate members but, in the final analysis, floor



procedures and behavior depend upon the senators themselves and those presiding at the meeting. The Senate Parliamentarians should study alternative rules and procedures to expedite the work of the Senate and make appropriate recommendations to the Senate.

## V.

MINORITY POSITIONS

There are two recommendations suggested by one or more, but less than a majority of the Commission's members. These are as follows:

A. The Senate, as now constituted, includes a student electorate divided along disciplinary and/or college lines. There is no formal connection between the Senate and the student governing organizations (such as UGSA and GSA) with the exception that the chairmen of the UGSA and GSA steering committees are ex officio members (without vote) of the Senate.

A number of students, including some with responsible positions in "student government" have proposed that "The Senate should take the initiative in formalizing a student governmental structure on this campus." The latter, for example, might include a provision whereby members of the UGSA and GSA Steering Committees (or their counterparts in a revised structure) would be voting members of the Senate, in addition to the students elected as senators from academic districts.

B. An effort has been made to include in all facets of the Senate student representation to insure that the students' views are presented. Most standing committees of the Senate have student representation with the exception of the University Senates Conference. There may be doubt as to whether the deliberation of the University Senates Conference may be of interest to students. If student representation were allowed, it would provide a way for students to present to the President concerns of students through a formalized structure. It may not be important that a student automatically be represented in this group, but it may be important for the Senate to have freedom to include a student member if they wish to do so. One or more members would recommend that consideration be given to changing the membership of the University Senates Conference to allow one of the members from each campus to be selected from the Senate student membership.

## IMPLEMENTATION:

The Commission is not a standing committee of the Senate, and it is the opinion of the Commission that it ceases to exist upon the filing of this report. In order to insure consideration of the recommendations contained herein, the Commission requests:

1. That copies of this report be furnished all current senators and those elected to serve for the 1974-75 academic year.

2. That the recommendations contained herein be reviewed by the Senate Council and, to the extent deemed appropriate by the Council, that the recommendations



either (a) be referred to the appropriate Senate committee for action or (b) they be placed on the agenda of the Senate for debate and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Norman H. Beamer  
Edward Gabrielson  
H. S. Gutowsky  
Hugh M. Satterlee  
Victor J. Stone  
Howard L. Wakeland  
Dorothy M. Wetzel  
Robert N. Corley, Chairman

April 15, 1974