

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

APPROVED BY UIUC SENATE

Committee on General University Policy
(Final;Action)

GP.93.06 Establishment of a Fourth Senate Review Commission

BACKGROUND

Article V, Section 9, of the Senate *Constitution* requires that "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 recommendations. The report of the commission shall be made public and distributed as all other reports of the Senate."

The first Senate Review Commission reported in 1974, and the second in 1977. They recommended minor changes, some of which have been adopted. These were followed by an *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty and Student Participation in University Governance. It recommended in 1981 that the Senate should consist of 100 faculty members, and suggested many other changes. Those strong recommendations were not accepted by the Senate.

In 1986, a Third Senate Review Commission was constituted and charged with developing proposals to enhance participation by the Urbana-Champaign academic community in forming the educational policies of the University. The Commission was asked within that context to recommend such revisions to the function and structure of the Senate as are deemed necessary and appropriate. This Commission, after a series of setbacks, did not issue a report and was formally disbanded by the Senate.

The role of faculty and students in the formal governance structure of the Campus needs reexamination. According to the *Statutes* (Article II, Section 1), "Except as otherwise provided in these *Statutes*, each Senate shall determine for its campus 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." Some feel that issues of educational policy are increasingly being decided outside of the formal Senate structure. Others feel that the Senate, as currently constituted, is not well equipped to deal with sensitive or critical issues, and that faculty and student participation is best utilized through other governance structures.

CHARGE

The Fourth Senate Review Commission is charged with reexamining the role of the Senate in the formal governance structure of the Campus. Particular attention should be paid to the role of faculty and students in the governance structure and to finding ways to enhance faculty and student involvement in productive ways. Within this context, the Commission is asked to recommend such revisions to the operation, function, and structure of the Senate as are deemed necessary and appropriate.

Many of the issues that were considered important at the creation of the Third Senate Review Commission remain unsettled and in need of resolution. These include Senate-Administration relationships, low Senate participation, high variation in the quality of Senate committee work, and too much concern with routine matters and not enough concentration on major issues. In addition, the Commission should be alert to new issues that need attention.

The Commission should consult widely and report its progress to the Senate periodically. It may wish to request position papers from academic leaders and should feel free to call upon the Senate or other committees for a more detailed consideration of particular issues.

The Commission is asked to present at least its initial findings and recommendations to the Senate no later than the April 1993 meeting.

COMPOSITION

The Committee on Committees will nominate a slate of candidates for election by the Senate as follows:

- *Five faculty members*, one of whom shall Chair the Commission. This group should include, but not be limited to, faculty with experience as active Senate members.
- *Two student members* whose experience includes extensive service as Senate members.
- *Two administrative officials* for whom the Chancellor should be invited to provide nominations.

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY

Wesley D. Seitz, Chair

Jesse G. Delia

Royal James Dwyer

Christian Kurrer

Jane Leuthold

*Roger Martin (*ex officio*)

James McGlathery

*Romaine C. Wicklund (PAC Liaison)

Tom Ulen

*denotes non-voting status

APPROVED BY UIUC SENATE
AS AMENDED

FOURTH SENATE REVIEW COMMISSION

The attached report from the Fourth Senate Review Commission contains a number of recommendations for changes in the Senate in order to make it more effective. The purpose of the resolutions stated below is to provide a framework by which these recommendations can be addressed in an orderly way by the Senate and the Senate Council. These broad resolutions will give a "sense of the Senate" to the Senate Council, so that it may proceed with confidence in implementing the recommendations of the Fourth Senate Review Commission.

1. Resolution #1 ON QUORUMS

The quorum required for conducting business in the Senate shall be reduced. (The Fourth Senate Review Commission recommends that the quorum be reduced to 100. The USSP Committee is also developing a proposal to reduce the quorum.)

2. Resolution #2 ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEES

2.a The number of standing committees in the Senate shall be reduced, ~~from 21 to 14.~~ (A proposed committee structure is specified in the Report of the Fourth Senate Review Commission, which can be used as a starting point in the detailed restructuring process.)

2.b Faculty membership in the Senate Council shall be by entitlement instead of by caucus of the committee chairs. Faculty members of the Council will be chairs of policy-making committees, plus liaison persons currently on the Council as specified in the report of the Fourth Senate Review Commission.

2.c The Senate Council shall appoint an *ad hoc* committee to ~~work out details and generate specific language to implement the recommendations above.~~ *develop specific recommendations.*

Another major recommendation of the Senate Review Commission was to implement a consent agenda to streamline the meetings of the Senate. This is an action that is implementable by the Senate Council and does not require a specific vote of the Senate. An advisory resolution to recommend that the Senate Council develop a consent agenda process is hereby provided.

3. Resolution #3 ON IMPLEMENTING A CONSENT AGENDA

The Senate Council shall work to implement a consent agenda for the conduct of Senate meetings.

Report of the Fourth Senate Review Commission

Background

The Fourth Senate Review Commission was established by the Senate on November 30, 1992 with the approval of GP.93.06. This action was taken in accordance with Article V, Section 9, of the Senate Constitution which states that "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."

The first Senate Review Commission reported in 1974, and the second in 1977. They recommended minor changes, some of which have been adopted. These were followed in 1981 by an *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty and Student Participation in University Governance. This Committee recommended that the Senate should consist of 100 faculty members and suggested many other changes. These recommendations were not accepted by the Senate.

In 1986, a Third Senate Review Commission was constituted and charged with developing proposals to enhance the participation of the UIUC academic community in forming the educational policies of the Campus. This Commission, after a series of setbacks, did not issue a report and was formally disbanded by the Senate.

Charge to the Commission

The Fourth Senate Review Commission was charged with reexamining the role of the Senate in the formal governance structure of the Campus. The charge to the Commission indicated that particular attention should be paid to the role of faculty and students in the governance structure and to finding ways to enhance faculty and student involvement. Within this context, the Commission was asked to recommend such revisions in the operation, function and structure of the Senate as it deemed necessary and appropriate.

The charge also noted that many of the issues that were considered important at the time of the Third Senate Review Commission remain unsettled and in need of resolution. These include Senate-Administration relationships, low Senate participation, high variation in the quality of Senate committee work, and too much concern with routine matters and not enough concentration on major issues.

The effectiveness of the Senate

The broad issue that underlies concerns with Senate structure, and the periodic appointment of Senate Review Commissions, is that of Senate effectiveness. The Senate, by the Statutes, is endowed with broad responsibilities. The Senate is the chief vehicle by which faculty governance is realized. But, in fact, the Senate's influence and the implementation of the Senate's recommendations are subject almost entirely to the discretion of the campus administration. The Commission focused on issues that would improve Senate effectiveness and improve consultation between the Senate and the campus administration: the size of the Senate, the conduct of Senate business, and the structure of Senate committees. In the remainder of this report we summarize our deliberations on these issues and provide conclusions and recommendations for the consideration of the Senate.

The size of the Senate

The size of the Senate was considered as a major issue because it relates directly to the effectiveness of the Senate and the campus community's perception of the effectiveness of the Senate. Presently, the Senate has 250 members (200 faculty and 50 students) who represent all academic units of the Urbana-Champaign campus. A proposal was made to reduce the size of the Senate, which would make all members more accountable; all members would have a committee assignment and, consequently, all members would be more active in both committee work and the general legislative deliberations of the full body. In the present Senate, there are times when a quorum is not present and consequently the risk of a quorum call and the suspension of business is very real. This reflects badly on the perception of the Senate and interferes with the orderly process of debating and voting on legislative matters. On the other hand, under a reduced size of the Senate, not all units would have their own representative, which would serve to promote a sense of disenfranchisement of faculty within certain units. Thus, the Commission rejected this proposal.

The orderly processing of business could be accomplished in a very large Senate, such as we have, by reducing the quorum from the present 125 to 100 members, which would be two-fifths of the total membership of the Senate. Past history has shown that most of the time there is a quorum at Senate meetings and, though occasionally attendance does dip below 125, there are usually at least 100 people there. **The Commission recommends that the quorum for Senate meetings be reduced to 100 members.** The goal of this recommendation is the belief that the Senate must be seen to conduct its business in an orderly way. Reports that matters could not be acted upon because of the absence of a quorum have serious costs in terms of the community's perceptions of the effectiveness of the Senate!

The conduct of Senate business

We commend the Senate for fostering the use of computer networking and recommend that, where possible, the work of the Senate and its committees utilize the campus network. We recommend that the Senate Council give serious attention to the ways in which the business that comes to the Senate is managed. We suggest that

- much of the routine business that necessarily comes before the Senate be handled by a consent agenda (see Appendix I) combined with a process to encourage Senators to ask questions and seek clarification of issues ahead of the meeting.
- after clearing the agenda by such a mechanism, the Senate leadership (and the campus administration that is part of the leadership) give careful attention to the management of the remaining business that comes to the Senate for formal discussion. **Only matters which have significant implications for the Senate electorates as a whole should receive time on the Senate's agenda.** The flow of such items to the floor of the Senate should be carefully planned so that those attending meetings do participate in significant discussions of self-evidently important issues.
- **the Senate Council should consider a reduction of the number of Senate meetings once the consent-agenda mechanism has been installed.** One of this smaller number of meetings should be devoted to the annual meeting of the faculty.
- insofar as possible, meeting times for committees should be established a year in advance, so that faculty and students can eliminate or minimize schedule conflicts.

The structure of Senate committees

In contrast to the perception of the Senate meeting as a whole, the work of and work on Senate committees is widely appreciated by faculty and students. And, in fact, much of the Senate's most important work is done formally and informally in its committees. However, the Senate's committees vary widely in their caseload and effectiveness. The Commission recommends that Senate structure of standing committees be strengthened by a closer alignment of the committee structure with the Campus policy-making and administrative structure. The current Senate committee structure, with its 21 standing committees, has been essentially the same for over twenty years, whereas over this time there have been significant changes in educational priorities and administrative structures. **The Commission recommends that the Senate's committee structure be reorganized to create 14 standing committees.** As part of this recommendation, the Conference on Conduct Governance, as presently constituted, would be discontinued. Some functions of the Conference have been distributed among several committees (see below), and a proposal for a revised mechanism for the important Senate role in the rule-making process on the UIUC Campus is presented in Appendix I. The proposed committees are:

- 1) Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The Commission recommends that this committee be continued as it now is. Its duties relate to the academic freedom of the faculty and tenure status related to it, and some of its functions are specified in the University Statutes.
- 2) Committee on Campus Operations, Human Resources, and Faculty Benefits. The Commission recommends that a new committee be formed to take over the duties of the former Campus Operations Committee, the Faculty Benefits Committee, and certain functions of the Equal Opportunity Committee. In addition to reporting to the Senate, this Committee would be advisory to the Vice-Chancellor for Administrative Affairs and Human Resources. This is one example of forming a committee that corresponds to a new administrative structure: the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Human Resources. The Committee on Campus Operations has acted in a broad advisory capacity to the Vice-Chancellor for Administrative Affairs. Since Human Resources has been added to that title, it is only logical that policy issues related to human resources, such as equal opportunity and faculty benefits, be added to the portfolio of this committee. It is in this administrative office that campus negotiations with the University offices and State offices related to faculty benefits take place. Consequently, it is logical that faculty benefits be subsumed into this larger committee.
- 3) Committee on Committees. The Commission recommends that the Committee on Committees continue as it is without any changes in its duties or membership.
- 4) Committee on Educational Policy. Educational policy is a prime aspect of faculty governance and this committee is central to the work of the Senate. However, portions of the charges to the present Admissions Committee, the Calendar Committee, the Equal Opportunity Committee, and the Continuing Education and Public Service Committee also relate to educational policy. The Commission recommends that the educational policy functions of these committees be subsumed into the Committee on Educational Policy; the caseload for these committees is not so heavy that they could not easily be handled under the purview of the Committee on Educational Policy.

- 5) Committee on External Relations and Public Service. The Commission recommends that some of the duties of the present Continuing Education and Public Service Committee and the External Relations Committee be combined into a new committee which can serve in a broad advisory capacity to the Associate Chancellor for Public Affairs and the Associate Vice-Chancellor for Continuing Education and Public Service. This provides a Senate committee that corresponds to a key administrative position to effect consultation and advice on matters of importance to the faculty, students, and the University community at large.
- 6) Committee on General University Policy. The Commission recommends that the duties of the Budget Committee be subsumed under the Committee on General University Policy. This is a logical combination of two broad-policy committees that have overlapping duties. The Committee on General University Policy would be the primary advisory committee to the Provost.
- 7) Committee on Honorary Degrees. The Commission reviewed the process now in force for evaluating nominations of candidates for honorary degrees. After much discussion within the campus community, the Commission decided that the existing process and committee structure for evaluating candidates for honorary degrees is working. Minor changes in procedure will be sufficient to serve the Senate and the campus in the years to come. The Commission recommends that the Committee on Honorary Degrees continue to function as it now does.
- 8) Committee on the Library, Computer Facilities and Telecommunications. The Commission recommends that the charge of the present Library Committee be expanded to include policy matters related to telecommunications and academic computing. This is a logical combination of activities and reflects national trends.
- 9) Committee on Research Policy. The Commission recommends the establishment of a new committee that shall be responsible for examination and review of all matters of research policy, including ethical issues related to the conduct and administration of research and the establishment or discontinuance of research units. Heretofore, the Senate has not had a committee directly concerned with research policy. Federal regulations continue to affect the conduct of research; there is a continuing need to develop policies relating to relationships with industry, the ethical practices of research, and interrelationships between faculty investigators on joint projects. A number of policy issues need to be debated and discussed and reported to the Senate for action, if appropriate. This committee would be broadly advisory to the Vice-Chancellor for Research.
- 10) Committee on Student Discipline. The committee would remain the same.
- 11) Committee on University Senates' Conference. The committee would remain the same.
- 12) Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures. The Commission recommends that into this committee be subsumed the activities of the Parliamentary Committee and the Committee on Elections and Credentials. Further, the Commission recommends that this committee be the writing committee for rules for standards of conduct, a function previously located in the Conference on Conduct Governance. This committee would take on the responsibilities for writing and/or reviewing proposals for rules on the recommendation of the Committee on Student Life and Conduct, other Senate committees, or the Senate Council.

- 13) Committee on University Student Life and Conduct. This new committee would have the duties of the present Committee on University Student Life in addition to many of the functions of the Conference on Conduct Governance related to rules for standards of conduct of students. This committee would be concerned with the policy-making aspects of rules. To facilitate the new arrangement the Commission has also developed a recommended procedure for the review, approval, and transmission of rules to the Chancellor (see Appendix II). This committee would be broadly advisory to the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs.
- 14) Senate Council. Two major changes in the composition of the Senate Council are recommended. First, the Commission recommends that the present seven faculty senators elected by a caucus of committee chairs be changed to ten faculty senators who are the chairs of the following Senate committees: Academic Freedom and Tenure; Campus Operations, Human Resources, and Faculty Benefits; Committee on Committees; Educational Policy; External Relations and Public Service; General University Policy; Library, Computer Facilities and Telecommunications; Research Policy; University Statutes and Senate Procedures; University Student Life and Conduct. With a reduced number of committees, the Commission recommends that all but two of those committee chairs (those that are involved primarily with policy) be members of the Senate Council: excluded would be the chairs of Honorary Degrees and Student Discipline, since these are primarily technical committees and have little to do with the making of policy. While the Committee on Committees recommends committee membership and chairs to the Senate, it is the Senate that ultimately votes to appoint committees, so that under this new proposal ultimately the Senate elects the members of the Senate Council, in addition to the direct election of the Senate Council Chair and Vice-Chair.

Second, the Commission recommends that the campus faculty member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Higher Education be removed as an *ex officio* member with vote. This recommendation is made to control the size of the Senate Council.

Presently, the Senate Council has fourteen members with vote; this proposal would increase the number of voting members to sixteen: the chair and vice-chair of Senate Council; the ten committee chairs referenced above; three students selected in the same manner as presently used; and the U-C faculty representative of the University Senates Conference.

APPENDIX I

Consent Agenda

We propose that routine matters appear under a "consent agenda," as an item on the Senate Agenda in something like the following format.

XX. Consent Agenda

Items on this list will be voted on as a block. Questions regarding the details of any item should be addressed to the chair of the committee presenting it, prior to the meeting. Requests to remove any item from the consent agenda for discussion on the Senate floor must be filed with the Clerk of the Senate no later than the Wednesday prior to this meeting. (A vote may have to be taken, but this is a matter for the Parliamentarians)

[Listing of routine items (e.g. routine matters from the Committee on Educational Policy or from the Committee on Committees). Items would be listed in the format as at present.]

APPENDIX II

Draft Proposals on Rule Making

The Conference on Conduct Governance as at present constituted has as its primary tasks (1) "review[ing] and transmit[ing] in writing to the Chancellor its approval, disapproval, or modification of standards of conduct ... initiated by sub-communities of the campus" and (2) "initiat[ing] and recommend[ing] in writing to the Chancellor adoption of additional rules it deems desirable".

The Senate Review Commission has recommended that the Conference no longer be a committee of the Senate. What follows are proposals for continuing the important Senate role in the rule-making process on the UIUC campus.

Background

The campus rules governing student conduct are contained in The Code on Campus Affairs and Handbook of Policies and Regulations Applying to All Students. This publication, in its current form, is a complex document containing the Code on Campus Affairs itself with its multiple sections covering individual rights, registered student organizations (including provisions for funding these organizations), regulations covering the use of university premises and facilities, and regulations covering certified student housing. The Handbook of Policies and Regulations Applying to All Students covers a wide variety of topics including statements of the campus policies on nondiscrimination and sexual harassment, statements on student responsibilities and conduct, grievance procedures (including procedures associated with capricious grading), probation and drop rules, registration procedures, grades and grading system, etc. One appendix covers the regulations for determining the residency status of students for the assessment of tuition.

It may well be desirable to have all regulations applying to students in one document which can be widely distributed. However, it must be recognized that the regulations included in the Code have very different sources, intentions, and sanctions and, to the extent that there is an active role for the Senate in developing one or another rule, involve very different routes to the floor of the Senate.

We recommend an immediate major revision of the Code on Campus Affairs and Handbook of Policies and Regulations Applying to All Students with a view to clearly distinguishing between rules concerning

- standards of student conduct broadly conceived,
- issues of educational policy and practice, and
- administrative policies and procedures that do not involve (potential) conduct or academic disciplinary issues.

The existing structure of the Conference on Conduct Governance gives it a clear role in the determination of all rules in the Code. The proposals that follow assume that Conference on Conduct Governance will be discontinued, so that the Senate's role in the process of approval of all rules and regulations applying to students must be reviewed.

Proposed Procedures for the Review, Discussion and Transmission of Rules and Regulations Governing Students

Assumptions

1. The rule-making authority on the Campus is the Chancellor; the ultimate authority for all rule making resides with the President and the Board of Trustees. The Senate's role is advisory.
2. Decisions by the Chancellor on new or revised rules and regulations should occur only after appropriate community-wide discussion and debate. Such community-wide discussion occurs by way of the involvement of the Senate in the rule-making process.
3. The Chancellor, through the Office of Campus Regulations, has primary responsibility for deliberations about, and the drafting of, rules and for the preparation and distribution of the Code of Campus Affairs and the Handbook of Policies and Regulations Applying to All Students and any successor documents that may be developed.

Proposed Procedures for Rule Making

1. Proposals for all rules initiated by sub-communities of the campus (including Senate Committees) will be reviewed, in the first instance, by the Senate Council. The Council may refer such proposals directly to the Senate for its advice and comment or may refer them to appropriate Senate committees for an initial advisory review. Proposals could also be published in the Daily Illini and/or on the Campus network.
2. After such advisory review, proposals for new rules will be filed with the Clerk of the Senate, and will also be included on the Senate agenda as items for discussion only if the Senate Council so decides.
3. After a rule is filed with the Clerk of the Senate or discussed by the Senate (whichever comes later), the Chancellor will make his or her decision about the appropriateness and the text of the rule. Thirty days after the Chancellor files that text with the Office of Campus Regulations (and appropriate publication of the new rule by the Office of Campus Regulations within those thirty days) the rule comes into effect.

Fourth Senate Review Commission

Geneva G. Belford
William F. Brooks
Thomas F. Conry, Chair
P. Judson Kenny
Christian M. Kurrer
Ian D. Westbury