

Minutes
Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting

February 28, 2011

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:15 p.m. on the 3^d floor of the Levis Faculty Center with Interim Chancellor Robert Easter presiding and Professor Emeritus H. George Friedman, Jr. as Parliamentarian.

Approval of Minutes

02/28/11-01 The minutes of November 1, November 8 (as amended), and December 6 were approved.

Senate Executive Committee Report

Senator Joyce Tolliver (LAS), Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), reported that today's handout is GP.11.03, Proposal to Establish the Institute for Genomic Biology, which will be moved from Consent Agenda to Proposals for Action.

Floor privileges were requested for Professor Doug Beck (ENGR), Chair of the Search Committee to Advise the President on the Selection of a Chancellor. Senator Tolliver moved such privileges be granted; there was no objection.

The Senate approved a motion to re-order the agenda so SC.11.09, Senate Statement on the Roles of the Campus and the Chancellor, would be first to be considered under the Proposals for Action rubric. There was no objection.

Professor Abbas Aminmansour (FAA), Educational Policy Committee Chair, moved to refer back to his Committee the one item under Old Business: EP.11.15, Proposal from the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to Eliminate the B.S. in Aviation Human Factors, the Professional Pilot Curriculum, and the M.S. in Human Factors in the Institute of Aviation. Professor Aminmansour indicated that the Committee has since received a proposal from the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor to close the Institute of Aviation and related procedural measures (e.g., Public Hearing) will need to be completed prior to returning EP.11.15 to the Senate.

By voice vote, the motion was approved.

Tellers for today's meeting are Nicholas Burbules (EDUC), Clif Brown (BUS), and Kevin Waspi (BUS).

Chair Tolliver then provided the following report.

I. Report for information: February 18 Letter from C. Kennedy:

I was very happy to receive this communication from Chris Kennedy, who chairs the Board of Trustees, and he asked me to share the letter with you all. I am really delighted that Mr. Kennedy has responded to the SEC's call, in our Statement, for the beginning of a university-wide conversation about the future of the University. You'll see that he also proposes a mechanism for communication between faculty and Board members, and I find this a very positive suggestion.

Mr. Kennedy and I are in continued communication about these matters. He called me this morning to touch base and to continue our conversation, and I am hopeful that we will come to an agreement about how to structure a university-wide discussion of future administrative structures.

II. Administrative Restructuring: Developments since we last met on December 6:

You may have read the University Update that the President sent by email yesterday. In answer to the question, "Where are we with the Administrative Review & Restructuring (ARR) report and the efficiencies it recommends?", he responds, in part, "We're actively implementing the ARR reforms in many areas, including procurement, capital projects, human resources, and information technology. More work will be ongoing."

I'd like to give you some details about recent changes. Please bear with me; there is a lot to say, and you need to know it all.

I have copied much of the information I will give you into a PowerPoint presentation.

First, a little background about the ARR report that is referred to as the basis for the changes that have been implemented and planned in our administrative structures:

The Administrative Review and Restructuring Working Group was appointed in November 2009 by Interim President Stan Ikenberry "to conduct an assessment of the organizational structure and delivery of administrative services at the University of Illinois and to recommend a set of reforms and changes to improve performance as well as to reduce cost."

The ARR Working Group examined 7 areas of our operations, with subcommittees charged with analyzing each area:

1. Communications, Public Relations, & Publications
2. Information Technology

3. Procurement
4. Service Centers
5. Human Resources
6. Regulatory Relief
7. Facilities, Capital Program, and Auxiliaries

The ARR Working Group issued its report on June 15 of last year; it is available online at <http://www.uillinois.edu/arr/Reports/>.

In the email message he wrote to distribute the report, Interim President Ikenberry summarized the importance of the recommendations by singling out the ARR Working Group's recommendation that the VPTED and the VPAA positions be combined, adding, "This initial step ... is intended to signal a much broader opportunity to improve functioning by reducing the number of senior executive positions at all levels, reducing layers of management, and capturing the synergies to improve performance."

Since we last met on December 6, SIX new administrative positions have been created and filled at the UA level. None of them are explicitly recommended in the ARR report.

In what follows, I will give you a summary of relevant ARR recommendations, of the nature of the position, and of the consultation of faculty that was carried out before making the appointments.

1. Appointment of Interim VPHA:

ARR Recommendation: The ARR working group noted that "The President and Chancellors are urged to consider ways to better coordinate the University's growing set of activities that deal with the training of health professionals and research in medical fields, as well as its linkage to key departments in state government, the various health-related agencies of the City of Chicago and Cook County, federal agencies, and other health partners around the State," adding that "new organizational designs may be required to ensure full articulation of all the University's health-related activities."

Consultation: Mandated by General Rules:

"Prior to recommending to the Board of Trustees the initial appointment of any university officer except for the president and the vice presidents/chancellors, the president shall seek the advice of the University Senates Conference. On the occasion of the reappointment of any University officer, the University Senates Conference may submit its advice if it so elects."

The mandated consultation took the following form:

President Hogan sent an email message during winter break to USC asking that individual members contact him with their thoughts about the desired characteristics of the individuals to fill these positions.

USC requested an opportunity to meet with the President as a group to discuss this broad question, as well as potential individual candidates.

The President promised to bring to the January 26 USC meeting the CVs of the individuals he had already selected to fill the two positions approved by the Board.

At that meeting, the President told USC members that he had forgotten to bring the CVs, but he told us the names of the individuals and told us a bit about their backgrounds.

At the USC business meeting, those present searched for the CVs of the individuals selected on the internet in order to produce a general sense of the appropriateness of the appointments.

2. Appointment of Interim VPR:

ARR: As Dr. Ikenberry's June message mentioned, ARR recommended that the position of VPTED be combined with the position of VPAA under the title Executive Vice President, for a net loss of one Vice President.

What changed:

In accordance with the proposed changes to the *Statutes* that were approved by the Board in November, the new position of VPHA was created, and the position of VPTED was reconfigured to include Research. The title was changed to VPR.

The President stated at the February 18 meeting with USC that there would be no reporting line between campus Vice Chancellors for Research and the new VPR, Dr. Larry Schook.

Dr. Avijit Ghosh, who was the VPTED, has now been named Special Assistant the President. He will be in charge of all implementation of ARR recommendations. This was the position for which Former President Ikenberry was named Special Assistant back in July.

Consultation: Merged with VPHA consultation.

3. Executive Director of Human Resources:

ARR Report recommendation:

ARR Recommendations 24 and 25 call for an immediate review of all policies governing AP positions; and that a task force be charged with “reviewing current benefits and making any changes to those benefits.” This includes taking “immediate steps to review the potential impacts of changes to the pension system for new employees on its ability to remain competitive as an employer.”

There is no ARR recommendation that a new UA-level position be created to oversee HR functions on the three campuses.

What changed:

A UA-level Executive Director of HR was created. Campus-level HR directors now report to the UA-level Executive Director.

On Feb. 11, the President announced to the Chancellors, to the Campus Senate chairs, and to a group of about twenty UA-level administrators that he had appointed Maureen Parks to this position. Ms. Parks had previously served as the Coordinator of HR for the UA level. The February 11 announcement states that she will “oversee all non-academic human resource operations and policy making for the University.”

Consultation: In October, USC was told that there were plans to appoint an Executive Director to centralize “back-office” functions—that is, administrative aspects of HR.

We discussed these plans at our next meeting in November, where concerns arose that there appeared to be plans to centralize not just administrative aspects of HR, but also HR academic functions such as promotion and tenure. These areas are, of course, academic, and so fall under the authority of the faculty according to the *Statutes*: “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.” (III.2.b)

USC members wrote a letter to the President expressing concern about what seemed to be a plan to bypass the authority of the faculty in defiance of the *Statutes*. We requested a special meeting with the President to discuss these concerns. This request was denied.

4. Centralization of Labor Negotiation: Executive Director of Labor and Employee Relations

ARR Recommendation:

There is no one position within the University charged with the responsibility of developing overall human capital strategy, labor negotiation strategies and appropriate HR systems.”

What changed: Negotiations with unions will now be coordinated through a central office, headed by Mr. Steve Veazie, who comes from University Legal Counsel.

Consultation: The Senates and the University Senates Conference were not asked for their input on this change.

5. IT centralization and appointment of Executive Director of IT:

In that same February 11 email message, President Hogan announced the appointment of Mr. Michael Hites to the position of Executive Chief Information Officer for the University.

ARR report recommendation:

There IS a general recommendation, not specific to IT, that “shared services should be considered as a cost-effective alternative to decentralization, consolidation or centralization of administrative services” and that “the University should put in place an organizational change management team to serve as an ongoing resource for the identification, review, and implementation of a shared or centralized service.”

Regarding IT specifically, the ARR report says this: ARR recommendations 20-23 call for strengthening the role of the University Technology Management Team, for “continued strategic investments in technology” be made to “support the core mission and enhance revenues,” for an “enhancement” of the Enterprise system, and for a reduction in operating costs through such changes as the termination of our contract with Centrex for telephone service.

There is no ARR recommendation that IT functions, policies, or services be centralized.

What changed: Michael Hites’s previous position was as coordinator of IT for the UA functions. His title was Associate Vice President for Administrative Information Technology Services. He will retain that same title, but his portfolio will be expanded in order to oversee information technology currently

being planned and administered on the campus level. Mr. Hites will report to VP/CFO Water Knorr.

Now, each campus-level Chief Information Officer will report to Mr. Hites.

In his February 11 announcement, the President specified that “Matters pertaining to academic and research IT will be handled at the campus level.”

We should also expect that the newly-created centralization of IT will NOT extend to areas such as NCSA, Beckman Institute, and other research centers.

Consultation: In January, the President told USC that “back-office” IT functions would be centralized and he mentioned the name of the person he had decided to appoint.

Shortly before the appointment was announced to the campus administrative and faculty leadership, the President informed the University Technology Management Team—which has one faculty representative from USC—that Michael Hites had been chosen as the new Executive CIO.

An external consulting group—the Huron Group, which also served as consultants for the ARR Working Group—was hired to provide suggestions. Some of those suggestions, again, go far beyond the recommendations of the ARR report. While it is not clear which of these recommendations will be actually implemented, two that are of special concern were centralizing control over “teaching and learning technologies” and recentralizing “distance education,” a disturbing trend for those of us who lived through the failed Global Campus initiative.

I have written to the President asking him to confirm that the “academic and research IT” referred to in his February 11 message will include such aspects of IT as classroom technology, student computing, and faculty support. Given that the *Statutes* clearly delegate authority to the campuses and to the colleges in such matters, I assume that he will confirm that the *Statutes* are indeed being followed and that it is NOT the case that CITES will be reporting to the new UA-level CIO. I am still in conversation with the President as I try to understand whether there is any plan that academic or research aspects of IT be centralized.

6. What is ahead: Enrollment Management

This area involves plans to move administration of financial aid away from the campuses and to the UA level. It may also involve the processing of admissions.

According to the *Statutes*, of course, it CANNOT involve admissions policies or decisions; as you know, the *Statutes* specify that it is the Senates who set admissions policy and the colleges who set admissions decisions.

If, for example, part of the plan were to involve the transfer of students from one campus to another, that would fall under Admissions and so could NOT be centralized without violating the *Statutes*.

Vice President of Academic Affairs Meena Rao convened a committee last fall to consider this question. The President has not met with that committee, as far as I know. Their report should be forthcoming soon.

At the February 18 meeting of USC, the President informed us that he had asked two outside consultants to visit each of the three campuses in order to make recommendations regarding Enrollment Management. The consultants are the Vice President for Enrollment Planning & Management at the University of Connecticut; and the Vice Provost and Director of Admissions at the University of Texas at Austin. They visited our campus last week.

ARR: The ARR report makes no recommendations at all regarding enrollment management.

Consultation: USC was informed of the visit of the outside consultants.

Of the seven areas of analysis identified by the ARR group, four have not yet been addressed: Communications, Public Relations, and Publications; Procurement; Facilities, Capital Program, and Auxiliaries; and Regulatory Relief.

NONE of the appointments made since December 6 are explicitly recommended in the ARR report.

When one examines the six areas of new centralization, and the corresponding appointments—which carry with them the attendant additional costs of new staff, offices, and supplies—we find a marked departure from the general orientation of the ARR report. Where the ARR report did seek savings, it was through “shared services” and consolidation of “back office operations.” The six new appointments announced—and put into motion—in the past three months reflect a significant centralization of decision-making, and new reporting lines that circumvent campus-level officers to put campus staff

directly under the control of UA officials. It is not at all clear that the ARR report authorizes such centralization, nor that it proposes or even justifies the centralized administrative and decision-making model under which the self-governance of the campuses is, I think, being reduced.

The consultation process through which these changes were made was perfunctory. Members of the SEC and of the USC have expressed our desire to the President for a more thorough and, above all, a more genuine consultative process. While the *General Rules* and the *Statutes* set out a bare minimum of consultation that must be followed, the provision in the *Statutes* that it is the faculty who have “inherent rights” over academic matters would indicate that consultation should be much more extensive than this bare minimum. This is especially so now, at a time when we must make crucial decisions about what structures and practices will best position us to thrive in a time of reduced support from the State.

The self-governance of the campuses is directly tied to the authority of the chancellors. It is the sense of the SEC that this authority runs the danger of being undermined by what seems to be a top-down administrative model that is being imposed incrementally. This cannot be good for our campus or for the University. Our students want their diplomas to show that their degrees were granted on the recommendation of the faculty of our campus; faculty members will not thrive in a research environment that hampers them with added bureaucratic constraints; and no one wants to work in an environment in which decisions are made by those who are ever further away from the arena in which their impact will be felt.

In his letter of February 18, which you have in your packet, Chair Kennedy states that the Board and the senior university leadership are convinced of the “one university, three campuses” model. However, the appropriateness and the implications of that model have not been agreed to, and in fact have never been presented for real debate. Central to that discussion is the fact that it is far from clear what that phrase implies. Variations on the phrase are used in the official documents of several universities, but there are differences among the administrative structures of those universities, and differences from our own structures.

For this reason, I have asked a group of my campus colleagues to produce a report of their research into how a variety of public multi-campus universities structure their academic and administrative enterprises. Paul Diehl chairs that ad hoc committee. They are working hard and I understand that we will discuss their report at our next meeting. My hope is that their report will serve as an informational basis for the urgently-needed conversation on this crucial topic, so that we can move beyond discussions of semantics and on to the

fundamental question of our shared understanding of what defines the University of Illinois.

We are now in the midst of a Chancellor Search, and the Board and the Search Committee are united in their desire to find the very best chancellor in the country to be the next leader of our campus. It is crucial that we make it known, as widely and as quickly as possible, that the faculty and the students of this campus do indeed want and will support a leader who will be the primary face of this campus, who will represent us in University, local, state, and national venues in ways that make us proud (as our Interim Chancellor has), and who will maintain and nurture the reputation of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign as a premier public research and teaching university.

Senate Executive Committee Chair Joyce Tolliver then turned the podium over to Professor Doug Beck, Chair of the Search Committee to Advise the President on the Selection of a Chancellor, who provided the following report on the work of his Committee.

The goal of the Search Committee is to recruit the best person in the country. We are poised to do that: our new Chancellor will have the opportunity to take a leading role in a nation-wide conversation among leaders of research universities about new models for success in an age of declining support and increasing international competition. This search is THE premier search going on right now in higher education.

The Search Committee has been meeting every week. The position description is online now. You can read it, and other Search materials, here: <http://www.uillinois.edu/UrbanaChancellorSearch/>

It should appear in the print version of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* this week. The extended position description (“white paper,”) written together by the Search Committee, the President’s Office, and the search firm, Isaacson Miller, is also available online.

The Search Firm plans to make its first presentation of candidates to the Search Committee in early April. The Search Committee plans to have a list of candidates to be interviewed in person (off campus) by early May. The Committee will then recommend a short list of excellent candidates to the President, who will, in turn, make a final recommendation to the Trustees.

A PLEA: While the Search Committee has received about 50 nominations already, it is still actively soliciting nominations. PLEASE let the Committee

know about potential candidates to be our next campus leader. You can do this on the Search website at <http://www.uillinois.edu/UrbanaChancellorSearch/>

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Easter sent kudos to Keith Marshall, Associate Provost for Enrollment Management, and Stacey Kostell, Director of Admissions, for helping to increase next year's applications by 5%. He reported that additional Stewarding Excellence @ Illinois (SEI) project reports will be wrapping up soon, and that the campus is close to naming a speaker for May 2011 Commencement exercises.

Questions/Discussion

There were no questions.

Consent Agenda

Hearing no objection, Dr. Easter pronounced that the following proposals were approved by unanimous consent:

- 02/28/11-02 EP.11.18*, Proposal from GRAD to add a master's thesis as an alternative to the master's examination in East Asian Languages and Cultures
- 02/28/11-03 EP.11.20*, Proposal from LAS to revise the M.S. in Astronomy
- 02/28/11-04 EP.11.21*, Proposal from LAS to revise the Ph.D. in Astronomy
- 02/28/11-05 EP.11.22*, Proposal from ACES to revise the M.S. in Agricultural Education
- 02/28/11-06 EP.11.24*, Proposal from LAS to revise the M.F.A. in Creative Writing
- 02/28/11-07 EP.11.25*, Proposal from ENGR to revise the B.S. in Materials Science and Engineering
- 02/28/11-08 EP.11.26*, Proposal from ACES to Establish an undergraduate minor in Leadership Studies
- 02/28/11-09 EP.11.27*, Proposal from ACES to revise the B.S. in Horticulture
- 02/28/11-10 EP.11.28*, Proposal from ACES to establish a minor in Horticulture
- 02/28/11-11 EP.11.31*, Proposed Guidelines for Degree Completion

Proposals for Action

- 02/28/11-12 SC.11.09*, Senate Statement on the Roles of the Campus and the Chancellor. Senator Joyce Tolliver, Senate Executive Committee Chair, summarized the background of this statement and took issue with some who have characterized it as "anti-President". She then moved its approval.

Senate Minutes
February 28, 2011

- 02/28/11-13 By voice vote, SC.11.09 was approved.
- 02/28/11-14 CC.11.07*, Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate. Professor Kim Graber (AHS), Chair of the Senate Committee on Committees, moved approval of the slate. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 02/28/11-15 By voice, the slate on CC.11.07 was approved.
- 02/28/11-16 CC.11.08*, Nomination to the State Universities Retirement System Members Advisory Committee (SURSMAC). Professor Graber moved approval of the candidate listed on the report. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 02/28/11-17 By voice, CC.11.08 was approved.
- 02/28/11-18 CC.11.09*, Approval of Nominations for the Athletic Board. Professor Graber moved approval of the slate. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 02/28/11-19 By voice, the slate on CC.11.09 was approved.
- 02/28/11-20 Dr. Easter presented for action GP.11.03*, Proposal to Establish the Institute for Genomic Biology. Senator Mary Mallory (LIBR), Chair of the Senate Committee on General University Policy, moved its approval on behalf of her committee. Senator William Maher (LIBR) moved to add the following paragraph to the existing text in item 3 “Organization,” to make the reference to “tenure home” explicit, to wit:
- “IGB will not serve as a “tenure home” as defined in the *University Statutes* Article VIII, Section 1, paragraph b. All of the faculty associated with the Institute for Genomic Biology hold tenure-track or tenured appointments in other existing academic units. If at any future time it should become desirable for IGB to function as a “tenure home,” then the procedures outlined in Article VIII, Section 3 (“Formation of New Units”) will be followed.”
- By voice vote, Senator Maher’s amendment was approved.
- 02/28/11-21 GP.11.03 was approved by voice vote, as amended.

Proposed Revisions to the *Senate Bylaws*

- 02/28/11-22 Chancellor Robert Easter presented for action SP.11.03*, Revision to the *Bylaws*, Part B 6. – Committee on Committees Term of Office. Senator Maher,

Chair of the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP), moved its approval. Senator David Olsen (BUS) expressed concern about the participation of students in the business of the Committee on Committees over the summer, particularly if students graduate. Senator Maher replied that students could still contribute to the work of Committee on Committees, since they conduct almost all of their business electronically.

02/28/11-23 By show of hands (84-6), SP.11.03 was approved.

Proposed Revisions to the *Senate Standing Rules*

02/28/11-24 Dr. Easter presented for action SP.11.06*, Proposed *Standing Rule 14* – Setting the Agenda for Senate Meetings. Senator Maher moved its approval on behalf of his committee.

02/28/11-25 By voice vote, SP.11.06 was approved.

Proposed Revision to the *Senate Constitution*

02/28/11-26 The Presiding Officer presented for information and first reading SP.11.05*, Proposed Revision to the *Senate Constitution*, Article II, Section 6 – Nomination Procedures. Senator Maher explained that this measure is designed to rectify a discrepancy between the *Senate Constitution* and *Faculty Election Rules*. He reminded senators that this proposal will return for second reading and action at the March 28 Senate meeting.

Reports for Information

02/28/11-27 CC.11.06* Search Committee to Advise the President on the Selection of a Vice-President and Chancellor of the Urbana-Champaign Campus: Tally of Votes Cast and Membership

02/28/11-28 SC.11.08* November 18 BOT

02/28/11-29 SC.11.10* January 20 BOT

02/28/11-30 HE.11.04* December 10 FAC/IBHE

02/28/11-31 HE.11.05* January 21 FAC/IBHE

02/28/11-32 HE.11.06* February 15 FAC/IBHE

02/28/11-33 SS.11.01* February 28, 2011, Letter from University Board of Trustees Chair Chris Kennedy to Senate Executive Committee Chair Joyce Tolliver

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Robert C. Damrau, Senate Clerk

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