

Minutes
Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting
September 16, 2013

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:12 pm at the Illini Union in Illini Room C with Chancellor Phyllis Wise presiding and Professor Emeritus H. George Friedman, Jr. as Parliamentarian.

Approval of Minutes

09/16/13-01 The minutes from April 22, 2013 and April 29, 2013 were approved as written.

Senate Executive Committee Report

Roy Campbell (ENGR), faculty senator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), requested floor privileges on behalf of Dean of the College of Education Mary Kalantzis and Associate Professor in Education Policy, Organization and Leadership Christopher Span to speak to EP.13.40 and Director of Special Events Laura Wilhelm-Barr and Associate Registrar Rodney Hoewing to speak to EP.14.01.

09/16/13-02 Floor privileges were granted as requested without objection.

Faculty senators H. F. (Bill) Williamson (LAS) and Mary Mallory (LIBR), and student senator Juan Bernal (GRAD) served as tellers for the meeting.

SEC Chair Campbell reminded senators that during Senate meeting Robert's Rules of Order will be used to guide discussion. The Senate and Senate committees are subject to the Open Meetings Act (OMA). An email with the link to OMA online training will be sent soon from the Senate Office.

Abbas Aminmansour asked that senators be reminded of the FAC-IBHE (Faculty Advisory Council to the Board of Higher Education) symposium: "Delivering Higher Education in Five Years" scheduled for 9:30 AM to noon on Friday, September 20, 2013 at the iHotel. Guest speakers are: Dr. Lynne Haeffele, Dr. Sylvia Manning, Dr. Nicholas C. Burbules, and Dr. Mike Baumgartner. More information can be obtained from the FAC-IBHE website.

The title for the Educational Policy proposal EP.13.40 was listed incorrectly in the hard copy version of the Senate packet, but was listed correctly on the website.

The SEC has discussed a variety of issues over the summer. Some of those important issues include Open Access, and the shared governance survey. The shared governance survey was created by the Senate Committee on General University Policy (GUP) and administered to faculty members by the SEC. SEC has asked GUP to analyze the results of the survey on behalf of SEC. Any questions about the shared governance survey should be directed to the GUP Chair; Joyce Tolliver.

Chair Campbell reviewed today's agenda and noted that the Seventh Senate Review Commission membership would be voted on today. The Review Commission is created every six to seven years to review the operations of the Senate to improve processes. The SEC ad hoc Task Force on Faculty Concerns and Issues spent a significant amount of work over the summer reviewing various topics. Those topics and recommendations will be part of the Committee of the Whole discussion towards the end of today's agenda. Campbell suggested allotting twenty minutes for the presentation of information and then no more than 3 minutes per senator for follow-up discussion.

09/16/13-03 Chair Campbell made a motion on behalf of the SEC to reserve approximately 40 minutes of the meeting time for the Committee of the Whole discussion. Hearing no objections, the motion passed by unanimous consent.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Wise noted six topics that she would cover in her remarks. Those six topics include Visioning Future Excellence and the campus strategic plan, freshman enrollment, faculty hiring, diversity initiatives, the faculty salary program and the Task Force on Faculty Issues and Concerns.

The Visioning Future Excellence initiative was completed in approximately eighteen months and concluded in July 2013. Valuable campus and community input was sought from nearly 3,000 faculty, students, staff, and external stakeholders. This information served as the foundation for the new campus strategic plan.

President Easter requested that each campus develop a campus strategic plan for the next three years. The strategic plan outlines very ambitious, but practical goals for next three years. Copies of the campus strategic plan were made available when exiting today's Senate meeting. There are several points falling under the statement that we will be a preeminent public research university with a land grant mission and global impact. Under that statement comes rebuilding our faculty, developing interdisciplinary research centers, investing in the arts and the humanities, enhancing research support and infrastructure for that support, developing transformative learning experiences for both undergraduate and graduate students as well as professional students, enhancing diversity initiatives, increasing student financial support, and enhancing philanthropic support. Many of these initiatives are already underway.

This year there was a record number of applicants; 33,203 applications despite the decrease in the number of high school graduates last year. The number of Illinois residents that applied held steady. Of the high school students with ACT scores of 32 or higher, two-thirds of those students applied to Illinois. There are more in-state students in this freshman class than any of our nine dashboard peers. There were 7,331 student accepted this year which exceeded the goal of 7,100. Of the freshman class, 73% are in-state students, 16% are international students, and 11% are domestic out-of-state students. This class boasts 21.6% first generation students and the highest ever average ACT score of 28.6. This is the most diverse class in the Big Ten, including the highest percentage of international students. Five hundred more Illinois residents were admitted than the prior year, and one hundred more students from Chicago Public Schools were admitted than last year. Seventy percent of transfer students came from Illinois Community Colleges.

Chancellor Wise and Provost Adesida previously announced that there will be 500 new faculty hired over the next 5-7 years. Faculty hires are for new positions where there is student demand, some hires are to replace those that have retired, and also positions that have been left vacant. Cluster hiring will be done around the six themes of Visioning Future Excellence. Cluster hiring takes more effort and to focus that effort, three of the themes will be focused on this year; Energy and the Environment, Health and Wellness, and Social Equality and Cultural Understanding.

In terms of Diversity initiatives, this is not just to increase numbers, but to increase excellence. This is to help students prepare for the global environment. Funding for the Target of Opportunity Program (TOP) has increased from \$75,000 to \$85,000 towards a faculty member of color's salary. If there is a second faculty member of color in same pool that a department wants to hire, the funds have increased from \$45,000 to \$60,000. If a department does not have a search open, but identifies a person of color to recruit, \$85,000 for three years will be provided to the department. If there are three candidates that a department is bringing to campus and there is a fourth equally qualified candidate the department would like to interview, the Office of the Provost will fund the interviewing costs for that fourth faculty member. All organizations whose mission is diversity are being reviewed to optimize efficiency, effectiveness, coordination, and collaboration.

The funds available when promoting faculty members from assistant to associate, and from associate to full have increased. Units can also supplement this further. Funds are targeted towards units that are lagging behind their peers.

The fiscal year 2014 base salary increment for merit was set at 2.75%. An additional .5% went to all units for the compression, market, equity and retention (CMER) funds. Central funds were also designated to areas where salaries were behind a unit's peers. A large majority of this funding went to arts and humanities. In fiscal year 2014, the average faculty salary increase was 4.65% including promoted faculty and not including promoted faculty was an average of 4.16%. Over the last three years there has been a concerted effort to increase faculty salaries in order to match our peers.

Chancellor Wise and Provost Adesida received last week the Task Force Report on Faculty Issues and Concerns. This is an excellent example of the shared governance. The recommendations are reasonable and helpful and the Chancellor and Provost will work with the Senate on how to implement many of the recommendations.

Questions/Discussion

Mallory (LIBR) asked about the shared governance survey conducted in the spring and what the next steps would be. Mallory also asked why the report is going to GUP and why that specific committee was chosen to first look at the results of the survey. Campbell responded that he recommended the report be returned to GUP so that Campbell could bring recommendations back to the full Senate. The survey results are posted on the Senate website so anyone can review the results. GUP originally created the survey and GUP Chair Tolliver and committee have been instrumental in this process so they have been tasked with analyzing the results and making recommendations. Mallory expressed her concerns that GUP would be the only committee to review the survey results, and also noted the importance of the survey and the need to address the issues raised in the survey. Mallory then mentioned the recent climate survey and noted that it appears to her that the climate survey, shared governance survey, and the Task Force on Faculty Issues and Concerns are treated as separate issues. Mallory would like to see more cross-over between the mentioned survey reports. Campbell responded that he expects there to be cross-over in the reports as the Senate proceeds further into the discussion of the issues. The Seventh Senate Review Commission is another avenue to address some of these important topics.

Tolliver (LAS) noted that a high number of people received the survey, but that only a small number, approximately 300 people, responded to the survey. Even with the lack of response, the responses are being taken seriously. GUP developed this very informal survey as a starting point for further discussion of these issues. Depending on the issues, GUP plans to make recommendations to other appropriate committees.

Heller (DGS) asked if the faculty TOP and raises are being funded by tuition. Wise responded that it is being funded by the general revenue fund that is a mix of state funds and tuition.

Consent Agenda

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

- 09/16/13-04 EP.13.40* Proposal from the College of Education to establish a non-licensure Bachelors of Science in Learning and Education Studies with concentrations in: 1) Applied Learning Science; 2) Educational Equality and Cultural Understanding; and 3) Workplace Training and Development.
- 09/16/13-05 EP.14.02* Proposal from the School of Social Work to establish an undergraduate minor in Social Work
- 09/16/13-06 EP.14.03* Proposal from the College of Engineering and the Graduate College to establish a Bioengineering concentration in the Master of Science Bioinformatics

- 09/16/13-07 EP.14.04* Proposal from the College of Education and the Graduate College to terminate the Doctorate of Education (EdD) in Special Education
- 09/16/13-08 EP.14.05* Proposal from the College of Education and the Graduate College to terminate the Doctorate of Education (EdD) in Human Resource Education
- 09/16/13-09 EP.14.06* Proposal from the College of Fine and Applied Arts to establish an undergraduate minor in Art and Design
- Proposals (enclosed)**
- 09/16/13-10 CC.14.03* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate
On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Prasanta Kalita moved approval of the nominees presented on CC.14.03. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 09/16/13-11 By voice, the candidates on CC.14.03 were approved.
- 09/16/13-12 CC.14.04* Nominations for Membership on the Seventh Senate Review Commission
On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Kalita noted that Kim Graber no longer wished to serve as chair due to an increase in her commitments. Abbas Aminmansour agreed to chair the Review Commission. Kalita moved approval of the nominees presented on CC.14.04 with Abbas Aminmansour serving as chair. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 09/16/13-13 By voice vote, the candidates on CC.14.04 were approved.
- 09/16/13-14 SP.13.08* Revision to *Standing Rule 14*
On behalf of USSP, committee Chair William Maher introduced proposal SP.13.08. The original *Standing Rule 14* was written in 2011. The restructuring of *Standing Rule 14* was prompted by a request to make changes from GUP. Substantive changes included adding the SEC's ability to postpone an individual proposal by one meeting. The proposal is to delete the old language deleted and replace is with the new language. Chair Maher requested that it be made clear that the background documents are part of the consideration of what the committee is putting forward as background information. Chair Maher moved approval of SC.13.08. No discussion followed.
- 09/16/13-15 By voice vote, Revisions to *Standing Rule 14* were approved.
- 09/16/13-16 SP.14.05* Proposed Revisions to the *Bylaws*, Part D.12 – Committee on Honorary Degrees
On behalf of USSP, committee Chair Maher introduced and moved approval of SP.14.05. This proposal simply removes the words "in executive session" to bring the *Bylaws* into compliance with Open Meetings Act (OMA). No discussion followed.
- 09/16/13-17 By voice vote, SP.14.05 was approved.
- 09/16/13-18 EP.14.01* Proposal to revise the 2013-2014 Academic Calendar
On behalf of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC), committee Chair Gay Miller introduced and moved approval of EP.14.01. Academic calendars are compiled years in advance with no way of anticipating issues such as the remodeling of the State Farm Center (Assembly Hall). The change in venue to Memorial Stadium is proposed as there is no other venue large enough to accommodate commencement ceremonies. The proposal also requests that a follow-up occur to evaluate the change in commencement from Sunday to Saturday, and also evaluate the change from two campus ceremonies to one campus ceremony. Francis (LAS), Chair of the

Committee on Commencement, conveyed the Committee on Commencement's agreement with the EPC proposal. No discussion followed.

09/16/13-19 By voice vote, EP.14.01 was approved.

Current Benefits Issues

John Kindt, Chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits reminded those present that if an individual employee contacts a representative regarding an issue, University resources cannot be used in support of any political activities and any political activities must not interfere with employment obligations to the University. All governmental offices may be reached by the state directory switchboard operators at 217-782-2000 if an individual has concerns.

Kindt noted that there are three different websites available to stay informed of benefits issues; www.suiaa.org, NESSIE (Net-driven Employee Self-Service and Information Environment), and www.surs.com. The committee's annual report can be found online on the Senate's website and hard copies are available from Kindt after the meeting.

There is a committee meeting right now that consists of five Illinois senators and five members of the house. This committee is called the Conference Committee on SB1 and members of this committee can be identified by performing an internet search on the committee name. SB stands for Senate Bill 1 and is the major pension benefits revision bill. The major issue of concern involves COLA (cost of living adjustment). The COLA is 3%, but the media is reporting that this will be cut by 50%. This affects everyone. The best proposal is setting the state COLA at the same rate as the federal COLA. The current proposal cutting COLA by 50% adds up over 25 years to a 40-50% cut in their standard of living. This is a very contentious issue. Nelson (LAS) noted that there are a significant number of retirees that have already lost their free health care. The Senate should keep in mind that this affects all employees, and not just faculty. Constitutional nullification of certain benefits will have serious implications in the future.

Reports

09/16/13-20 HE.13.09* FAC/ IBHE Report – May 17, 2013
 09/16/13-21 SC.14.03* BOT Observer Report – July 25, 2013
 09/16/13-22 UC.13.09* USC Report – May 15, 2013
 09/16/13-23 UC.13.10* USC Report – June 18, 2013

In regards to the June 18 University Senates Conference (USC) Report, Weech (LISC) asked for clarification on what items of concern about the structure of the Academy on Capitalism and Limited Government were and were not addressed. Burbules responded that the USC expressed a number of concerns about the organization, funding, mission statement, and website. The website has been completely overhauled. The mission statement has been made much less ideological. Their events have a much lower profile. One of the outstanding issues that have not been addressed is the composition of the board of directors of the Academy. There is a tax law for supporting organizations, which the Academy is considered, that states that the majority of the board members have to be appointed by the supported organization. This was not the case so the board has been reorganized and the composition is very different from the original composition, but to Burbules's understanding is still not in full compliance. This was an Urbana campus issues, but when funding shifted to more than one campus it became a cross-campus issue and the USC became involved.

09/16/13-24 HD.14.01* Request for Nominations for Honorary Degrees

Committee of the Whole

09/16/13-25 Hearing no objections, the Senate moved into the committee of the whole discussion by unanimous consent.

Burbules:

This Task Force report started with a statement Randy McCarthy and I presented to the Senate last spring. Instead of a divisive fight over unionization, we wanted to try to change the campus conversation toward identifying the specific concerns and needs of faculty, and how we can better address them within the framework of shared governance.

We think the Task Force succeeded spectacularly, and we are very grateful to the twelve other participants who gave up so much of their summers to work with us in producing this report.

The Task Force included Senate leadership and the chairs of the relevant Senate committees. It did most of its work in three subcommittees, chaired by Randy, myself, and Joyce Tolliver. Each committee met repeatedly over the summer, including numerous meetings with administrative colleagues who shared information and helped develop realistic, achievable solutions to the issues raised.

We want to thank the members of the administration who met with us, answered all of our questions, and were extremely forthcoming with information, including confidential information that allowed us to do our job.

The result is not just a bunch of ideas, but in effect, a joint statement with the administration in which there is already mutual buy-in and commitment to making these reforms work. This is the way shared governance is supposed to function, and we hope that the Senate Executive Committee and relevant Senate committees will work with the administration in developing mechanisms to implement these recommendations. Of course, where these entail actionable items, they will come before the full Senate for a vote.

Randy, Joyce and I will briefly summarize the eighteen recommendations.

McCarthy:

Recommendation 1: For several years the campus has conducted a review of average salaries in each department by rank. This past year, the Provost has begun to systematically address the pay discrepancies that these reviews revealed. It will take a substantial influx of salary revenue, on the order of \$10 million, to realign salaries across the entire campus. It is not recommended that higher salaries be accomplished by relying on non-tenure track faculty but by maintaining our history of offering classes taught by active tenure track researchers.

We recommend that the steps begun this year should be continued to a general multi-year program to bring faculty salaries up to a highly competitive level and that faculty should be involved with administration in monitoring our progress.

Recommendation 2: It is important that we consider the total compensation, which includes salary, but also research and travel support, retirement, health plans and other benefits. A competitive compensation package requires significant financial resources and

there are many variables. Gains in salary, for example, may end up being offset by increased costs in health care premiums.

We recommend that the campus create a comparison model that combines both salary and other benefits.

Burbules:

Recommendation 3: The proposed Compensation Review Committee would be modeled on the structure of the Campus Budget Oversight Committee: a faculty committee that meets with the Provost and his staff to review the competitiveness (externally) and the equitability (internally) of our overall compensation package – not only salary, but as Randy just said, salary and benefits. This committee would have access to campus data from all units, and would propose areas in which gaps or inequities need to be addressed.

Recommendation 4: The pension issue is difficult because so little of it is within our control, and because the political dynamics in Springfield are a continually shifting target. We supported the IGPA approach, not because we think it is perfect – we call it the best of a bad set of options – but because it does two things we think are essential. First, it accepts the inevitability that the pension system is going to change, and tries to engage that reality in a way that would give the university somewhat greater control over the program. Second, it addresses the serious problems with the so-called “Tier II” program for employees hired after January 2011, which none of the other major proposals talk about. We say that the IGPA plan is not ideal, and we are open to other realistic alternatives that address these two major concerns.

McCarthy:

Recommendation 5: We have suggested a holistic view of salary and benefits as part of an overall compensation package. One major problem the task force recognized was a lack of clear information about what our current benefits are. The information is on the Web, but in scattered locations. We have, for example, fairly strong family leave policies but awareness of them varies greatly from unit to unit.

We recommend that a more user friendly and comprehensive faculty handbook about benefits be created.

Burbules:

Recommendation 6: We think that budget transparency is an area where we can do better. We have had budget presentations from campus and university financial officers before. We recommend making those regular annual events. We want to strengthen the role of the Senate Budget committee in helping to plan those sessions so that they highlight the kinds of information faculty most want to hear about. We also want to strengthen the role of the Budget committee in monitoring how well department and college level governance is following the statutory requirement that unit officers prepare unit budgets in consultation with their executive committees. We have reason to think, based on the survey GUP did last year that this practice is uneven across the campus.

McCarthy:

Recommendation 7: The key metric in determining deferred maintenance is the facility condition index which is the ratio of deferred maintenance to the current replacement value. An index of 10% is the borderline between a well maintained campus and one that is deteriorating. In 2007, our index was a staggering 23% but through a combination of

bonds, the introduction of a student fee and money from Administration, it was down to 16% by 2012. It will take over \$200 million in additional moneys to reach an index of 10%. However, the only recurring money dedicated to differed maintenance is the student fee. We need at least \$20 million more a year in recurring funds to maintain our facilities and we recommend that a realistic plan be developed to not only restore but maintain our campus.

Tolliver:

My subcommittee colleagues and I were tasked with looking into how well the decision-making process for promotion and tenure works on our campus. What we were looking for was how well our P and T processes conform to the basic principles of fairness, transparency, and consistency. What we found was that, in general, they do pretty well, particularly at the level of the campus. But we also identified some areas in which we thought there was room for improvement.

A couple of these areas have to do with strengthening our existing support systems for faculty, and we have suggested ways that the provost's office might help colleges and units provide more consistent support. We also noted some procedural areas where we thought the principles of transparency, consistency, and fairness could be better enacted, and our recommendations for change in those areas will need to be considered carefully.

I want to emphasize this: no recommendation for changes in procedural practices in P&T can be acted upon without serious consideration by several parties. Clearly, the deans will need to weigh in on some of the recommendations; the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will give its advice to the full Senate about others; and perhaps some might be considered by GUP. So, please don't think that this Committee of the Whole discussion is your only chance to respond to the Task Force recommendations.

When we looked at the consistency of P and T procedures across campus, we found that not everyone's case for promotion or tenure gets the same amount of review. Some faculty are in departments that are housed in Schools that are, in turn, housed in Colleges, and those cases get reviewed at each of these levels before they get to the campus committee-- for a total of four levels of review. Other faculty are in small colleges where there is effectively only one level of review before the case is considered by the campus committee, so they have two levels of review.

Recommendation 8: We think reducing this *range* of levels of review would make our processes more fair across campus units. We have suggestions about how to do this, but we did not urge any single course of action.

Another area in which our procedures vary from unit to unit has to do with those cases in which individuals might be in a position to vote on the same case at more than one level. Imagine that you're a member of your college executive meeting, and one of your departmental colleagues is being considered for tenure and promotion.

Communication 9 makes it clear that you can't vote at both levels, but at which level *can* you vote?

Some colleges leave this up to the individual. We think this leaves open the possibility that individual faculty members might use their votes to game the system, by voting where they think their vote will count for more, choosing different levels for different candidate cases. This is neither consistent nor transparent.

The Task Force Recommendation 9 leaves open the question of at *which* level the vote should be cast, but says that colleges should formulate clear policies on this matter and apply them consistently.

Another area we considered is what happens when a unit is trying to recruit a senior scholar, someone who would come with tenure already. So an off-cycle review needs to be done, expeditiously but carefully.

So, Recommendation 10 is that: For the sake of transparency and consistency, we recommend that our campus documents include some language about how to do these reviews. These requirements might be very broad, to allow flexibility and agility – but we believe there should be at least some common guidelines across colleges.

Probably the procedural aspect of promotion and tenure that we spent most time thinking about was what happens when a recommendation for *denial* of promotion or tenure is appealed. Currently, Communication 10 states that the default is that these appeals be heard by the *same committee that issued the denial*. It does allow for the candidate to "make a compelling case" that the appeal should be heard by a specially-constituted committee. However, our subcommittee concluded that the process would be more fair if we reversed the default and the exception:

Recommendation 11: The default should be that the appeal be heard by a committee *different from* the committee that decided to *deny* the promotion or tenure. There may be times when the candidate actually *wants* the case to go back to the same committee, in which case that should be what happens, if the candidate requests it.

We also saw some ways that the language in Communication 10 might be made more consistent and less ambiguous, and we reflect that in Recommendation 11 as well.

In the course of our conversations with Craig Koslofsky, he noted that sometimes FAC receives requests for advice on grievances from specialized academic staff members whose contract has not been renewed. We realized that our campus documents do not set out any such procedure.

This led us to make Recommendation 12.

The last two recommendations in the section on P and T have to do, not with our decision-making processes *per se*, but with making sure that faculty members are provided with the best possible support by their department heads and deans in the years leading up to the tenure or promotion decision, and in the months when that decision is being made.

We want to be sure that everyone who is considered for promotion or tenure benefits from scrupulously well-informed, expert support from their department head, so we

recommend that our colleagues in the provost's office redouble their efforts to stress the importance of training in this area: Recommendation 13.

Finally, while we applaud the assiduous work already being done by the Provost's Office to support the mentoring of assistant and associate professors, we also note that part of this support comes in the form of the annual performance evaluations that are carried out at the department level. We want to be sure that everyone who will be considered for tenure and promotion gets regular feedback on their progress, so Recommendation 14: we encourage the Provost's Office to make sure every college has guidelines for best mentoring practices, and that every college enforces the requirement of annual performance reviews.

McCarthy:

Recommendation 15: The Faculty Advisory Committee, created by the Senate, provides guidance to faculty on personnel matters and serves as a formal faculty grievance committee once other avenues of appeal have been exhausted. In order to make the FAC and its functions better known to the faculty, we recommend the FAC annual report be forwarded to the senate and communication number 10 revised.

Recommendation 16: When first elected to the senate, I was told: The role of the Senate is to chew deliberately on new ideas of administrators until the administrators leave, and then to adopt the good ideas which survive the long grinding process. This is a good thing but we also need a means for more timely decisions while maintaining transparency, accountability and democratic participation. We recommend that the Seventh Senate Review Committee consider this problem.

Burbules:

Recommendation 17: If we are going to have to do more to reallocate our resources, then unit reviews, and possible closures or consolidations, are going to be a fact of life. But where these are going to be considered, we think it is essential that they be done in accordance with due process. One thing we have seen on occasion is creating a *de facto* program closure or change merely through the transfer of faculty. It may be a voluntary transfer, it may even be at the request of the faculty; but where these transfers occur, there needs to be some formal review of their programmatic implications.

Recommendation 18: Our sense is that shared governance is strong on this campus. Others nationally see us as a model of shared governance, and anyone who reads the papers knows a number of instances over the past six or eight years where the Senate has asserted itself in very effective ways. But we can always do better, and the survey that the Senate conducted last year shows that there are areas where we ought to do better. We need to foster better respect and trust between faculty and members of the administration (most of whom are also faculty), and need to do more to raise awareness of shared governance and why it is the best form of organization for decision-making and building faculty support for change. This recommendation addresses those concerns. Over the course of this year, the Senate will be considering even more ways to ensure that shared governance works well at *all* levels of the campus.

Chair Campbell thanked the task force for all of the work that they did and asked for questions.

Kindt served on the task force and applauded all of the hard work of task force. There are two primary recommendations on benefits issues. In recommendation 4, a report published by the Institute of Government and Public Affairs (IGPA) is routinely referred to as the "IGPA report". Last spring when pension issues were a major issue before the legislature, input was not accepted and many associates around the state pushed for a fair review of the IGPA report by decision makers who were considering these issues. The continued push resulted in a hearing before the Conference Committee on SB1. There is one item in the IGPA report that involves a reduction in the COLA. The task force nor Kindt concur with the COLA reductions and are not endorsed by Kindt or the task force.

Kindt added that we have a constitutional provision from the 1970s called the non-impairment provision that protects our benefits. Last fall, the legislature tried to remove this provision, but was defeated.

Nelson (LAS) noted that he would have liked to see more information about non-tenure track cases. Nelson recommended adding non-tenure track (NTT) faculty to recommendation 12 and 14 to make sure they have the same protections. Nelson also recommended having more provisions for NTT faculty similar to what is offered at Michigan University. Also give more information about patterns and discrepancies for NTT faculty from college to college and departments to departments. Nelson gave his strong opinion to not endorse recommendation 4, and especially noted that the reduction in the COLA not be endorsed.

Bielski-Boris (LER) expressed her concern that as there is a very diverse group of faculty on this campus, that there should have been a more comprehensive review for all faculty types and not just tenure track. Bielski-Boris suggested that a survey should have been conducted to gather opinions before the recommendations were made.

Burbules responded to Nelson by stating that the task force was not charged with looking at NTT faculty members, but the task force would be open to expanding the scope to include NTT faculty. The IGPA plan was the best available solution, but the task force does not endorse the reduction to the COLA. Burbules responded to Bielski-Boris that this report was brought to the Senate and to the faculty for review and feedback. This report is not, nor was it meant to be a final statement. This report is a starting point for a wider conversation.

Ando (ACES) noted that recommendation 6 would have the Senate Committee on the Budget very busy. Ando felt that the statements about University Laboratory High School were misleading and not well thought out.

Oberdeck (LAS) commented that the task force created a very comprehensive set of objectives of pressing issues. The structure of small groups of constituents meeting with top administrators should not continue and would like to see a more robust representation of faculty across the campus. The process of disseminating information, holding discussion, and receiving feedback takes time and that time should be taken to review concerns. The senate is a good platform to continue these discussions.

O'Brien (FAA) spoke about the report not addressing NTT faculty issues. O'Brien asked if NTT faculty could be included in this report. Other universities have standards and regular reviews of NTT faculty and also a formal promotion line for NTT.

Kindt clarified that this report is for open discussion and does not endorse the IGPA report or the reduction in the COLA. Kindt understood that other universities have conceded to the reduction in the COLA so it is an immediate concern.

Burbules responded to O'Brien that this report does not address all problems and that NTT faculty could be folded into some of these recommendations. The *Statutes* define the faculty as tenure

and tenure track. There are reasons why there are distinctions in the *Statutes*. This does not minimize the issues and concerns about NTT faculty.

Mallory (LIBR) commented that NTT faculty members have become so important to the university and that maybe the *Statutes* should include NTT faculty members. Recommendation 16 states that there have not been any obvious violations of procedures outlined in *Statutes VIII.4* and *Standing Rule 13* since their adoption. Mallory disagrees that there have been violations. Sometimes there are hearings, but not a faculty vote. This should be further investigated before any decisions are made. Mallory questioned why on page 22 of the report, it indicates that the task force was not subject to the Open Meetings Act.

Kalita (ACES) noted that he served on one of the subcommittees of the task force and was under the impression that the NTT faculty issues were being addressed by another group.

O'Brien (FAA) recommended better defining of the faculty.

09/16/13-26

A motion was made for the committee of the whole to rise and report. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

New Business

No new business.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

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