

AGENDA

Senate of the Urbana-Champaign Campus

October 21, 2013; 3:10 pm

Illini Union – Illini Room C

- I. **Call to Order** – Vice Provost Barbara Wilson
- II. **Approval of Minutes** – September 16, 2013
- III. **Senate Executive Committee Report** – Chair Roy Campbell
- IV. **Chancellor's Remarks** – Vice Provost Barbara Wilson
- V. **Questions/Discussion**
- VI. **Consent Agenda**

These items will only be distributed via www.senate.illinois.edu/131021.asp. If a senator wishes to move an item from the Consent Agenda to Proposals and have copies at the meeting, they must notify the Senate Office at least two business days before the meeting. Any senator can ask to have any item moved from the Consent Agenda to Proposals.

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| EP.14.07 | Proposal from the College of Business to Permanently Establish the Center for Business and Public Policy | Educational Policy
(G. Miller, Chair) |
| EP.14.10 | Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) and the Graduate College to Eliminate the Physiological and Molecular Plant Biology Concentration from the MS and PhD in Biology | Educational Policy
(G. Miller, Chair) |
| EP.14.12 | Proposal from Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research to rename the Center for a Sustainable Environment as the Institute for Sustainability, Energy and Environment | Educational Policy
(G. Miller, Chair) |

VII. Proposals (enclosed)

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| CC.14.05 | Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate | Committee on Committees
(P. Kalita) | 1 |
| SP.14.04 | Proposed Revisions to the <i>Bylaws</i> , Part D.9 – Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion | University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(W. Maher) | 3 |
| SP.14.06 | Proposed Revisions to the <i>Statutes</i> , Article XIII, Section 8 – to authorize the University Senates Conference to initiate revisions to the <i>Statutes</i> (First Reading) | University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(W. Maher) | 5 |
| HD.14.02 | Nominations for Honorary Degrees | Honorary Degrees
(J. Tyson) | 11 |

VIII. Current Benefits Issues (5 min.)– John Kindt, Chair of Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits**IX. Reports (enclosed)**

- | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----|
| HE.14.01 | IBHE-FAC Report – September 20, 2013 | A. Aminmansour | 17 |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----|

X. New Business**XI. Adjournment**

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.

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

CC.14.05 Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate

Campus Operations

To fill one student vacancy created by the resignation of Tyler Durgan (LAS)

Jeffrey Chandler	LAS	Term Expires 2014
------------------	-----	-------------------

Student Discipline

To fill one faculty vacancies created by the resignation of Kent Choquette (ENGR)

Albert Valocchi	ENGR	Term Expires 2015
-----------------	------	-------------------

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Prasanta Kalita, Chair
Sara Benson
Anthony Fiorentino
Tim Flanagan
William Gropp
Shao Guo
Rachel Heller
David O'Brien
Joyce Tolliver
Jenny Roether, *ex officio*

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

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(Final; Action)

SP.14.04 Proposed Revisions to the *Bylaws*, Part D.9 – Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion

BACKGROUND

On November 5, 2012, the Senate approved the Resolution on Diversity Values Statement (EQ.13.01). That statement called for the mandate of the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion to be revised to include monitoring diversity implementation on the campus and reporting to the Senate on the diversity status of the University. The following proposal would add that responsibility to the *Bylaws* charge for the committee.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures and the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion recommend approval of the following revisions to the *Bylaws*, Part D.9. Text to be added is underscored and text to be deleted is indicated by ~~strikeout~~ (e.g., ~~sample text for deletion~~).

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *BYLAWS*, PART D.9

- 1 9. Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion
2
3 (a) Duties
4
5 The Committee shall:
6
7 1. Develop and support programs and guidelines promoting an equitable and
8 welcoming campus environment for members of any underrepresented, historically
9 disadvantaged, or marginalized groups. Programs and guidelines may be
10 developed wherever an apparent needs exists, including but not necessarily limited
11 to the following areas:
12 • a. Academic and civil service employment, teaching, research, and public
13 service;
14 • b. Admission and financial aid policies and practices for undergraduate,
15 graduate, and professional students, as well as educational policies,
16 practices and programs;
17 • c. Community projects and studies which relate to equal opportunity for
18 disadvantaged and minority groups at all levels (students, faculty, and staff)
19 on the campus.
20 2. Evaluate continually the equal opportunity posture of the campus and the
21 University as a whole with regard to enunciated principles and actions taken.

- 22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
3. Communicate and cooperate with other campus and University offices and committees established to work toward the objectives of this committee (e.g., the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access and the Chancellor's Committee on the Status of Women), as well as with local (non-University) community groups concerned with equal education and employment opportunity and with access of community minority groups to University cultural and recreational facilities and programs.
 4. Where appropriate, make reports and recommendations to the Senate and to other units and officials of the University.
 5. Monitor diversity programs on the campus, recommend new and improved initiatives, and report to the Senate on the University's diversity status on an annual basis.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

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

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(First Reading; Information)

SP.14.06 Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2.b and Article XIII, Section 8 –
to authorize the University Senates Conference to initiate revisions to the *Statutes*

BACKGROUND

The attached proposed revisions are presented to the Senate in response to a June 21, 2013 request from the University Senates Conference (USC) that the *University Statutes* be revised to articulate a means whereby the USC may initiate the process for amending the *Statutes*.

On occasion, the USC has sent to the campus Senates proposals for amendments to the *University Statutes*. Some of these proposals have originated from University administration. These amendments have included ST-30, which provided for sanctions less than dismissal (in *University Statutes*, Article IX, Section 6), and ST-45, on interruptions of the probationary period (which appeared in several different articles of the *Statutes*). In these cases and others, the Administration recommended amendments to the USC, which studied the proposals and then referred them to each respective Senate for consideration and debate.

Although this practice has been employed from time to time, the *Statutes* are silent about what particular process should be followed when *Statutes* proposals originate with USC. The current proposal describes the existing practice, confirming that USC may introduce amendments to the *Statutes*. It further preserves the autonomy of the respective Senates to follow their own legislative processes in considering such proposals. Specifically, it requires that all proposals for amendments to the *Statutes*, including those coming from the USC, must be referred to the respective Senates. A Senate will not be bound by the text accompanying such proposals, and may subject the proposal to amendment and adaptation, following its own procedures.

Accordingly, the Senate Committee on University Statues and Senate Procedures (USSP) is offering an amendment to Article XIII, Section 8 and is offering new language to Article II, Section 2.b to provide consistency with the present provisions in Article II that authorize the senates to propose amendments through the following existing language:

“Each senate may propose amendments to these *Statutes* through the University Senates Conference to the president and the Board of Trustees as provided in Article XIII, Section 8.” (Article II, Section 1.f)

For reference, USC’s June proposal (ST-79) is attached to this document as Appendix A. On examining USC’s proposal, the USSP concluded that the language could be both simplified and clarified, especially in regard to the process that should be followed in the respective campus senates. The USC proposal could be interpreted as limiting the campus Senates to

merely affirming or rejecting the amendment, with or without comments, which would be inconsistent not only with existing practice but also with the spirit of the *Statutes*.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends approval of the following revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2.b and Article XIII, Section 8. Text to be added is underscored and text to be deleted is indicated by ~~strikeout~~ (e.g., ~~sample text for deletion~~).

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE STATUTES, ARTICLE II, SECTION 2.B AND ARTICLE XIII, SECTION 8

1

2 **ARTICLE II. LEGISLATIVE ORGANIZATION**

3 **Section 2. University Senates Conference**

4 b. *Functions.*

5 The University Senates Conference shall review all matters acted upon by each
6 senate. The conference shall determine whether senate actions requiring
7 implementation or further consideration by officials or other groups within the
8 University have been referred to the appropriate officials or groups. The
9 conference itself may make any original or additional referral it deems
10 advisable, and may append its comments and recommendations. Should the
11 conference find a matter acted upon by one of the senates to be of concern to
12 another senate, it shall refer the matter and the action to that senate. If two or
13 more senates have acted differently on a subject, the conference shall attempt to
14 promote agreement or consistency. Where agreement or consistency cannot be
15 effected within a reasonable period of time, the conference shall transmit the
16 related actions of the senates together with its own recommendations to the
17 appropriate officials or groups within the University and shall simultaneously
18 notify the secretary of each senate of its action. Any senate may record and
19 transmit its further comments to the same addressees and to the conference.

20 The University Senates Conference shall assist the senates to communicate with
21 one another, with University and campus administrative officials, and with the
22 Board of Trustees (through the president), and may develop and implement
23 procedures to enhance such communication.

24 The University Senates Conference may propose amendments to these *Statutes*
25 through the several senates as provided in Article XIII, Section 8.

26 **ARTICLE XIII. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

27 **Section 8. Amendments**

28 a. *Initiation by a Senate or by the University Senates Conference.*

29 (1) Each of the senates by vote of a majority of all members present and voting at a
30 regular or special meeting may propose amendments to these *Statutes*. No final
31 senate action shall be taken on a proposed amendment until the next meeting

32 following the one at which it was introduced. The secretary of a senate shall
33 notify the secretary of the other senates and the secretary of the University
34 Senates Conference of the text of a proposed amendment promptly after the
35 meeting at which it is introduced. The proposed amendment shall be referred
36 to the University Senates Conference for its consideration and transmission to
37 the other senates for action; the conference may append its comments and
38 recommendations. [continue here without paragraph break] The proposed
39 amendment shall be placed promptly on the agenda of the other senates.

40 (2) The University Senates Conference by vote of a majority of all members present
41 and voting at a regular or special meeting may propose amendments to these
42 Statutes. The secretary of the conference shall notify the secretaries of the
43 campus senates of the text of a proposed amendment promptly after the
44 meeting at which it is introduced. The proposed amendment shall be
45 transmitted to the senates for such action as each of them shall see fit; the
46 conference may append its comments. The proposed amendment shall be
47 placed promptly on the agenda of each senate.

48 (3) Each senate may act on the proposed amendment in accord with its own
49 established procedures, including the right to accept, to modify, or to reject any
50 proposed amendment or proposed statutory text. Final action in each senate on
51 the proposed amendment may be taken by a majority of all members present
52 and voting at a regular or special meeting held not earlier than the next meeting
53 following the one at which it was introduced in that senate.

54 (4) If every senate acts affirmatively on the proposed amendment and concurs as to
55 its text, the conference shall send the proposed amendment to the president for
56 transmission to the Board of Trustees and shall simultaneously notify the
57 senates of its action; the conference may append its comments. If the senates do
58 not agree as to the proposed amendment, the conference shall endeavor to
59 promote agreement of the senates. Where agreement cannot be effected among
60 all the senates within a reasonable period of time, but the text of a proposed
61 amendment has been agreed upon by all but one of the senates, the conference
62 shall send that proposed amendment, the recommendations of the dissenting
63 senate, and its own recommendations to the president for transmission to the
64 Board of Trustees and shall simultaneously notify the senates of its action. A
65 senate may record and send its further comments to the president for
66 transmission to the Board of Trustees.

67 *b. Initiation by the Board of Trustees.* The Board of Trustees may initiate proposals to
68 amend the *Statutes*, but the board shall not finally adopt any such proposal without
69 first seeking the advice of the president, the senates, and the University Senates
70 Conference. Any proposal to amend the *Statutes* which is initiated by the Board of
71 Trustees shall be transmitted through the president to the University Senates
72 Conference and transmitted by the conference, with its recommendations, to the
73 senates for consideration and advice. The proposed amendment shall be placed
74 promptly on the agenda of each of the senates. If the senates do not agree in their

75 advice concerning the proposed amendment, the conference shall endeavor to
76 promote agreement; where agreement cannot be achieved within a reasonable
77 period of time, the conference shall send the advice of the senates and its own
78 recommendations to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees and
79 shall simultaneously notify the senates of its action. A senate may record and send
80 its further comments to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees.

81 c. An amendment shall become effective when approved by the Board of Trustees or
82 at such later time as the board may specify.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

William Maher, Chair

Jennifer Baldwin

H. George Friedman

Wendy Harris

Scott Jacobs

Calvin Lear

Anna-Maria Marshall

Mark Roszkowski

Sandy Jones, *Ex officio (designee)*

Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*

Dedra Williams, *Observer*

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *STATUTES*

(Text to be deleted is in [square brackets] and text to be added is underlined.)

ARTICLE XIII. General Provisions

Section 8. Amendments

a. *Initiation by a Senate.* Each of the senates by vote of a majority of all members present and voting at a regular or special meeting may propose amendments to these *Statutes*. No final senate action shall be taken on a proposed amendment until the next meeting following the one at which it was introduced. The secretary of a senate shall notify the secretary of the other senates and the secretary of the University Senates Conference of the text of a proposed amendment promptly after the meeting at which it is introduced. The proposed amendment shall be referred to the University Senates Conference for its consideration and transmission to the other senates for action; the conference may append its comments and recommendations.

The proposed amendment shall be placed promptly on the agenda of the other senates. If every senate acts affirmatively on the proposed amendment and concurs as to its text, the conference shall send the proposed amendment to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees and shall simultaneously notify the senates of its action; the conference may append its comments. If the senates do not agree as to the proposed amendment, the conference shall endeavor to promote agreement of the senates. Where agreement cannot be effected among all senates within a reasonable period of time, but the text of a proposed amendment has been agreed upon by all but one of the senates, the conference shall send that proposed amendment, the recommendations of the dissenting senate, and its own recommendations to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees and shall simultaneously notify the senates of its action. A senate may record and send its further comments to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees.

b. *Initiation by the University Senates Conference.* The University Senates Conference by vote of a majority of all members present and voting at a regular or special meeting may propose amendments to these *Statutes*. The secretary of the conference shall notify the secretary of the campus senates and the secretary of the Board of Trustees of the text of a proposed amendment promptly after the meeting at which it is introduced. The proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the senates for action; the conference may append its comments.

The proposed amendment shall be placed promptly on the agenda of the senates. If every senate acts affirmatively on the proposed amendment and concurs as to its text, the conference shall send the proposed amendment to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees and shall simultaneously notify the senates of its action; the conference may append its comments. If the senates do not agree as to the proposed amendment, the conference shall endeavor to promote agreement of the senates. Where agreement cannot be effected among all senates within a reasonable period of time, but the text of a proposed amendment has been agreed upon by all but one

of the senates, the conference shall send that proposed amendment, the recommendations of the dissenting senate, and its own recommendations to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees and shall simultaneously notify the senates of its action. A senate may record and send its further comments to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees.

[b]c. *Initiation by the Board of Trustees.* The Board of Trustees may initiate proposals to amend the *Statutes*, but the board shall not finally adopt any such proposal without first seeking the advice of the president, the senates, and the University Senates Conference. Any proposal to amend the *Statutes* which is initiated by the Board of Trustees shall be transmitted through the president to the University Senates Conference and transmitted by the conference, with its recommendations, to the senates for consideration and advice. The proposed amendment shall be placed promptly on the agenda of each of the senates. If the senates do not agree in their advice concerning the proposed amendment, the conference shall endeavor to promote agreement; where agreement cannot be achieved within a reasonable period of time, the conference shall send the advice of the senates and its own recommendations to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees and shall simultaneously notify the senates of its action. A senate may record and send its further comments to the president for transmission to the Board of Trustees.

[c]d. An amendment shall become effective when approved by the Board of Trustees or at such later time as the board may specify.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

Committee on Honorary Degrees
(Final; Action)

HD.14.02 Nominations for Honorary Degrees

The Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees is pleased to nominate the following individuals for an honorary degree to be conferred at the May 2014 Commencement exercises:

- George E. Andrews
- Narayana N.R. Murthy

Information relative to the background and achievements of these nominees is attached. Based on the criteria approved by the Senate, the Committee has selected these individuals for Senate consideration.

The Committee wishes to express its sincere appreciation to all who participated in the process, particularly those who spent considerable amounts of time and effort in preparing documentation for these nominees.

COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES

Jeremy Tyson, Chair
Mckennon Biers
Stephen Cartwright
Harrison Kim
Connor Schickel
Jinming Zhang
Steven Zimmerman

George Andrews
Evan Pugh Professor of Mathematics
The Pennsylvania State University

EDUCATION:

B.S. and M.A., Oregon State University, 1960
Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, 1964

Nominated by Bruce Berndt, CAS Professor of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

BASIS FOR NOMINATION:

George Andrews is an internationally recognized number theorist and the preeminent authority on the mathematical theories of partitions and q-series as well as their application to statistical physics. Over the course of his career, he has dramatically advanced the visibility of his subject by elucidating and clarifying the pioneering work of the remarkable Indian mathematician Srinivasa Ramanujan. Through expository writing, public lectures, and as a consultant for a PBS documentary on Ramanujan, he has helped to put a human face on an often esoteric subject. His passion for mathematics transcends his area of research, encompassing mathematics education at all levels as well as service to his university and to national and international scientific organizations and advisory boards.

EXCERPTS FROM THE NOMINATION LETTER:

“Andrews is one of the world’s foremost number theorists, as witnessed by the fact that at the age of 73, the *Selected Works of George E. Andrews*, totaling approximately 1100 pages, has already been published. The theory of partitions began over two and a half centuries ago with the work of the great Swiss mathematician Leonhard Euler. At the beginning of the 20th century, discoveries by India’s greatest mathematician, Srinivasa Ramanujan, revolutionized the subject. The theory of q-series is intimately woven with the theory of partitions. The first theorems in the subject were found by Euler, Gauss, and Cauchy. Ramanujan is universally recognized as the leading figure in the history of the subject, while Andrews is unquestionably today’s premier researcher and the world’s leading authority on the subject in the history of mathematics.”

“It has often been asserted that Andrews’ 1976 discovery of Ramanujan’s ‘Lost Notebook’ in the Trinity College library would be comparable, in the music world, to finding the tenth symphony of Beethoven. In the past two decades, the lost notebook has had an enormous influence on the theory of partitions.”

“Andrews has been a tireless servant to mathematical endeavors at all levels with a longstanding interest in elementary and high school education. In his retiring Presidential address at the annual meeting of the American Mathematical Society in January 2012, Andrews devoted the last half of his lecture to K-12 mathematics education.”

“Because of his distinguished research career, his tireless commitment to mathematics at all levels, and his intimate connections with the University of Illinois, it would be an honor for the University of Illinois to bestow upon George Andrews an honorary doctoral degree.”

AWARDS:

1980 Hedrick Lecturer, Mathematical Association of America
1982 Guggenheim Fellow
1997 Member, American Association for the Advancement of Science
1998 Honorary Degree in Physics, University of Parma, Italy
2003 Member, National Academy of Sciences
2007 Polya Lecturer, Mathematical Association of American
2008 Honorary Professorship, Nankai University, China
2009 Fellow, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics
2012 Fellow, American Mathematical Society

EXCERPTS FROM THE LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION:

Freeman Dyson, Professor Emeritus of Physics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ

“Professor Andrews has been a world leader in the field of analytic number theory for the last forty years. He has built up at Pennsylvania State University a mathematics department of outstanding quality. Whenever I visit him there, I find him at the center of a buzz of creative activity. He is a star in the world of mathematics. I recommend him whole-heartedly as a candidate for an honorary degree. By honoring him, you will also bring honor to your own university.”

Richard Askey, Professor Emeritus of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin at Madison

“I do not know how to describe the work Andrews has done with Ramanujan’s Lost Notebook other than to say that I am in awe of it, and think it has been done about 100 years earlier than I thought it would be. When Andrews started to do mathematics his area was seen as marginal, but no longer. This change is primarily due to his work. He has also served a term as President of the American Mathematical Society, a position which should only go to those who have a broad and deep view of how mathematics develops and interacts with other fields. He qualifies on all of these counts.”

“In a talk at the meeting in Urbana to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Ramanujan’s birth, Freeman Dyson referred to George Andrews as the chief gardener in Ramanujan’s garden. That is a better description than I can come up with, but it falls short of what George Andrews has done.”

Peter Paule, Professor of Mathematics, Director of RISC (Research Institute for Symbolic Computation), Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria

“Professor Andrews enjoys the highest international reputation; he is an exemplary leader among his peers. Andrews’ book *The Theory of Partitions* (1st edition, 1976) is still **the** reference book in the field. His AMS presidency was an outstanding activity appreciated worldwide. He is one of the very few eminent research mathematicians who cares about the mathematical education and training of our young people. Andrews also played a decisive role in the development of the (freely available) OMEGA computer algebra package. Andrews was using computer algebra at a very early stage of its development (he was an official tester for IBM’s SCRATCHPAD system). But in the course of the OMEGA project I also learned about Andrews’ remarkable feeling for algorithmic aspects. George Andrews is an outstandingly productive mathematician with stunning creativity. His scientific achievements and also his various services for the scientific community resulted in the highest level of worldwide recognition as a scholar.”

Narayana N. R. Murthy
Executive Chairman
Infosys Ltd.

EDUCATION:

Bachelor of Engineering, National Institute of Engineering, Mysore, India 1967
Masters of Technology, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, India 1969

Nominated by Narendra Ahuja, Professor Emeritus, Donald Biggar Willet Professor of Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Janak H. Patel, Professor Emeritus, Donald Biggar Willet Professor of Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

BASIS FOR NOMINATION:

Narayana N. R. Murthy is one of the world's most visionary entrepreneurs and distinguished business leaders. As founder of Infosys Limited, one of the largest and leading IT companies in India, his leadership has transformed the country's economy, putting India on the world stage. Murthy is a humanitarian who believes that the real power of success is in generosity. He has established the Infosys Science Foundation to recognize scientific research and the Infosys Foundation to address the basic needs of the poorest of the poor.

EXCERPTS FROM THE NOMINATION LETTER:

“In 1981, Murthy founded Infosys Limited along with six younger colleagues in Bangalore, India. The founders had to borrow the initial seed capital of about \$250 from their wives, as no bank was willing to fund them. Under Mr. Murthy's leadership, Infosys emerged as a leading provider of IT services globally, and has grown into an organization with revenues of \$6.35 billion, over 600 clients, 133,000 employees, operating in 76 cities in 33 countries, and a market capital of \$37.2 billion.”

“Murthy created the country's largest (and one of the world's largest) stock option plans for the employees of Infosys by giving away as much as 35% of the total equity. The Infosys Foundation has created libraries for poor children in 15,000 villages in India; provided scholarships to thousands of poor children; built hospitals; supported cultural activities, and supported Akshaya Patra, the largest free-lunch program in the world.”

“Murthy not only created one of the largest companies in India, he transformed the country's economy and put it on the world stage, and has become a source of inspiration for entrepreneurs across India and the world.”

AWARDS:

1999 Fellow, Indian National Academy of Engineering
2003 Ernst and Young World Entrepreneur of the Year
2007 Ernst Weber Medal, IEEE
2007 Commander of the Order of the British Empire
2008 Legion d'honneur, Government of France
2010 Foreign member, US National Academy of Engineering
2011 NDTV Indian of the Year
2012 Listed among the “12 greatest entrepreneurs of our time”, *Fortune*

EXCERPTS FROM THE LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION:

Bill Gates, Chairman, Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA

“As an engineer, a business leader, and a philanthropist, Narayana Murthy truly stands apart for his remarkable accomplishments, his intellectual vigor, his ethics and business values, and his deep commitment to India and the poor. Through his visionary work in founding Infosys and running the company for 21 years, he not only created an industry, but fundamentally transformed India. In the process, he not only enriched tens of thousands of his countrymen, but lifted the image of his country throughout the world, and – most importantly – transformed the hopes and aspirations of generations of young Indians. The impact on his country, in my view, cannot be over-stated. Thanks to Narayana’s vision and determination, Infosys has become a leading provider of IT services globally, with 133,000 employees in 33 countries. His public service in India and throughout the world is a model for any business leader. As a philanthropist and public citizen, he has once again profoundly influenced India. The Murthy family has been vital supporters of India’s free lunch program, Akshaya Patra, feeding 1.3 million children daily. Giving this honorary doctorate to so eminent a leader as Narayana Murthy will bring much deserved recognition to Narayana for his work.”

John L. Hennessy, President, Stanford University

“Mr. Murthy is a distinguished leader and one of India’s most successful and well-respected entrepreneurs. His company, Infosys, is the 11th largest company in the software and services sector worldwide. And the story of the company being built from scratch and with minimal resources, in a country without the financial and human resources available to a U.S. entrepreneur, is both unique and inspiring. In addition to his business leadership, Mr. Murthy is an admirable humanitarian with a strong commitment to humanitarian causes.”

W. Kent Fuchs, Provost, Cornell University

“As founder and CEO of Infosys, Mr. Murthy combined his knowledge of engineering and computer science with a keen understanding of business to build the company from the most humble beginnings to its current status as a global leader in IT consulting and software development and services. During his association with Cornell as a trustee and presidential councilor, Mr. Murthy has inspired many on our campus through his advocacy for the same values of fairness, transparency, accountability and social responsibility that he built into the corporate culture of Infosys. Mr. Murthy is widely and justly admired in the business, engineering and philanthropic communities. To grant him an honorary degree would be a credit to the University of Illinois and an appropriate recognition of the accomplishments, integrity and generosity of this remarkable individual.”

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

HE.14.01 Report on the September 20, 2013 meeting of the FAC to the IBHE.

The [Faculty Advisory Council \(FAC\)](#) of the [Illinois Board of Higher Education \(IBHE\)](#) held a regularly scheduled meeting at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) on Friday September 20, 2013 with 31 member institutions present.

The entire morning program was dedicated to a public symposium titled, Delivering Higher Education in Five Years from now. The program began with Chair Aminmansour welcoming the audience to the event followed by remarks from Dr. Charles Tucker UIUC Vice-Provost and Dr. Harry Berman Executive Director of IBHE. Symposium speakers were Dr. Lynne Haeffele, Senior Policy Director for Education, Office of the Illinois Lieutenant Governor; Dr. Sylvia Manning, President of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC); Dr. Mike Baumgartner, Vice President Finance and Special Projects, Complete College America and Dr. Nicholas C. Burbules, Gutgsell Professor, Department of Education Policy, Organization and Leadership and Director of Ubiquitous Learning Institute, College of Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. An [article in the October 3-2013 edition of Inside Illinois](#) covered the symposium. The symposium was attended by about 120 people including officials from the University of Illinois, State of Illinois and others.

Chair Aminmansour called the regular portion of the meeting to order at 1:15 PM. After introduction of members present, Aminmansour reported that on his recent activities as Chair including a redesign of the [Council's web site](#). FAC Vice Chair Marie Donovan reported that she had been in contact with the IBHE Student Advisory Committee (SAC) in order to establish a line of communication between our Council and SAC and that a member of SAC has agreed to join our next FAC meeting.

The Council held a discussion with Melissa G. Madsen, Chair of the UIUC Council of Academic Professionals (CAP) titled *Academic Professional Exemption Authority, Civil Service Audit Process - - Implications for Faculty*. Other guests for this portion of the meeting included Deborah Stone of UIUC Director of Academic Human Resources and Richard Atterberry, former UIUC CAP Chair. The Council followed up with questions for the guests. FAC Members agreed to discuss the issue with their campus HR offices and continue their discussion at the next FAC meeting.

Malinda Aiello, IBHE Assistant Director for Private Business and Vocational Schools discussed Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) panels and encouraged public and private university faculty to step forward to serve on panels in different disciplines. She emphasized that active (not retired) faculty are preferred for filling these positions.

Ocheng Jany, IBHE Associate Director for Academic Affairs reported on the progress in the process of accepting and review of applications for the IBHE Faculty Fellows Program that was originally recommended by the Council.

The three caucuses of the Council (four year public universities; community colleges and private/independent institutions) met separately and reported back to the Council. The private/independent institutions caucus discussed implications of shifting student access and affordability, the increase in adjunct professors, and inviting David Tretter, President of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities to meet with the caucus at the next caucus meeting. The community college caucus considered whether schools should have a full time theatre faculty member or a part timer, that many students cannot have a rigid course schedule, and the use of development courses versus competency pinpointing. The public universities caucus discussed promoting the IBHE Faculty Fellowship and possible topics for the current year.

During the Business portion of the meeting, the Council approved the minutes of its June 14, 2013 meeting at Lincoln College.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM. The next IBHE-FAC meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2013 at Chicago State University

Respectfully submitted

Abbas Aminmansour