

University Senates Conference (USC)
Tuesday, November 17, 2011
Minutes
(Final; Information)

PLACE: Videoconference call (UIUC members convened in 257 HAB)

PRESENT: Andersen, Campbell, Chambers (Chair), Erricolo, Fadavi, Francis, Graber, Leff, Mallory, Martin, O'Brien, Patston, Shanahan, Struble, Switzer, Ting, Wheeler

GUESTS: Mike Biehl, Christine Des Garennes (News Gazette), Avijit Ghosh, Michael Hogan, Lisa Troyer, visiting senator from Springfield

Chambers convened and welcomed members and guests to the meeting. The first portion of the meeting was dedicated to discussing the preliminary report of the USC Enrollment Management Task Force. Leff, chair of the group, indicated that she had received feedback from all three campus senates and the final report is due at the end of December. A preliminary report was written for purposes of providing President Hogan with initial guidance about the recommendations contained in the Report of the External Review Team on Enrollment Management and Services. Chambers stated that due to the cyclical nature of enrollment management, and his desire to implement changes in an expeditious manner, President Hogan is anxious to receive the final report as quickly as possible. The report states that there are three areas in which everyone on the Task Force agreed. Although everyone was interested in Recommendation 7 (common application), the committee realizes this is an expensive endeavor.

At 9:25, Hogan, Troyer, and Ghosh arrived. Hogan said that the senates will have observers at the December 2 meeting, and he doesn't think the Board would object if there were comments related to Dashboard. Hogan said he received a letter about the annual review of vice-presidents. Last year there wasn't much of a review since the role of chancellors was being turned over. Since then he has met with the chancellors to work on a goal setting exercise. Hogan said he would be happy to continue whatever the practice in the past had been in relation to reviewing the vice-chancellors. Hogan said in the spring we could provide the president with advice. He spoke with the vice-presidents about previous reviews, and their perception was that there had not been a consistent process. Wheeler said there was a systematic process and that Ghosh can attest to that. Sailor said we would receive the goals and accomplishments of each vice-president to assist with the review. Hogan asked if we wanted to review the role of all university officers or just the vice-presidents. Chambers said in the past the reviews have considered only the vice-presidents who relate to the academic mission of the university. Wheeler asked if we could discuss this among ourselves and then get back to the president.

In relation to enrollment management, the president said there isn't much he has to say other than what he has said before. Chambers said a committee chaired by Carol Leff has written a letter that was communicated to Hogan. Leff said that there was the understanding that a final report would be submitted in late December but a preliminary report would be submitted earlier. She said that the senates have also produced reports which will help to inform the responses in the final report. Leff summarized the main points of the letter. All members of the committee and the larger community felt that Recommendations 1 and 2 were both necessary and valuable and should be undertaken at the first

opportunity. In addition, the committee felt Recommendation 12 should be acted on immediately so that financial aid decisions can be made earlier. She stated that there may be more items in the December report that we support. The Springfield campus suggests moving forward with all recommendations except Recommendation 10 which is a concern shared at all three campuses. Leff said the outside report does not consider cost/benefit or resource allocations. The final page addresses the common application process that is being used by an increasing number of institutions in the Big Ten, and it does make things more convenient for applicants. The cost/benefit ratio, however, has not yet been examined. Therefore, the recommendation isn't something that could be implemented immediately. She suggested that we might want to follow the Ohio State model which entails one year of planning and one year of implementation. She said that not all three campuses would need to go online at the same time.

Hogan thanked Leff for her report. He said he accepts that other universities might get there first and get credit, but it is more about doing this carefully and without making mistakes. He said that if something is a priority, you find the resources for it. If diversity and accessibility are important, we should locate the resources. The Board would say that achieving greater diversity, increasing accessibility, and increasing the opportunity to attract the best and brightest are important, and they would allocate to that. Hogan stated, "Priorities are priorities only when there is money behind them."

Switzer asked Hogan about an article written in the News Gazette that had a quote from Burbules. She wanted to know if he felt similarly that the others campuses were suppressing the light of UIUC. He said that he didn't want to address the issue in detail because he wasn't even sure if the quote was accurate. He said every campus has had enrollment issues that have not been adequately addressed over a number of years. The Chicago campus, for example, has difficulty recruiting a freshman class that will be retained and graduate in a timely manner. As for the branding issue, he wasn't sure what that meant. All campuses share the "University of Illinois" brand that is on all campus diplomas. He feels it is a valuable brand and that enrollment management can help us assist that brand. Chambers said that the fundamental issue is that all three campuses have unique missions and that UIUC is clearly the most mature. He said that UIS is newer and still maturing. Chambers said that the role of USC is to promote cohesiveness and synergy and not work against each other. Hogan said the different missions of the campuses is what gives us our strength and that we need to leverage that more.

Ting said that UIS senate supports all recommendations except Recommendation 10. It's not that they are opposed to it, they only want to make sure the UIS applications are not being ignored because more attention is being paid to the larger sister campuses. Francis said that an appendix should be added to the enrollment management report that makes things more clear so faculty won't read inappropriate and premature opposition into the report. He said the report he read said nothing about faculty involvement. He said that "centralization without transparency is death." Hogan said he doesn't like to think of enrollment management as centralization. Financial aid and admissions offices will still be on campus and actively involved. In fact, the report indicates that these offices might need to be enhanced. He also doesn't see the enrollment manager as being the enrollment czar. He angrily chastised USC members that this is probably the first time that a president has ever asked senates to think through the enrollment management process and that he is seeking our advice, not our consent. He doesn't want to see, "All this crap that has been appearing in the papers." He is sorry about the divisiveness that all of this has caused, about the tape that has been requested, and the "e-mails that fly around late into the evening from members of the senate where others don't feel included." He asked a group to advise him, and he has empowered people and what was offered in the best of collegial spirits has evolved into something else.

Ghosh said implementation issues will need to be worked out and that it will help all three campuses be more effective in serving our students. Wheeler said that the report was delivered within 15 days and that the committee worked quickly and hard to meet his deadlines. Chambers said everyone would like to move forward as quickly as possible but that concerns came up as dialogue emerged. He said a report was promised by the end of the semester and that he would get that report. He told Hogan that most of the e-mails in the middle of the night were with the intent of getting the report to him quickly. Biehl said his task force was extremely collegial and worked very hard. He embraces many of the recommendations. The feeling is that until Recommendations 1 and 2 have been defined, it's hard to know how to embrace the other recommendations. Hogan said he is not inclined to think that the devil is in the details. He feels very comfortable that these details can be worked out effectively and efficiently.

Hogan left the meeting at 11:30. After a brief break the committee reconvened to discuss the president's visit and whether he truly wanted input related to faculty participation in the admissions process or the overall recommendations. Graber voiced concern that there may have been communication from members of the USC that went to the president and did not come through the chair of the committee who is the only person on USC who has been designated as the spokesperson for the group. She also stated she was concerned with the level of collegiality that currently existed on the committee. Switzer stated that she agreed that we must improve our collegial relationships but that she has significant concerns about the leadership abilities of some USC members and specifically gave names and examples of problems. Wheeler moved that we begin to listen to each other and work together in a professional manner.

The resolution related to campus rotation of leadership positions will be forwarded to the different campuses.

Francis moved that we adhere to tradition and ask to evaluate the goals and achievements of the four traditional vice-presidents, excluding the chancellors (finance, research, health services, academic affairs). Discussion ensued about whether or not we should evaluate the vice-presidents who also serve as chancellors. Wheeler suggested that if we do so, we should only consider their role as vice-presidents since the campuses evaluate the chancellor portion of the role. This was voted down but it was unanimously agreed that we continue to evaluate those in the traditional role of vice-president (of which there are 7 in the university system).

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved and old business was briefly addressed.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim C. Graber