

## AGENDA

Urbana-Champaign Senate  
January 30, 2012; 3:10 pm  
Levis Faculty Center

**I. Approval of Minutes**—December 5, 2011

**II. Senate Executive Committee Report**—Matt Wheeler

**III. Chancellor's Remarks** – Phyllis Wise

There may also be updates on the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Search from Search Committee Chair Paula Kaufman.

**IV. Questions/Discussion**

**V. Old Business**

**Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*** (Second Reading; Action)

SP.12.07	Proposed Revisions to the <i>Statutes</i> , Article II, Section 2 – University Senates Conference (Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions)	University Statues and Senate Procedures ( <i>W. Maher, Chair</i> )	1
----------	---	---	---

**VI. Proposals for Action (enclosed)**

SP.12.08	Adjustment of numbers used in calculating size of Faculty Voting Units	University Statues and Senate Procedures ( <i>W. Maher, Chair</i> )	7
CC.12.09	Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate	Committee on Committees ( <i>B. Francis, Chair</i> )	11
SC.12.09	Endorsement and Support of University Senates Conference Chair Donald Chambers' Statement on the Ethical Dimension of Leadership to the Board of Trustees on January 19, 2012	Senate Executive Committee ( <i>M. Wheeler, Chair</i> )	13
SC.12.10	Statement on Ethical Leadership and Shared Governance	Senate Executive Committee ( <i>M. Wheeler, Chair</i> )	15
RS.12.01	Resolution on Senate Agendas	Pre-filed Resolution ( <i>P. Loeb</i> )	25
RS.12.02	Resolution on Enrollment Management, Diversity, and Shared Governance	Pre-filed Resolution ( <i>A. Kagan et al.</i> )	27

**VII. Proposed Revisions to the *Bylaws and Standing Rules* (Final; Action)**

SP.11.12	Revisions to the <i>Bylaws and Standing Rules</i> Regarding Illinois Open Meetings Act compliance.	University Statues and Senate Procedures <i>(W. Maher, Chair)</i>	29
----------	--	--	----

**VIII. Reports for Information (enclosed)**

HE.12.04	FAC/IBHE Report – December 9, 2011	A. Aminmansour	33
UC.12.03	USC Report – November 17, 2011	K. Graber	37
UC.12.04	USC Report – January 13, 2012	K. Graber	41
SC.12.11	BOT Observer Report – December 2, 2011	J. Tolliver	43
SC.12.12	BOT Observer Report – January 19, 2012	J. Tolliver	47

**IX. New Business**

**X. Adjournment**

**Minutes**  
**Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting**  
December 5, 2011

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:18pm on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the Levis Faculty Center with Chancellor Phyllis Wise presiding and Professor Emeritus Kenneth E. Andersen as Parliamentarian.

**Approval of Minutes**

12/05/11-01 The minutes from November 7, 2011 were approved as written.

**Senate Executive Committee Report**

Senator Matthew Wheeler (ACES), Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) gave the following report.

Wheeler announced that a vote for faculty and student nominees on the Provost Search committee would be held and indicated that all faculty Senators and student Senators should have received the appropriate ballot when checking-in today.

Wheeler reviewed the forming of the Enrollment Management Task Force in response to the external Enrollment Management report that was commissioned by President Michael Hogan from external consultants. He thanked Senator Michael Biehl (VMED) for chairing the Enrollment Management Task Force and for leading the Task Force in writing a report.

Michael Corn, University Chief Information Security Officer, plans to meet with the General University Policy Committee (GUP), the Information Technology (IT) committee, and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) regarding the Electronic Communications Policy. Once Corn meets with the Senate committees, he will bring the policy back to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) before it comes before the full Senate.

Wheeler noted Chancellor Phyllis Wise's request to hold a Listening and Learning session with the full Senate immediately following today's meeting.

12/05/11-02 Wheeler moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:30 pm in order to accommodate the Chancellor's request. Hearing no objections, it was pronounced that the meeting would adjourn at 4:30 pm.

Wheeler noted that the information regarding a resolution on the taxation of graduate student employee tuition waivers was distributed at the door. This issue will be presented and discussed by student Senator Carrey Hawkins Ash at the December 12 SEC meeting.

12/05/11-03 Floor privileges were requested for Robert Hughes, Jr., Professor and Head in the Department of Human & Community Development to speak to EP.12.15, Proposal to Revise the Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) Concentration within the PhD Curriculum in Human and Community Development. Floor privileges were also requested for Ruth Watkins, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) and Michael Bragg, Executive Associate Dean of Engineering to speak to the Committee of the Whole Discussion on Enrollment Management. Such privileges were granted with no objection.

Tellers for the meeting were Bill Williamson (LAS), Nancy O'Brien (LIBR), and Drew Travernor (FAA).

### **Chancellor's Remarks**

Chancellor Phyllis Wise announced that she had met with most academic units to date, and looks forward to holding a Listening and Learning session with faculty and students today. She had anticipated spending 100 days on the Listening and Learning Tour, but the tour will be ongoing with such a busy schedule. Wise mentioned the Town Hall meeting scheduled for tomorrow at Krannert Center for Performing Arts from 4-5 pm. She also invited all Senators to a holiday reception immediately following the first Senate meeting of 2012 on January 30.

### **Questions/Discussion**

No questions were asked.

### **Consent Agenda**

Hearing no objections, Chancellor Wise pronounced that the following proposals were approved by unanimous consent:

- 12/05/11-04 EP.12.13\* Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences (ACES) to Terminate the Community Studies and Outreach Concentration in the PhD Curriculum in Human and Community Development
- 12/05/11-05 EP.12.15\* Proposal to Revise the Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) Concentration within the PhD Curriculum in Human and Community Development

### **Proposals for Action**

- 12/05/11-06 CC.12.07\* Nominations for Faculty Membership on the Search Committee for a Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Senator Bettina Francis (LAS), Chair of the Committee on Committees presented a slate of 12 faculty nominees. She then moved to vote for five candidates. Senator Al Kagan (LIBR) nominated Harriet Murav (LAS) from the floor and presented her written statement of willingness to serve. There were no additional nominations and nominations were declared closed.

A count of the tellers indicated the following vote totals: James Anderson 38, Karen Campbell 15, Leon Dash 21, Faye Dong 24, Jan Erkert 19, Placid Ferreira 21, Samantha Frost 21, Prasanta Kalita 19, Barbara Minsker 33, Catherine Prendergast 35, Joseph Rosenblatt 27, Bill Stewart 17, and Harriet Murav 18.

- 12/05/11-07 By ballot, James Anderson, Faye Dong, Barbara Minsker, Catherine Prendergast, and Joseph Rosenblatt were declared elected.

- 12/05/11-08 CC.12.08\* Nominations for Student Membership on the Search Committee for a Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

A count of the tellers indicated the following initial vote totals: Miheer Munjal 3, Franklyn Rocha Cabrero 1, and Meghan Schaffer 3. The students cast votes to break the tie with final vote totals as follows: Miheer Munjal 4 and Meghan Schaffer 3.

- 12/05/11-09 By ballot, Miheer Munjal was declared elected.

- 12/05/11-10 EQ.12.01\* Report on Certain Diversity and Equity UIUC Campus Issues. Senator Harry Hilton (ENGR), Chair of the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion moved

that the Senate receive the report and the Senate Clerk forward the report to those recommended on the list in the report. By voice, the motion passed.

- 12/05/11-11 GP.11.05\* Proposed Statement on Unit Mission Statements and Activities. Senator Nicholas Burbules (EDUC), Chair of the Senate Committee on General University Policy gave a short overview of the proposal and moved its approval. By voice the motion passed.

#### **Proposed Revisions to the *University Statutes***

- 12/05/11-12 SP.12.07\* Proposed Revisions to the *University Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 – University Senates Conference (Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions). William Maher, Chair of the Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures gave an overview of the process for making amendments to the *University Statutes*. Maher noted that this was a first reading and the second reading would be at the January 30 meeting. Faculty Senator George Francis (LAS) asked what the current special circumstances were surrounding the 2011/12 variance in the regular rotation of the SEC leadership positions. Senator Nicholas Burbules (EDUC) indicated his willingness to discuss the circumstances of the current situation at the January 30, 2012 meeting.

#### **Reports for Information**

- 12/05/11-13 HE.12.03\* November 18 FAC/IBHE Report  
12/05/11-14 UC.12.02\* October 18 USC Report  
12/05/11-15 FB.12.03\* Current Benefits Issues and Events

#### **Committee of the Whole**

- 12/05/11-16 The Senate voted to move into a committee of the whole discussion on the Enrollment Management Task Force Report.

Senator Michael Biehl (VMED), Chair of the Enrollment Management Task Force, acknowledged the Task Force members and gave opening remarks discussing the Task Force's process of working through the external report and their process of writing their conclusions in the report.

Ruth Watkins, Dean of LAS, spoke to the need for the Office of the Provost to remain the decision making entity for the make-up of the student body. Michael Bragg, Executive Associate Dean of Engineering, commended the Task Force for their time and effort. He noted the difficulty of fully understanding the complexities of the University, and completely agreed with the Task Force recommendations.

Faculty Senator and SEC Vice-Chair Joyce Tolliver (LAS) expressed her gratitude for the work of the Task Force and noted its model of shared governance. She then noted her opinion that each campus should continue making enrollment decisions for its own campus.

Faculty Senator Mark Roszkowski (BUS) felt that this issue should have been taken to each individual Senate and recommendations should have come from each campus, and not from an outside entity.

SEC Chair Wheeler Matt thanked Senators for their comments and suggestions. Wheeler announced that the SEC will vote on the Enrollment Management Task Force report on Monday, December 12.

Biehl added clarification that as a Task Force, they wanted to model effective an objective reasoned approach to the issues in this report. There are continual references to collaborative approaches with faculty, campus administration, and university administration. Biehl noted that the Task Force felt that a more effective approach is a collaborative one.

Chancellor Wise added that she was very appreciative of all the work that has been done, and noted that the College Deans support the Task Force's work. She hopes this process can be done collaboratively and with a definite campus voice.

**New Business**

No new business was discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:16pm

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

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

DRAFT

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures  
(Second Reading; Action)

SP.12.07 Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 – University Senates  
Conference (Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions)

**BACKGROUND**

It has been a long-standing tradition of the University Senates Conference (USC) to rotate leadership positions of Chair and Vice Chair among the three campuses. This tradition has been superseded in rare instances due to special circumstances. For example, Luther Skelton from UIS was to become Chair in 1999-2000 and when he died, no other representative from UIS was available to serve in his place.

The UIS Senate approved a resolution to codify this tradition in the *Statutes*. Their proposed amendment is attached.

The USC has passed a statement preferring tradition to codification. The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures agrees with the USC. Codifying the tradition in the *Statutes* as proposed by UIS is too inflexible. For example, had this rotation been codified in the *Statutes* in 1999, no one available and willing to serve would have been eligible for election that year.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends that the UIUC Senate vote to concur with the USC's September 21 statement to not support codifying this rotation in the *Statutes*.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

William Maher, Chair

Nikita Borisov

H. George Friedman

Piyush Gupta

Melissa Madsen

Anna-Maria Marshall

Jim Maskeri

Ann Reisner

Charles Evans, *Observer*

Sandy Jones, *Ex officio (designee)*

Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Chicago • Springfield • Urbana-Champaign

University Senates Conference  
377 Henry Administration Building, MC-348  
506 South Wright Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

October 21, 2011

Professor Philip A. Patston, Chair  
UIC Senate Executive Committee  
Dept. of Oral Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences  
558 DENT MC 838

Professor Matthew B. Wheeler, Chair  
UIUC Senate Executive Committee  
Dept. of Animal Sciences  
368 Animal Sciences Lab MC 630

Re: Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 (University Senates Conference) –  
Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions (USC ST-76)

Dear Colleagues:

The UIS Senate approved a resolution on September 9 which calls for changes to the *Statutes*. The statutory revisions proposed by the UIS Senate, along with the resolution, are enclosed for the consideration of your senates.

The University Senates Conference unanimously approved a statement at its meeting of September 21, which attempted to resolve this issue. The offer was not accepted by the UIS Senate. The USC statement is enclosed.

Please inform us after your senate has taken action on this item. Please be as expeditious as possible.

Sincerely,



Donald A. Chambers, Chair  
University Senates Conference

Enclosures

c: Elizabeth Dooley  
Michael Hogan  
Jenny Roether  
Kathy Rutherford  
Michele Thompson  
Tih-Fen Ting  
Members, University Senates Conference



Deletions are ~~strikethrough~~  
Additions are ***bolded, underlined, and italicized***

Approved  
Campus Senate Meeting  
September 9, 2011

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD  
CAMPUS SENATE 2011/2012  
RESOLUTION 41-11**

**Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 – University Senates Conference  
(Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions)**

**WHEREAS**, the three campuses of the University of Illinois differ in size and orientation, and each has equally valuable educational and social roles to play in Illinois and beyond; and

**WHEREAS**, the University Senates Conference functions as an advisory, transmitting, and coordinating body on behalf of the University faculty and thus ought to share University-level governance among faculty from the three campuses; and

**WHEREAS**, the University Senates Conference has had a long tradition of rotating its leadership positions (i.e., chair and vice chair) among members of the three campuses; and

**WHEREAS**, the rotation was established to maintain harmonious relations within the University, to acknowledge a degree of parity among the campuses, and to exemplify shared governance at the University of Illinois;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the rotation tradition of leadership positions in the University Senates Conference will be upheld with a UIS member assuming the chair position in Fall 2012;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Campus Senate of the University of Illinois at Springfield approves the following revisions to the *Statutes* regarding the organization of the University Senates Conference.

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED** that the Campus Senate of the University of Illinois at Springfield transmits this resolution to the University Senates Conference, Vice President/Chancellor Susan Koch, President Michael J. Hogan, and to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois.

1    **Section 2. University Senates Conference**

2    **a. Organization**

- 3    (1) The University Senates Conference shall be made up of twenty members. The basic  
4    representation shall be two members from each senate. Additional members shall be  
5    apportioned to each senate, at least one from each senate, in numbers proportional to the  
6    number of faculty members on each campus. The apportionment shall be recalculated  
7    every five years. Each senate shall elect its own representatives from its membership.
- 8    (2) Senators whose senatorial terms expire before their conference terms expire shall  
9    complete their conference terms. Any faculty senator or faculty senator-elect shall be  
10   eligible for election to the conference. The term of office shall be three years beginning  
11   on the first day of the next academic year following the election. Approximately one-  
12   third of the conference members from each senate shall be elected annually.
- 13   (3) A quorum for conference meetings shall consist of a simple majority of the total  
14   membership of the conference. If a quorum cannot be obtained otherwise, the conference  
15   members from a senate may designate as many as two alternates from the faculty  
16   members of their own senate to serve at a specific meeting.
- 17   (4) The conference officers shall be a chair and a vice chair, who shall be elected for one-  
18   year terms by and from the conference and shall not be from the same senate. **There shall**  
19   **be a rotation among the three senates for the chair and vice chair positions. The senate**  
20   **that has its member elected as the vice chair by and from the conference shall have its**  
21   **member elected as the chair the following year. The senate that has its member elected**  
22   **as the chair by and from the conference shall not be eligible for either the chair or the**  
23   **vice chair the following year.** The chair shall not be from the same senate in two  
24   consecutive years.
- 25   (5) The executive committee of the conference shall consist of two members from each  
26   senate: the conference chair, the conference vice chair, and four additional members  
27   elected annually by and from the conference. The conference may authorize the executive  
28   committee to act on behalf of the conference between scheduled meetings.

## University Senates Conference

Approved September 21, 2011

The University Senates Conference affirms its tradition of rotation of leadership positions among the three campuses and supports the principle of re-establishing the rotation as soon as reasonable but does not support codifying this rotation in the *Statutes*.



**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures  
(Final; Action)

SP.12.08 Adjustment of numbers used in calculating size of Faculty Voting Units.

**BACKGROUND**

As the Clerk of the Senate has assembled materials to initiate this winter's election of next year's Senate, USSP has determined that an adjustment needs to be made in the numbers used to determine the size of faculty voting units. Unfortunately, following this past summer's transition in the staff of the Senate office, the records have been found to be incomplete. In reconstructing the material regarding voting units, the Clerk has discovered that following the formula stated in the Constitution strictly, given recent changes in the size of the faculty, would result in a faculty membership of 169 rather than the 200 desired by the Constitution. Although arriving at a Senate of exactly 200 faculty has not been achieved over the past few years, USSP is concerned that a membership as low as 169 is a significant matter which should be brought to the Senate for resolution by adjusting numbers as authorized in the Constitution Article II, Section 4. That provision reads:

Section 4. A voting unit having seven members of the faculty electorate is entitled to elect one senator from its membership. For each 12 members of the faculty electorate over the initial seven, the unit shall elect an additional senator. Prior to each election, the Senate shall retain or adjust the numbers 7 or 12 or both by whole numbers to ensure that after such election the total number of senators from the faculty electorate shall be as close to 200 as possible.

Insofar as the language of the Constitution, and the legislative history of its adoption puts primary emphasis on the goal of 200 for faculty representation, USSP recommends that the Senate make the necessary adjustment by adopting the numbers of 5 and 10 in place of the numbers of 7 and 12 to arrive at a faculty electorate as close to 200 as possible. The proposed numbers would be consistent with the logic of the Senate when it first adopted the formula, and maintain the principle that each department would have a senate seat. USSP further recommends that the Senate mandate that the Clerk of the Senate conduct an analysis of departmental size no later than the beginning of November each year to enable future adjustments to be made by the Senate in a timely fashion.

## Historical Background to 7/12 Voting Unit Size.

In 1969//70, the Senate charged the Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures with the task of preparing a report on the long-standing issue of how the Senate might be reconstituted. USSP's April 21, 1970 *USSP Report on Reconstitution of the Senate* stated that the then present Senate consisted of "approximately 1,010 professors, a dozen or so administrative officials, 120 elected associate and assistant professors, 33 faculty members appointed to Senate Committees, and 38 students who have varying floor and voting privileges by virtue of committee membership."

The Committee reported its unanimous consensus that among the alternatives for the size of the new Senate, the one most likely to provide responsible action, most able to respond to the coming pressures and problems, and the one most likely to be representative would be a smaller body numbering in the range of 200 to 300. Its *Report* (IV.B) recommended "That the Senate approve in principle the reconstitution of the Senate from its present size to a smaller representative body of a size and makeup to be determined." (Note that as of Senate's May 4, 1970 approval of this recommendation, the Senate had not yet decided on the size of student representation.)

On the question V.B "How do the Faculty Select Their Representatives" the Committee's consensus was to build the election process around voting units oriented to the academic organization of the campus, using the department or its equivalent as the basic unit because. It noted that the wide diversity of departments would provide "a more balanced and varied Senate body, particularly if each voting unit is as a general proposition entitled to at least one representative." Recommendation V.B.4 stated: "That each voting unit having at least 7 faculty shall elect from its membership one member to the reconstituted Senate. For each 12 voting members over the initial 7 it shall elect an additional member to the reconstituted Senate." This recommendation was approved by the Senate on May 25, 1970.

Following discussion and intermediate amendments, the USSP's April, 1970 *Report on Reconstitution of the Senate* was approved by the Senate on June 3, 1970 with no changes to the "7/12" provision. Since nothing was reported about the discussion of this provision, the only insight to the choice of the number 12 is provided by the report's statement: "The number 12 comes from dividing the total eligible faculty by a number sufficient to provide a Senate of between 180 and 210 elected persons [faculty], the range that the Committee judges to be optimum from the viewpoint of providing broad representation without getting too large to be unwieldy. The figure of course can be adjusted up or down easily . . . ."

A minor grammatical amendment was made to the clause now known as Senate Constitution, Article II, Section 4 on November 9, 1970, and at that same meeting the Senate approved the new Constitution with only three dissenting votes. The newly constituted Senate of 204 faculty and 50 student senators convened for its first Organizational Meeting on May 13, 1971.

Supporting Data.

The 2011/12 Senate has 183 faculty seats. The number of verified faculty eligible to vote in the 2012/13 Senate Elections is: 2,014. The following table illustrates the size of Senate that would result using different possibilities for the number of faculty required for a department to have a single seat and for additional seats. Note that currently, the smallest department has 5 faculty, and there is only one of this size, none with 6 faculty, and five with 7 faculty.<sup>1</sup>

Number of faculty needed to secure first senate seat	Number needed to secure additional seat(s)	Resultant Senate Size
7	12	169
7	11	179
7	10	192
7	9	208
6	12	175
6	11	183
6	10	198
6	9	214
5	12	177
5	11	193
5	10	205
5	9	220

---

<sup>1</sup>By comparison, when the Senate was reconstituted in 1970, 17 departments had only one senate seat. The voting units consisted of 7 faculty (two were at this size), one department had 8 faculty, one had 9, three had 10, etc. Three other very small faculty units (having 3, 4, and 6 respectively) were “merged” with two larger voting units.





**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on Committees  
(Final;Action)

CC.12.09 Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate

Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion

To fill a student vacancy created by the resignation of Santos Gordils

Rishi Girish

ENGR

Term Expires 2012

Educational Policy Committee

To fill two faculty vacancies created by the resignation of Eric Meyer and Richard Mintel

Thomas Nevins

LAS

Term Expires 2012

Gary Schnitkey

ACES

Term Expires 2013

Committee on Student Discipline

To fill a faculty vacancy created by the resignation of Clarence Lang

John Popovics

ENGR

Term Expires 2013

To fill two student vacancies created by the resignation of Max Ellithorpe and Michael Galvan

Shao Guo

DGS

Term Expires 2012

Leah Dinh

BUS

Term Expires 2012

**Committee on Committees**

Bettina Francis, Chair

Damani Bolden

Harley T. Johnson

Prasanta Kalita

John Kindt

Jim Maskeri

Cris Mayo

Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey

Chaya Sandler

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**  
Senate Executive Committee  
(Final; Action)

SC.12.09      Endorsement and Support of University Senates Conference Chair Donald Chambers' Statement on the Ethical Dimension of Leadership to the Board of Trustees on January 19, 2012

The following statement was made by University Senates Conference Chair Donald Chambers to the Board of Trustees on January 19, 2012.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS TO THE BOARD  
ON THE ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP  
(JANUARY 18, 2012)**

Thank you, members of the Board, for the opportunity to speak with you today, in the midst of one of the worst scandals ever to confront this university.

This is a time when faculty leaders must speak up about our commitment to ethical standards, as you have. I am speaking here on behalf of the current elected senate leadership of Urbana, Matt Wheeler and Joyce Tolliver; of the Chicago senate, Phil Patston and myself; and of the University Senates Conference, Nick Burbules and myself.

These have been long and difficult days for all of us, so I will be brief and direct.

We believe that the Investigative Report on Anonymous E-Mails contains evidence implicating a wider scope of involvement in the controversy than simply the question of who wrote the anonymous e-mails themselves.

Today, we want to articulate a number of principles:

First, ethical conduct means more than merely legal conduct; and there are things which may be legally permissible, but which are nevertheless ethically reprehensible.

Second, direct causal responsibility is not the same as moral responsibility; and responsibility for setting an ethical tone and promoting a culture of accountability is a central dimension of leadership.

Third, as Trustee Edward McMillan has so aptly articulated, leaders must accept responsibility for what happens on their watch even if they may not have personally directed or approved it.

No one can read the Investigative Report, including the Appendices, without being shocked by a widespread pattern of inappropriate, secretive, and deceptive behavior. The content of some of the secret communications is unbelievably mean-spirited and nasty. I am sure that readers to whom these individuals are just names would wonder, *Who are these people?* This pattern of sleazy conduct, now on open display, is as damaging to the university as the production of the infamous e-mails themselves.

In closing, I want to reiterate our central concern with this scandal. This pattern of behavior, including but not limited to the production of the anonymous emails themselves, is the most serious assault on the principles and processes of shared governance that has ever occurred in the history of this great university.

But beyond this, we speak to our concerns as educators, conscious of our role as models and exemplars to our students in how to conduct themselves. Our behavior, as professors or as administrators, is always on display to them; and when we fail to hold ourselves to the highest standards of behavior, we fail as educators as well.

**Senate Executive Committee**

Matthew Wheeler, Chair

Joyce Tolliver, Vice-Chair

Abbas Aminmansour

Richard Atterberry

Robert Brunner

Nicholas Burbules

Roy Campbell

Bettina Francis

Kim Graber

Kaitlyn Hastings

Harry Hilton

Peter Hughes

William Maher

Jim Maskeri

Gay Miller

Sarah Projansky

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**  
**URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**  
 Senate Executive Committee  
 (Final; Action)

SC.12.10      Senate Statement on Ethical Leadership and Shared Governance

The release of the Investigative Report on Jan. 13, 2012 documents a broad pattern of surveillance and intrusion into legitimate faculty governance deliberations. As the main text and appendices of that Report make clear, the attempts of the President's Chief of Staff to undermine shared governance through her anonymous emails were but one symptom of a more generalized culture of leaked documents, suspicion, and intimidation that the President tolerated and participated in (see attached documentation).

Faculty, students, and staff members from all over this institution share our concern that the fraudulent emails sent by the President's Chief of Staff do not represent an isolated event, and that the problems documented in the report will not be solved simply by her departure.

As elected faculty, staff, and student leaders, we believe that there must be accountability for this broader failure of leadership. Ethical leadership, we believe, means patiently building consensus for reform, not mandating it as an act of command; it means respectfully engaging honest disagreements, not trying to eliminate them; and it means working with campus leaders and faculty as partners in governance, not as subordinates to be ordered to action.

Unfortunately, the pattern of behavior documented in the Investigative Report falls far short of this ideal of ethical leadership. It does not reflect our view of the appropriate relationship between the university administration and campus communities, and it does not represent our view of this university and its values.

This is not the Illinois way.

**Senate Executive Committee**

Matthew Wheeler, Chair

Joyce Tolliver, Vice-Chair

Abbas Aminmansour

Richard Atterberry

Robert Brunner

Nicholas Burbules

Roy Campbell

Bettina Francis

Kim Graber

Kaitlyn Hastings

Harry Hilton

Peter Hughes

William Maher

Jim Maskeri

Gay Miller

Sarah Projansky

## DOCUMENTATION

**1 Appendix 15, Investigative Report: December 10 email from President Hogan to Chairman Kennedy, summarizing his directives to the Chancellors and University Senates Conference Chair to support the enrollment management recommendations. It includes an email (from Michael Biehl, member of the USC Task Force drafting its report) anonymously forwarded by UIS professor Tih-Fen Ting that, Hogan claims, shows that the campuses are hopelessly divided and that UIUC is “pressuring” the other campuses to accept its report “with the aim of forcing a confrontation”:**

From: Hogan, Michael  
To: ckennedy@mmart.com;  
Subject: follow on enrollment management  
Date: Saturday, December 10, 2011 1:29:50 PM

Chris,

I mentioned you yesterday on the phone that I was having a very serious conversation with our chancellors on enrollment management. You wanted an update on the meeting and here’s how it went. I made a couple of adjustments in order to make the enrollment management plan more palpable to the chancellors, but without compromising the authority of the president and effective implementation of the recommendations.

I stated as strongly as I could that the Board and I had endorsed the new plan and expected them to follow suit and to so inform their provosts, deans, enrollment management staff, and their senate leadership, including the chair of the senates conference. I asked them to issue that communication within 48 hours. I’ll give you an update at the end of that period.

I also let Don Chambers know that I’d already received all three campus reports on the enrollment management report and that UIC and UIS seemed mostly accepting of the report, while UIUC was oppositional. Consequently, I expected to receive the independent reports from each campus regarding their concerns with the enrollment management plans, in keeping with the statutes, which require that USC report differences when there is no consensus.

Today, however, I received information anonymously (following my sign off) that a confrontation may be being staged. The fact is that I have three responses to the enrollment management report that show relative agreement between UIS and UIC, with UIUC the outlier as nearly completely oppositional and whose report is copied nearly word-for-word as the Senates Conference draft response. As the e-mail below shows, the UIUC delegation is trying to pressure others to accept it as the official response with the aim of forcing a confrontation.

I remain optimistic that the Chancellors will re-direct their campuses, but this is clearly disturbing.

Please let me know if you have any suggestions for addressing this.

Best,  
Mike

Michael J. Hogan  
President

University of Illinois



>One of the things I and Nick have been trying to promote is that we  
>don't have a UIUC view, a UIC view, and a UIS view on the President's EM proposals,  
>but rather a united, joint, consensus view. Our USC report should and does  
>present a joint, united front between the UIUC and UIC reps in a  
>report format and revised/edited consensus conclusions that have  
>already been broadly accepted and praised as a "thoughtful, reasoned  
>report" by UIUC administrators and Senate, and from what I am hearing, UIC >administrators.

>

>If we present our report in a similar format and conclusions as a  
>joint, UNITED UIUC/UIC view (UIS is a wild card), the President will  
>be compelled to listen and collaborate. If he still chooses not to at  
>that point, I don't think we can hold back any longer those that want  
>to escalate this into a full confrontation with him. If we present it  
>as a non-united "UIUC thinks this, UIC thinks this, and UIS thinks  
>this" he can easily say "faculty are divided so I am going forward  
>with implementation".....I don't think that is what we want and in my  
>opinion, will result in an operational and public relations disaster for all campuses and >this university.

>

>Therefore, I would suggest the USC reps from each campus make sure the  
>USC report presents their campus perspective within the consensus  
>views, and that we NOT place each individual campus report on a site  
>for everyone to view and focus on their differences. That's what I  
>was taught consensus-building is,,,,,giving up your exact, specific,  
>individual viewpoints for united, joint viewpoints that you and all other participants can >ACCEPT.

**2 Appendix 16, Investigative Report: Two texts drafted by President Hogan on Dec. 10, 2011, and sent to Chairman Kennedy to be mailed out under his name to University Senates Conference chair Don Chambers and the Chancellors, asserting that the enrollment recommendations “represent Board policy”:**

Don,

I’m writing t regarding the Board’s and President’s plans to begin implementation of the enrollment management recommendations.

There are serious problems in enrollment management on all three campuses -- we are not enrolling enough minorities, financial aid packages are inadequate and poorly executed, there is unnecessary competition across the campuses when it comes to recruiting, in general our yields are poor, our marketing is not competitive with other institutions, and there are costly redundancies and poor coordination in our operations across the campuses.

This is why we supported the president’s initiative to conduct an external review of enrollment management, the recommendations coming out of that review, and the appointment of an executive director to coordinate and direct our efforts across the University.

We have charged the president with implementing those recommendations as one of his high priority goals for the year, and the chancellors are prepared to support that goal. In short, the recommendations represent Board policy, as well as the President’s goal. The two should be viewed as inseparable and we hope that the Conference will not find itself at odds with what the trustees, as well as the President, are trying to do.

I ask that you share this with your colleagues in the Senates Conference. I think it’s important for them to know the Board’s interest in moving forward on this as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,  
Chris

Dear Paula, Susan, and Phyllis,

Saturday night over dinner, Mike mentioned that he had been meeting with you to work through implementation plans for advancing our enrollment management operations. He told me that he and the chancellors had come to terms and that you are now prepared to lead your campuses in the implementation.

Since taking office, the trustees have been concerned about our enrollment trends – lower yields, decreasing diversity, inadequate financial aid, unnecessary competition and costly redundancies across our campuses. This is why we approved the appointment of an executive director of enrollment management and asked Mike to have our operations reviewed. We endorsed the report that the review team generated and charged Mike with implementing it as one of his key goals for the year, including the appointment of an executive director of enrollment management, who will coordinate and direct our efforts across the University.

I’m pleased to hear that you are conveying to your campuses that implementing these recommendations is a high priority for the Board, as reflected in Mike’s goals, and I want to thank you for your leadership on this



important initiative.

Sincerely,  
Chris

**3** On December 12, 2011, all three chancellors issued similarly-worded email messages to their campus constituents expressing broad support of the enrollment management initiative.

**4 Appendix 1, Investigative Report: email from “UI Integrity,” in which Lisa Troyer asserts, “I find the coercive nature of forcing consensus where it clearly does not exist very troubling. . . . Using tactics of coercion, threats, and bullying to drive away disagreement are not what we are or should be about” and “I’m also disturbed by the comments of some that the purpose of conveying consensus (whether real or false) is to avoid appearing weak or to avoid strengthening the president’s position.” The email also discourages the Conference from looking into who leaked internal documents to the President. The Investigative Report shows that, before the President received these documents, USC member Tih-Fen Ting leaked them to the President’s Chief of Staff:**

**From:** About UIIntegrity [<mailto:aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com>]

[<mailto:aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com>]]

**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2011 11:56 AM

**To:** Leff, Carol Skalnik; Switzer, Carrie L; Erricolo, Danilo; Chambers, Donald A.; Francis, George K; Gibori, Geula; Martin, John C.; ANDERSEN, KENNETH E; Graber, Kim C; Mohammadian, Kouros; Struble, Leslie J; Mallory, Mary; Wheeler, Matthew B; O'Brien, Nancy Patricia; Burbules, Nicholas C; Patston, Philip A.; Campbell, R H; Fadavi, Shahrbanoo; Ting, Tih-Fen; Shanahan, Timothy

**Subject:** call for reason and honesty

Dear Colleagues,

I’ve observed the traffic between us these last weeks, without jumping into it. It is traffic that grows increasingly perilous and collisions between members of the conference have become a daily matter of fact.

I write anonymously, because I see the public finger-pointing and thinly veiled threats to personal and professional reputations toward those who dissent by a scarce few among us. I can’t afford such public and personal attacks at this time in my scholarly career. But, I feel compelled to express my dismay at what we have become and what we are tolerating in this governance body.

Let me note that I believe that the president most likely received the draft report of our committee from an outside source. So let us stop accusing one another. The draft report had already been shared by members of our conference with more than one outside source to try to garner support from others who are not Conference members. Conference members have admitted as much. But it was a poor calculation. It might not be difficult for us to track down those who distributed it outside our ranks or who distributed it to the president, although I think we best let it rest.

I need to say that like some others, I find the coercive nature of forcing consensus where it clearly does not exist very troubling. It’s not surprising that some decided to resign from the committee rather than become unwilling collaborators in such an exercise. I do believe we should always do our best to find consensus, but when we don’t, we need to recognize it. The statutes require us to convey all campus positions openly and honestly when there is a disagreement. Using tactics of coercion, threats, and bullying to drive away disagreement are not what we are or should be about.

I appreciate that some have worked hard to try to find a consensus, but those good efforts have not been successful. Pretending consensus exists when it does not will undermine the credibility of our body. We need to be transparent and honest in sharing the points of disagreement in any final document we issue. I agree with some others that appending individual campus reports is the best solution in the interest of

integrity and transparency. We should not be afraid to be open and honest about our disagreements. I'm also disturbed by the comments of some that the purpose of conveying consensus (whether real or false) is to avoid appearing weak or to avoid strengthening the president's position. There is nothing weak about a lack of consensus if that is the case. There is strength in honesty; there is weakness in dishonesty. We don't serve our offices well by covering up reality.

Finally, the public comments by some on this body who are degrading other campuses and other individuals in public meetings and in the press are unbecoming and perhaps even unethical. No campus is better than others; no individual is better than others. We are all equals and it is time to start treating one another with respect and to exercise integrity in carrying out our statutory duties. We can respectfully disagree and there is much honor in respectfulness.

Senator

**5 Appendix 6, Investigative Report: excerpt from report on December 5, 2011 UIUC Senate meeting, by Jan Dennis, Asst. Director of University Relations. Writing to the President, Dennis summarizes the Senate's discussion of the UIUC Task Force Report on the enrollment management recommendations:**

By way of summary, there was apparent unanimous support that enrollment management should remain with campuses. There also was a strong sense that the administration is making decisions in a move toward centralization, and then bypassing the Senate, or approaching the Senate and telling them what will be done, without seeking input. The enrollment management plan, as Business Administration professor Mark Roszkowski alleged, is the third time the Senate has been effectively cut out of the process, following reorganization and IT consolidation.

Roszkowski advocated drawing a line in the sand, saying a faculty-administration confrontation is inevitable, and the sooner the better. His comments were greeted with applause.

Mike Biehl, chairman of the task force, discouraged that approach. He called for fostering faculty collaboration with administration and the Board of Trustees . . .

Ruth Watkins, dean of LAS: Ruth said the composition of undergraduates – where they're from, their achievements, their demographics, etc. – are one of the most important decisions a campus makes and should remain a campus decision, with the provost's office as the final authority. The makeup of undergraduates is a big part of a campus's identity, she said. She also said that some of the recommendations in the consultant's report are "under specific." . . .

**6 Appendix 7, Investigative Report: Dec. 5 email from Lisa Troyer to Avijit Ghosh, on Hogan's behalf, referencing the Dennis report:**

Mike's would like your thoughts about a couple of things:

(1) The "line in the sand" comments and assertions that there needs to be a "confrontation" with Mike -- this is troubling, even though Biehl and others discouraged it;

(2) Would it be worth visiting with Ruth Watkins (and subsequently other deans)? We're wondering how many of those who commented here actually read the entire external review report and/or whether they are basing their understanding solely on the task force report -- there seems to be a lot of misunderstandings here about what is being recommended.

**Z Chronology of events, documented by the Appendices from the Investigative Report; USC/SEC liaison reports; USC minutes and emails; and, in the case of the President's phone call, by the direct report of USC Chair Don Chambers, who received it:**

Between late October and the release of the anonymous e-mails, the President repeatedly insisted that the Conference's report should only address the narrow question of the role of faculty in admissions and whether that role would be affected by his proposals. He said that he did not want a point-by-point review of the recommendations in the external consultants' report. This effort to direct and delimit what the Conference could address in its report was at odds with the spirit of shared governance, with the Conference's statutory responsibilities to review academic policy matters, and with the President's own requests for just such a broader review on April 29, August 31, and again on October 18 (USC Minutes).

Then, on November 17, the President met with the full University Senates Conference and angrily chastised the Conference members, including the chair of the task force working on the draft report, when he learned that they were attempting to produce a consensus document across the three separate senate statements – as is also the Conference's statutory responsibility. This same complaint was echoed in the anonymous December 12 e-mails.

During that meeting, the President also complained about the Conference members' communicating with each other in "late into the evening" phone calls and e-mails. This theme advanced by the President – that there was something inappropriate and conspiratorial in the Conference's efforts to seek to develop a consensus report – was a recurring element in a number of e-mails between Tih-Fen Ting and Lisa Troyer, and the December 12 e-mails themselves.

On Friday December 9, the University Senates Conference was scheduled to vote on a draft report from its task force. The President had received a copy of the draft report that was improperly forwarded by Tih-Fen Ting, even though the Conference had explicitly agreed that no drafts would be shared with others until the group was ready to issue its final report. Upon receiving the leaked draft, the President contacted the Chair of the Conference, and in an irate phone call attempted to pressure him to alter the report.

Over the course of that weekend the President continued his effort to suppress opposition to the enrollment management proposals from the Chancellors and faculty leaders. In his December 10 e-mail to Chair Kennedy, the President summarizes his communications with the Chancellors, saying,

I stated as strongly as I could that the Board and I had endorsed the new plan and expected them to follow suit and to so inform their provosts, deans, enrollment management staff, and their senate leadership, including the chair of the senates conference. I asked them to issue that communication within 48 hours.

In addition to this, he then drafted letters to the Chancellors and to the full Conference, enjoining these parties to drop their objections to the enrollment management proposals. The letter the President drafted for the Conference concluded,

In short, the recommendations represent Board policy, as well as the President's goal. The two should be viewed as inseparable and we hope that the Conference will not find itself at odds with what the trustees, as well as the President, are trying to do.

That letter was sent on December 11, the Chancellor statements all appeared on December 12, and on that same day the anonymous e-mails were sent to the Conference by Chief of Staff Troyer, posing as a member, trying to exacerbate divisions within the Conference and discouraging it from producing a consensus report on the enrollment management proposals.

The question of direct knowledge or responsibility by the President for these e-mails needs to be subsumed under the wider question of his involvement in a clear effort to divide and intimidate the Conference, and to interfere with its efforts to produce an advisory report. *Even if Chief of Staff Troyer concocted the December 12 e-mails alone, her efforts were in the service of this wider strategy. They were not an isolated or totally individual act.*

**g On December 21, 2011, the University Senates Conference approved its consensus report on the enrollment management proposals, by a 13-2 vote. It was unanimously supported by the UIC members and by all but one of the UIUC members.**

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Prefiled Resolution

RS.12.01 Resolution on Senate Agendas

WHEREAS the agenda of the UIUC Senate's November 7 meeting raised issues concerning Illinois Senate Bill 512;

WHEREAS those issues were discussed in the Benefits Committee report as well as the report on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education;

WHEREAS the Urbana-Champaign Senate voted to discuss those issues, but the Senate Parliamentarian determined that the Illinois Open Meeting Act, if applicable, would prohibit a vote expressing the sense of the Senate because of a lack of prior notification that such a vote might take place;

WHEREAS the November 7 Senate meeting was the last possible meeting for such a vote to be relevant and timely;

WHEREAS advance notice of possible Senate action is always appropriate;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Senate Agendas for meetings should include notification to the effect that issues raised in any report included in the agenda might be the subject of a vote taken in the meeting; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures is requested to bring to the Senate a change in the *Senate Bylaws* and/or *Standing Rules* that will require such notification in future agendas.

*Sponsored by Senator:*

*Peter Loeb, Mathematics*





**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Prefiled Resolution

RS.12.02 Resolution on Enrollment Management, Diversity, and Shared Governance

WHEREAS the Enrollment Management Report commissioned by the University President's office addresses vital issues with respect to admissions, recruitment, and diversity at the three campuses of the University of Illinois, and

WHEREAS the UIUC Academic Senate Enrollment Management Task Force has issued a considered response acknowledging the recommendations of the Report that should be acted upon immediately, and collaboratively undertaken, and

WHEREAS the University Senates Conference has issued a similar report, and

WHEREAS the Task Force advocates that many recommendations await the establishment of collaborative processes within the contexts of campus-specific imperatives, and

WHEREAS neither the Report nor the Task Force has adequately addressed support needed to retain students from underrepresented groups, local conditions that impede retention, and the range of diversity parameters including race, gender, and economic status, and

WHEREAS the Task Force also advocated against implementing a number of recommendations in their current form, in most cases because they compromise the particular identity, missions, and academic strengths of the three campuses, and

WHEREAS the call for new University-level Enrollment Managers further bloats an already top-heavy and extraordinarily expensive University Administration, and

WHEREAS these recommendations echo the wider trend toward administrative centralization at the expense of shared governance bodies, and

WHEREAS recent news of administrative misconduct augments these concerns,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the UIUC Academic Senate reiterates its support for the Task Force proposals, particularly the facilitation of meaningful collaboration of campus faculty, enrollment managers and administrators in any new initiative, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate calls upon the Board of Trustees to postpone any implementation of recommendations other than those implementing campus level enrollment plans and collaborative mechanisms, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate calls for effective campus-level programs for the support and retention of students from underrepresented groups, and initiatives to sustain faculty from those groups, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate calls for attention not only to the timing but the level of tuition so that the University may be truly accessible to students from diverse backgrounds, seeking economies especially at the level of the University and campus administrations rather than core missions and,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate urges the President and the University Administration to reaffirm, in word and deed, a commitment to genuine shared governance where the advice of the faculty is not only encouraged but seriously considered, and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this resolution be transmitted to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, the University President, and the UIUC Chancellor and Interim Provost.

Endorsed by:

Al Kagan, Library

Kathryn J Oberdeck, LAS

Teresa Barnes, LAS

Tamara Chaplin, LAS

David Cooper, LAS

Norman Denzin, College of Media

LeAnne Howe, LAS

Peter Loeb, LAS

Megan McLaughlin, LAS

Mary Mallory, Library

Cris Mayo, School of Education

Melissa Pokorny, School of Art and Design

Mark E. Roszkowski, College of Business

Mark Steinberg, LAS

Stephen Taylor, School of Fine and Applied Arts

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures  
(Final; Action)

SP.11.12, Revisions to the *Bylaws* and *Standing Rules* Regarding Illinois Open Meetings Act Compliance

**BACKGROUND**

The Illinois Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/) (OMA) requires that "public bodies" in the state hold open deliberations and take actions in full view of the public. To that end, the OMA requires that public bodies provide notice of their agenda and allow members of the public to observe proceedings and to have access to minutes and other documents. The Freedom of Information Act (5 ILCS 140/)(FOIA) also mandates the availability to the public of most documents generated by public bodies and their constituent assemblies, such as committees and subcommittees. The OMA recognizes that public bodies must from time to time deliberate about sensitive issues that require confidentiality, including employment, financial affairs, and criminal matters. Thus, public bodies are entitled to close meetings, but only under a narrow set of statutory circumstances that must be articulated in advance.

Historically, the Senate has always followed rules that adhere to the spirit of the OMA and FOIA. Senate rules require that meetings always be open to the public, with provisions to close them when the Senate deems it necessary. Senate documents have always been available to the public under Senate rules. However, Senate rules about these matters are not 100% in compliance with OMA and FOIA.

Based on the Attorney General's *Guide to the Illinois Open Meetings Act* and an Illinois appellate court opinion in *Board of Regents v. Reynard* (292 Ill.App.3d 968, 4<sup>th</sup> District, 1997), it appears that the University of Illinois Academic Senate, including its committees and subcommittees, may be "public bodies" within the meaning of the OMA. Thus, the Senate's *Bylaws* and *Standing Rules* must be amended to bring the Senate into compliance. This proposal sets out those amendments.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends approval of the following revisions to the *Bylaws* and *Standing Rules*. Text to be added is underscored, and text to be deleted is indicated in [square brackets].

**PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE BYLAWS**

- 1 Part A – Meetings
- 2

- 3 9.  
4 a. Meetings of the Senate shall ordinarily be open to the public. Accredited  
5 representatives of the news media may observe Senate meetings, and facilities  
6 shall be provided for the public at large to listen to and, if physically feasible, to  
7 observe Senate proceedings.  
8  
9 b. The Senate reserves the right to close its sessions in those cases in which public  
10 disclosure would substantially and adversely affect the matters being considered.  
11 A specific exemption of the Open Meetings Act [5 ILCS 120/2(c)] permitting the  
12 closure of the meeting must be cited before closing a session.  
13  
14 c. This policy that Senate meetings are open to the public, and any implementing  
15 procedures, shall apply to the Senate when meeting as a body, and also to Senate  
16 committees and other constituent bodies.  
17  
18 d. The text of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/), including Section 2(c) setting  
19 out the permissible reasons for closing a meeting, may be found at the following  
20 URL: <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=84&ChapterID=2>.  
21

## 22 **PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *STANDING RULES***

### 23 Standing Rule 5. Open Meetings Regulations

- 24  
25 D.
- 26 1. Matters of business which are judged by the Senate Executive Committee to  
27 warrant a closed session of the Senate will ordinarily be placed last on the agenda.  
28 Such matters need not be specifically described in advance, [, but the general  
29 category of the matter warranting a closed session will be indicated.] The Senate  
30 Executive Committee must cite the specific exemption in the Open Meetings Act  
31 (5 ILCS 120/2(c)) that permits the closure of the meeting.  
32
  - 33 2. If in the course of a debate in an open meeting, matters evolve which a Senate  
34 member deems to warrant a closed session, the senator may move for a closed  
35 session. The senator must cite the specific exemption of the Open Meetings Act  
36 (5 ILCS 120/2(c)) that permits the closure of the meeting. Unless the Senate rules  
37 otherwise, the approval of such a motion will postpone further debate on the  
38 matter to the conclusion of the regular agenda, at which time the meeting will be  
39 closed. No such motion shall be deemed approved without a two-thirds vote of the  
40 senators present and voting.  
41
  - 42 3. When the agenda is presented at the beginning of a Senate meeting, any senator  
43 may move to schedule an item proposed for open session to a closed session. The  
44 senator must cite the specific exemption of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS  
45 120/2(c)) that permits the closure of the meeting. Such a motion shall require for  
46 approval a two-thirds vote of those senators present and voting.  
47

- 48 4. When a closed session is about to begin, the presiding officer shall clear the  
49 chambers and public areas of all persons not entitled to be present.  
50  
51 5. The Senate may not take any final vote during a closed session. Procedural votes,  
52 such as a vote to refer to a committee, may be taken in closed session. In order to  
53 take a final vote on any matter, the session must first be reopened to the public.  
54  
55 6. The text of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/), including Section 2(c) setting  
56 out the permissible reasons for closing a meeting, may be found at the following  
57 URL: <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=84&ChapterID=2>.  
58  
59 E. Semi-annually, the Senate Executive Committee shall review the minutes of all  
60 closed Senate sessions to determine whether those minutes may be released to the  
61 public.  
62

63 Standing Rule 8. To Take Jurisdiction of Items Reported for Information  
64

65 The Senate may take responsibility from any Senate committee on a reported action taken  
66 by the committee on behalf of the Senate. This may be accomplished by passage of a  
67 motion to take jurisdiction. The motion to take jurisdiction allows debate on the merits of  
68 the original committee action. Passage of this motion requires a simple majority. The  
69 item becomes Old Business on the agenda of the next Senate meeting. [unless the Senate  
70 votes by a two-thirds majority to take immediate action.]  
71

72 Standing Rule 10. Copying and Searching Senate Records  
73

74 B. Senate committee [agenda, minutes, and] working documents [which]  
75 that are not distributed to the Senate are not considered public documents. They  
76 are not available for distribution except to the members of the originating  
77 committee and to the Senate Executive Committee, without the express consent of  
78 the originating committee. Senate and Senate committee meeting agenda and  
79 approved minutes are considered public documents.  
80

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

William Maher, Chair

Nikita Borisov

H. George Friedman

Piyush Gupta

Melissa Madsen

Anna-Maria Marshall

Jim Maskeri

Ann Reisner

Charles Evans, *Observer*

Sandy Jones, *Ex officio (designee)*

Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*



# Report on IBHE Faculty Advisory Council Meeting

December 9, 2011

HE.12.04

The [Faculty Advisory Council](#) (FAC) of the [Illinois Board of Higher Education](#) (IBHE) held a regularly scheduled meeting at The President Abraham Lincoln Hotel & Conference Center, Springfield, Illinois on Friday December 9, 2011 with 34 [member institutions](#) present. Guests of the council included IBHE staff Don Sevener (Deputy Director for External Relations), Bob Blankenberger (Deputy Director for Academic Affairs), Alan Phillips (Deputy Director for Finance and Planning), Ocheng Jany (Associate Director for Academic Affairs), Linda Oseland (Associate Director), Dan Cullen (Assistant Director for Academic Affairs), Allison Witt (Assistant Director for Academic Affairs), Candace Mueller (Assistant Director) as well as Elaine Johnson (Vice President for Academic Affairs, Illinois Community College Board) and David Tretter (President of the Federation of Illinois Independent Colleges and Universities).

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 AM by Chair Aminmansour. He reported on the meeting of the Performance Based Funding (PBF) Steering Committee earlier in the week and noted that the Committee is to submit its recommendations to the IBHE in advance of its February 7 meeting when the Board will approve its higher education budget recommendation.

The major item on the FAC's [meeting agenda](#) was discussion with the IBHE staff of [Performance-Based Funding](#) mandated by Illinois [Public Act 97-320](#) (HB1503). The bill requires IBHE to establish metrics for performance-based funding of state's public universities and colleges beginning with the fiscal year 2013. IBHE has established a [Steering Committee](#) on PBF which [meets regularly](#) to develop a set of metrics for PBF for consideration by the Board in time for next year's budget proposal to the State. The Council held a lengthy discussion with the IBHE staff involved in development of the Steering Committee's recommendations. In the end the Council decided to forward a new recommendation to the PBF Steering Committee for its consideration and inclusion in its recommendations to the Board. The Council's recommendation was to address quality assurance by adopting the ratio of tenure system faculty to non-tenure system faculty as a metric for evaluation (see attached letter).

In other business, the Council recognized Mr. Don Sevener, the retiring IBHE Deputy Director for External Relations. A resolution previously approved by the Council was read (copy attached) to Mr. Sevener for his distinguished service to higher education in Illinois. He was also presented with a plaque bearing the text of the resolution. Mr. Sevener was joined at the meeting by his wife. Ms. Keely Burton, the staff member who recently left IBHE was also recognized.

In the afternoon session, the Council caucuses met individually and reported back to the Council.

The Council covered other routine business including approval of minutes of the previous meeting and the IBHE staff were recognized for their hospitality. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM. The next meeting of the Council will be held at the Columbia College of Chicago on Friday January 20, 2012.

Respectfully submitted  
Abbas Aminmansour

Attachments

**Resolution of Appreciation from  
The Faculty Advisory Council of the  
Illinois Board of Higher Education  
For Don Sevener, IBHE Deputy Director for External Relations**

*Whereas*, Don Sevener has served admirably on the staff of the Illinois Board of Higher Education since 1997,

*Whereas*, Mr. Sevener served as the IBHE Deputy Director for External Relations since 2007,

*Whereas*, in his capacity as Deputy Director, Mr. Sevener did an excellent job as the public spokesperson for the Board, as the Board's chief liaison to the General Assembly, and as the interface between the Board and many other external constituencies,

*Whereas*, Mr. Sevener has been involved in all key initiatives and activities of the Board including the development of the Illinois Public Agenda for College and Career Success, budget issues and, the Board's legislative agenda,

*Whereas*, Mr. Sevener served as the Interim Executive Director of the Board in 2010,

*Whereas*, Mr. Sevener plans to retire at the end of the 2011 calendar year,

*Whereas*, Mr. Sevener has taught English at three higher education institutions and he is a former journalist,

*Whereas*, IBHE's Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) is the most comprehensive organization representing Illinois' higher education faculty from public and private institutions as well as community colleges,

*Be It Therefore Resolved* that, the Faculty Advisory Council of the Illinois Board of Higher Education offers its utmost gratitude to Mr. Sevener for his effective and sincere efforts to serve the State of Illinois, the Board of Higher Education and the higher education community,

*Be It Also Resolved* that, the Council wishes Mr. Sevener an enjoyable and well-deserved retirement,

*Be It Further Resolved* that the Council Chair forwards this resolution to the members of the Board of Higher Education and its staff.

This resolution was approved by the members of the Council on this day, Friday November 18, 2011.



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN



**Abbas Aminmansour, Chair**  
Faculty Advisory Council  
Illinois Board of Higher Education  
c/o 117 Temple Buell Hall, MC-621  
Champaign, IL 61820 USA

January 3, 2012

Dr. George Reid, Chair  
Performance Based Funding Steering Committee  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

Submitted via email to: [Reid@IBHE.org](mailto:Reid@IBHE.org)

Dear Dr. Reid:

Happy New Year.

The Faculty Advisory Council of the Illinois Board of Higher Education respectfully offers the following metric for consideration by the Performance Based Funding Steering Committee in its deliberations to develop recommendations to the Board.

*We recommend that the ratio of tenure-system to nontenure-system faculty be used as a metric for performance based funding.*

Tenure-system faculty include tenure track (faculty on their probationary period to obtain tenure) as well as those who have already earned tenure. Nontenure-system faculty includes all other instructional staff. We believe this metric will contribute to maintaining quality in our institutions' accomplishing their missions.

We continue to offer our strong support for development of simple, rational, fair and practical criteria for performance based funding in Illinois.

Many thanks to you and the Steering Committee for your consideration and hard work on this important matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "A. Aminmansour".

Abbas Aminmansour, Chair  
Faculty Advisory Council, Illinois Board of Higher Education

cc: Alan Phillips  
Robert Blankenberger



**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



**University Senates Conference (USC)**  
**Friday, January 13, 2012**  
**Minutes**  
(Final; Information)

PLACE: Student Center West, University of Illinois at Chicago

PRESENT: Andersen, Burbules (Vice-chair), Campbell, Chambers (Chair), Erricolo, Fadavi, Francis, Gibori, Graber, Leff, Mallory, Martin (via phone for the afternoon session), Mohammadian, Patston, Shanahan, Struble, Switzer, Ting

GUESTS: Mike Hogan, Chris Kennedy

Chambers convened the meeting at 10:02 a.m. and stated that President Hogan and Board Chairman Kennedy will join us at 1:00 p.m. to discuss Dashboard. He stated that if we discuss the Troyer personnel matter with Kennedy we would have to go into Executive Session. Chambers said it was a pleasure to honor Michelle Thompson at our dinner last night. Discussion ensued regarding the open meetings act and procedures for requesting such a session.

Anderson moved to approve the minutes from November 17, 2011 and Burbules seconded the motion. On page 3, paragraph 6, Chambers clarified that ex-officio members have the same rights as committee members but without the right to vote. Based on Switzer's comments at the last meeting he indicated that the minutes infer the ex-officio members were guilty of conspiracy and that is not true. He felt that an apology was due to the ex-officio members. Chambers shared documents further clarifying the role they played on the committee and that there was absolutely no conspiracy. Discussion ensued about the FOIA request for the tape of the October meeting and how that presented numerous difficulties for the USC since members no longer felt comfortable recording meetings. Ting stated that the request was made from John Martin, not the UIS Executive Committee (EC) or Senate. When questioned further, Ting stated that it was discussed in the UIS Senate and EC but that the request was made from Martin. Chambers asked why that discussion was not included in the UIS minutes. The remainder of the morning session was spent discussing the open meetings act and the responsibility of individual committee members to act professionally and responsibly. Many concerns were shared.

After returning from lunch, Kennedy asked that we move to Executive Session to discuss personnel matters of the university. Anderson moved to go to Executive Session. Graber seconded the motion. Burbules stated that the president should be asked to leave the room during that part of the meeting in which he would be discussed. Kennedy said he would not entertain that request. The motion to move into Executive Session passed unanimously.

The group moved out of Executive Session at 2:55 p.m. to discuss the Enrollment Management (EM) report. Kennedy felt that EM was more pressing than Dashboard and asked that we address the concerns of USC members point by point. Leff said that many of the concerns were in relation to whether the benefits of EM would outweigh the costs. Other major concerns related to branding. Kennedy led the remainder of the afternoon session in which each recommendation was discussed. Suggestions from USC members were entered into Powerpoint slides that would later be made available. The meeting ended at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kim C. Graber





**Report of the  
University of Illinois Board of Trustees Meeting  
Dec. 2, 2011  
University of Illinois at Springfield**

This was the first BOT meeting to be video-streamed; it was also the first Board meeting attended by our Chancellor, Phyllis Wise; and by the new Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Christophe Pierre.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS MEETING:**

1. **President Hogan** announced that, in the wake of the recent sex abuse scandal at Penn State, he had formed **a task force** to inventory our current processes and training in this area. He commented that he had decided to form the task force, and then heard from Board Chair Chris Kennedy that the Chair also wanted him to form such a committee and report back to the Board.

Serving on the Task Force will be Tom Bearrows (University Counsel), Maureen Parks (Executive Director of Human Relations), and Donna McNeilly (University Ethics Office).

The initiative will involve the following steps:

1. a communication emphasizing safety for all members of our community, specifying that anyone witnessing criminal activity is required to report such activity to law enforcement officers, and that all who make such reports will be protected from retaliation;
2. an inventory and evaluation of our current preventive and reporting practices;
3. implementation of new policies, including mandatory sexual harassment training for all university employees

The President specified that we would implement special oversight for activities involving youth, such as music camp, 4H, etc.

2. George Reid, Executive Director of the **Illinois Board of Higher Education**, spoke on performance-based funding. The Blueprint for Higher Education created by the IBHE a couple of years ago revealed a gap in terms of access. However, the UI is making good progress in closing that gap.

3. Special Assistant to the President Ajijit Ghosh presented data based on the "**Dashboard**," which is the Board's system of measuring progress in a variety of areas on each of the three campuses. Each campus has its own "dashboard," which compares the campus to its peers. Currently only "peer" campuses are identified in these reports, but, in response to a request from Chair Kennedy, Dr. Ghosh indicated that future reports might also include "aspirational peers." Trustee Pamela Strobel indicated that it was important that the Chancellors be consulted when determining the list of peers and aspirational peers for each campus. The Board agreed that discussion of campus and even unit-level metrics would form an important part of the January 2012 Board retreat.

Chair Kennedy expressed his sense that, of the six yearly Board meetings, two should be dedicated to examining globally the status of the University, considering all aspects of the Dashboard.

4. Several months ago, the Board hired the Bronner Group to advise the University on how we could increase the number of contracts we award to **MAFBE**-certified companies. (MAFBE stands for Minority and Female Business Enterprise). Representatives of the Bronner Group--which itself is MAFBE-certified--gave their report. They reported that about 10% of the funds the University spends on contracts goes to MAFBE-certified companies.

They recommended that, in order to increase this percentage, we create 2.5 additional positions for supplier diversity-related activities, including a half-time position to support technology. They also suggested that we stop using the term MAFBE, which they said has negative connotations across the state, and that we instead use a new "brand"--for instance, "UILLINOIS Supplier Diversity."

Trustee Koritz asked how much money the University had paid the Bronner Group for this consultation; the answer was "about \$220,000."

The trustees considered the relative merits both of the Bronner Group recommendations, and of the funds spent on their consultation. Trustee Estrada noted he often heard questions about the University's commitment to hiring minority-owned businesses, but that we should also hold ourselves accountable for the amount of money we spend on **consultants**.

5. A group of legislators presented a statement to the Board requesting that they make every effort to keep the **Police Training Institute** open on our campus

A Stewarding Excellence report had recommended that we investigate other ways for PTI to operate that would not involve campus expenditure. . Laurel Prussing, Chapin Rose, Mike Frerichs, and Naomi Jakobssen argued, however, that short-term financial difficulties should not drive a decision to close an entity that has trained over half of the police officers in the state.

Chair Kennedy assured the guests that President Hogan would work to find a way to "be flexible" in planning PTI's future.

6. Chancellor Susan Koch gave a **presentation on the University of Illinois-Springfield campus** and its recent accomplishments. Among other data presented were the following:

ISU has 5,137 students, 61 percent of whom are undergraduates. It has 44 degree programs. Recent noteworthy events included Chancellor Koch's representation of UIS at the Illinois State Fair, at which Lt. Governor Sheila Simon hosted an event for top high school scholars.

Also, Chancellor Koch spoke of UIS's accomplishments in online learning, including briefings given by two faculty members to the Governor on online learning, and the promotion of Prof. Ray Schroeder to Associate Vice Chancellor for Online Learning.

Chancellor Koch expressed the following goals for her campus:

1. Establish a tone of ethical, open, engaged leadership--including establishing a variety of communication channels, including a Chancellor's Blog, which will launch in January.

2. Advance academic and research mission, by identifying the academic and research programs at which UIS can be the best in the world
3. Increase the UIS investment in student recruitment, success, and retention. The UIS goal is to increase enrollment to 6000 undergraduate students.
4. Advance diversity efforts, for which the campus will increase the staffing in its office of equal access and opportunity.

7. Senate Chair **Tih-Fen Ting** gave the annual report on the activities of the **UIS Senate**. Among other points:

1. The Senate Executive Committee of UIS has 6 members and meets every two weeks.
2. The full UIS Senate consists of 28 senators, including 20 faculty members. This number represents 10 percent of UIS's tenure-track faculty.
3. One accomplishment of the UIS Senate was to approve an initiative to raise awareness of the Access Illinois Initiative, which will increase scholarship funds for underrepresented students. Dr. Ting praised Chancellor Koch for having made a \$25,000 contribution to this fund.
4. Speaking about the University Senates Conference request for a cross-campus summit, Dr. Ting noted that the UIS Senate had proposed different topics for this summit, and asserted that none of those topics were reflected in the USC report. However she added that was glad to see that many of the topics proposed by UIS were already addressed in the enrollment management proposals forwarded by the two outside consultants hired by the President's Office.

Chair Kennedy asked Dr. Ting how **the "pruning" of academic programs** takes place at UIS. She responded that there was a careful budgetary review before any new programs were approved at the campus level, and that there was ongoing program review with intense faculty participation, the outcomes of which were to be taken seriously.

Chair Kennedy asked Dr. Ting about her view of the role of the Board in making decisions regarding program pruning, and she responded, "I guess the Board can tell administrators what to do."

8. During the report of **Chief Financial Officer Walter Knorr**, the following figures were presented:

1. Our MAP funding, for financial aid, is coming in as billed, as are tuition dollars.
2. Tuition and state money go mostly to support our academic mission, including salaries. Average salaries at the three campuses:  
\$65,000 at UIS  
\$96,000 at UIC  
\$106,000 at UIUC

There is a considerable lag in faculty salaries behind peer private institutions such as Duke, Washington University, etc.

The Board discussed the increasing need for money to fund financial aid. Chair Kennedy expressed the opinion that **we should be using internal cuts from ARR to provide more financial aid.**

It was noted that UIUC has the second highest graduation rate among public institutions in our peer group, and the second lowest debt level upon graduation.

The President asserted that his office would be doing **a very serious program review**, starting with centers and institutes and then going to doctoral programs. He added that the University must be sure to allocate our funds to “the highest priorities.”

9. Faculty comment: **University Senates Conference chair Don Chambers** spoke about the role of USC and added his observation that faculty must be centrally involved in decisions about what metrics should be included in the “Dashboard” that is used to measure performance.

**Joyce Tolliver, SEC Vice-Chair**  
URBANA SENATE OBSERVER

**Report of the  
University of Illinois Board of Trustees Meeting  
January 19, 2012  
University of Illinois at Chicago**

Audio/video recordings of the meeting will be available here:

<http://www.uillinois.edu/trustees/audio>

SUMMARY: The meeting included over four hours of executive session discussion. In open session, the trustees elected officers for the calendar year, approved tuition rates, and voted on appointments included in the agenda items, including the appointment of a new football coach for the UIUC campus. They also heard a presentation from University Senates Conference Chair Don Chambers on the responsibility of our administrative leaders for the ethical violations detailed in the January 13 Investigative Report.

This was the last Board meeting of Dr. Michele Thompson, who has served the University for over thirty years. A resolution was read in appreciation of her distinguished service, and President Hogan announced that the rooms in the UIC Student Union where the Board meets will be renamed in her honor.

1. ELECTIONS: Chris Kennedy was unanimously re-elected to a third term as BOT chair. Trustees Stroben and McMillan were re-elected as members of the Executive Committee. Thomas Bearrows was re-elected as BOT representative of University Counsel. Finally, BOT Secretary Michele Thompson was re-elected until Jan. 30, 2012, at which point she will retire and the position will be assumed by Susan Kies.

2. TUITION: In accordance with the Board's decision last year to set the four-year tuition rate at the level of inflation, an increase of 4.8% was approved.

VP Knorr noted that Illinois is the only state that has the four-year guaranteed tuition. This guarantee skews the numbers, since individual students pay the same rate of tuition for four years in a row. It also makes it hard to compare our tuition rates across public universities in other states.

He also noted that, while there has been an increase in our enrollments over the past decade, there has also been a 34% decrease in state funding.

Trustee Koritz expressed a hope that next year the increase in tuition can be set at 0%.

Trustee Montgomery expressed the opinion that online education could provide more access at a lower cost.

3. APPOINTMENTS: Usually, academic and administrative appointments are approved by the Board without comment. This time, Trustees Oliver and Montgomery spoke against the appointment of Timothy Beckman as the UIUC head varsity coach for football. Trustee Oliver asserted his conviction that insufficient efforts were made to recruit and hire an African-American coach, and noted that, within our league, we join only Purdue and Northeastern in the dubious distinction of never having hired an African-American football or basketball coach. Both Trustee Oliver and Trustee Montgomery voted "no" on the hiring of Coach Beckman; other trustees approved the hire.

Chair Kennedy noted that during executive session discussions, each trustee had had an opportunity to frankly discuss this personnel issue.

4. STATEMENT ON LEADERSHIP read by Don Chambers, Chair of University Senates Conference: The text of the statement is included below.

The Board made no response to the Statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS TO THE BOARD ON THE ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP (JANUARY 18, 2012)

Thank you, members of the Board, for the opportunity to speak with you today, in the midst of one of the worst scandals ever to confront this university.

This is a time when faculty leaders must speak up about our commitment to ethical standards, as you have. I am speaking here on behalf of the current elected senate leadership of Urbana, Matt Wheeler and Joyce Tolliver; of the Chicago senate, Phil Patston and myself; and of the University Senates Conference, Nick Burbules and myself.

These have been long and difficult days for all of us, so I will be brief and direct.

We believe that the Investigative Report on Anonymous E-Mails contains evidence implicating a wider scope of involvement in the controversy than simply the question of who wrote the anonymous e-mails themselves.

Today, we want to articulate a number of principles:

First, ethical conduct means more than merely legal conduct; and there are things which may be legally permissible, but which are nevertheless ethically reprehensible.

Second, direct causal responsibility is not the same as moral responsibility; and responsibility for setting an ethical tone and promoting a culture of accountability is a central dimension of leadership.

Third, as Trustee Edward McMillan has so aptly articulated, leaders must accept responsibility for what happens on their watch even if they may not have personally directed or approved it.

No one can read the Investigative Report, including the Appendices, without being shocked by a widespread pattern of inappropriate, secretive, and deceptive behavior. The content of some of the secret communications is unbelievably mean-spirited and nasty. I am sure that readers to whom these individuals are just names would wonder, *Who are these people?* This pattern of sleazy conduct, now on open display, is as damaging to the university as the production of the infamous e-mails themselves.

In closing, I want to reiterate our central concern with this scandal. This pattern of behavior, including but not limited to the production of the anonymous emails themselves, is the most serious assault on the principles and processes of shared governance that has ever occurred in the history of this great university.

But beyond this, we speak to our concerns as educators, conscious of our role as models and exemplars to our students in how to conduct themselves. Our behavior, as professors or as administrators, is always on display to them; and when we fail to hold ourselves to the highest standards of behavior, we fail as educators as well.

**Joyce Tolliver, SEC Vice-Chair**

URBANA SENATE OBSERVER