

I
ILLINOIS
Office of the Senate

Report of the
Eighth Senate Review Commission

Submitted to the:
Senate Executive Committee and the
Urbana-Champaign Senate

May 14, 2019

Commission Members:

Cole, CL (Chair)
DeLorenzo, Michael
Forsyth, David
Harris, Wendy
Knox, Emily
Roether, Jenny
Roncone, Annalisa
Schiffer, Ryan
Trei, Kelli
Tyson, Jeremy

INTRODUCTION

The Senate established the Eighth Senate Review Commission during the 2018-19 academic year to carry out a review of the Senate and make recommendations for consideration by the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). In order to accomplish this goal, the Commission solicited input from Senators, Senate Committee Chairs, and other Senate leaders. The Commission met eleven times (November 9, November 16, December 7, January 23, February 6, February 20, March 6, March 27, April 10, April 24 and May 8) to plan and carry out its mission.

The Eighth Senate Review Commission (SR) respectfully submits the following recommendations for consideration by the Senate and the SEC. To provide accountability and transparency, SR requests that the SEC provide a written response to the Senate on each recommendation by the end of the 2019-20 academic year. The written response should contain details of what, if any, action has been taken and the current status of each recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

REVIEW THE PARTICIPATION OF EMERITI IN THE SENATE AND ITS COMMITTEES

The recent governance audit noted the participation of emeriti as a topic of review in two of the past three Review Commission reports (XSR.00.03, Final Report of the Fifth Senate Review Commission, and XSR.15.01, Report of the Seventh Senate Review Commission), yet the topic never reached the full Senate as a discussion or as part of an actionable proposal. The SR recommends holding a Committee of the Whole Discussion (COTW) at a Senate meeting to discuss the role of emeriti in the Senate and on Senate committees.

An informational document, created by SEC and included in the meeting packet, could start the COTW discussion with suggested paths forward. Those paths could include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Confirm the current emeriti participation.
- 2) Allow emeriti to serve only as senators, but not serve on committees.
- 3) Allow emeriti to serve on committees, but not serve as senators.
- 4) Allow emeriti to serve only on certain committees, but not as senators.
- 5) Limit emeriti service on committees, and allow emeriti to serve as senators.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

IMPROVE THE MANAGEMENT OF SENATE MEETINGS TO MAINTAIN QUORUM

During the review of attendance at Senate meetings, the SR advises that the Senate is having difficulty maintaining quorum throughout meetings, rather than achieving quorum at meetings. The SR recommends the SEC play a more active role in the management of Senate meetings. Those strategies could include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Reviewing the 5:15 pm adjournment time (*Standing Rule 1*) to consider ending at 5:00 pm.
- 2) Setting a time limit on remarks by the Chancellor and SEC Chair.
- 3) Setting and adhering to time limit to introduce a proposal to the Senate (e.g., three minutes).
- 4) Setting and adhering to time limit on discussion of a proposal while allowing requests for additional time (e.g., three minutes per person).
- 5) Arranging the agenda so all items requiring a vote (minutes/consent agenda/proposals) appear at the beginning of the agenda and all items that do not require a vote (remarks/questions/reports) would appear at the end of the agenda.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

REVISE THE *BYLAWS*, PART A.1 AND A.5.G

At recent Senate meetings, some topics of discussion made it difficult for the Chancellor or his designee to preside over portions of the meeting, requiring him to relinquish the chairship during those discussions. The SR recommends the SEC discuss the most appropriate person to preside over Senate meetings. Possible presiding officers include:

- 1) Chancellor or Chancellor's designee
- 2) SEC Chair
- 3) Parliamentarian
- 4) Elected Speaker of the Senate

The majority of the business conducted at the Organizational Meeting is voting on members of the various committees of the Senate for the next academic year; therefore, the SR recommends the incumbent SEC Chair preside over the voting portion of that meeting. The SR also recommends the Chancellor (or designee) should continue calling the meeting to order and giving remarks at the Organizational Meeting.

RECOMMENDATION #4:

REVISE THE DUTIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY, INCLUDING *STANDING RULE 13*

Background information for the following suggested revision of duties is in the attached Appendix A.

- A. **Degree programs and Requirement for award of degrees:** The *Bylaws* should be revised to reflect the role of the Senate and clarified as to what "general" requirements (as stated in the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.c) refer.
- B. **Initiation, changes or discontinuance of curricula:** The colleges, not the Senate, have jurisdiction over curricula (as stated in the *Statutes*, Article III, Section 2.c). The reference to curricula should be removed from the *Bylaws*.
- C. **Formation of new units and Changes in organization:** If there is a desire to formalize the "Levels of Governance for Program and Curricular Changes" document, the *Statutes* should be changed to reflect the role of the Senate, and the *Bylaws* should add such duties to EP.
- D. **Formation, Termination, Separation, Transfer, Merger, Change in Status, or Renaming of Units/Naming and Renaming Rights/*Standing Rule 13*:**
 - i. *Standing Rule 13a* should be removed as it puts EP in contradiction with college oversight as noted in the *Statutes*, Article IV, Section 2.c which states, "The faculty of the department shall have power to determine such matters as do not so affect relations with other departments or colleges,"

or *Standing Rule 13a* should be rewritten to provide clarity or remove other broad language that is in conflict with college authority.

This recommendation is supported by the recent governance audit where it was noted that *Standing Rule 13a* goes beyond the Senate's authority to provide advice on the closing of academic units as well as presuming all changes within a program of a

certain size will affect other units or colleges. However, it was also noted that there is no process or control to ensure all unit closings are sent to the Senate as required by the *Statutes*.

- ii. The language in *Standing Rule* 13b and 13c (and 13a, if rewritten) should be moved to the *Bylaws* under the duties of EP and clarified as regular duties of the committee to prevent further confusion or changing of *Standing Rule* 13.
- iii. There is no role for EP in naming and renaming rights, and they should be removed from the process.

E. **Review of budgetary implications:** The SR agrees with the recent governance audit that the Chancellor should determine whether EP should review the budgetary impact of proposals and to what extent.

F. **Other recommendations** made by the Office of University Audits, related to EP but to be addressed by the Provost:

- i. It was recommended that the Provost boost monitoring of enrollment trends using data sets including but not limited to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) Academic Programs Efficiency and Effectiveness Report (APEER). When trends are identified, the Provost should reach out to units at the college level for additional information and context that may require Senate review or further explanation.
- ii. The Provost has agreed to review the academic governance process and work with EP to formalize actions that require review based on the *Statutes*.
- iii. The Office of the Provost will work to educate academic units about the approval process and specific expectations therein.

RECOMMENDATION #5:

FURTHER DEFINE THE ELIGIBILITY AND DUTIES OF THE SEC CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

The SR noted the only eligibility requirement for the positions of SEC Chair or Vice-Chair is to be an elected senator. The SR recommends that the SEC determine additional eligibility criteria and duties for the positions of SEC Chair and Vice-Chair, such as:

Eligibility:

- 1) At least one year of service on the Senate or a Senate committee.

Duties:

- 1) Establish and maintain relationships with the chair of each Senate committee and regularly advise and support Senate committee chairs (e.g., once per semester).
- 2) Initiate reviews of standing Senate committees on a five-year rotation (i.e. with a total of twenty standing committees, four committees would be reviewed each year).
- 3) Enforce the expectation that Senate committees submit annual reports and share these reports with the Senate.

RECOMMENDATION #6:

CREATE A GUIDE TO CLARIFY THE ROLE AND DUTIES OF EACH SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIR

SEC should work with each Senate committee and former chairs to create a guide specific to each committee.

The guide should include items such as:

- 1) Annual report guidelines and deadlines
- 2) Basic Illinois Open Meetings Act (OMA) rules
- 3) Items specific to committee (e.g. GP – monitor background checks, faculty policy guide; LB – conducting 1 year and 5 year reviews of Library Dean)
- 4) Process to create subcommittees

RECOMMENDATION #7:

REVIEW EACH SENATE COMMITTEE’S DUTIES AND MEMBERSHIP

The SR recommends that each Senate standing committee (*Bylaws*, Part D as shown in Appendix B) review its duties and membership to determine if the committee/body is appropriately charged, aptly structured, and properly functioning. Each committee shall provide feedback on their review to the SEC. The SEC shall oversee the review process.

The SR reviewed the current academic professional membership on Senate committees and does not recommend adding academic professional members to any additional Senate committees. The following Senate committees currently have academic professional members:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Senate Executive Committee | Equal Opportunity and Inclusion |
| Admissions | Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits |
| Budget | General University Policy |
| Campus Operations | Information Technology |
| Committee on Committees | Public Engagement and Outreach (2 APs) |
| Educational Policy | University Statutes and Senate Procedures |
| Elections and Credentials | University Student Life |

Below are some specific items that should also be considered while reviewing the following committees:

Academic Freedom and Tenure

Review the *Statutes*, Article IX, Section 6b(3) to determine if a committee has been specified by the Senate for hearings regarding severe sanctions on faculty other than dismissal for cause. Revise the *Bylaws* to charge the appropriate committee specified by the Senate.

Review the *Statutes*, Article X to ensure the committee’s charge is in alignment.

Budget

Work with the Office of the Provost to determine the duties and any overlap with other University budget committees.

Committee on Committees

Consider a simplification of the nomination and election process for all members of CC. Revise the academic professional member selection process to bring it in line with all other Senate committee academic professional members. The academic professional members on CC are selected by the Council of Academic Professionals (CAP) while all other Senate committee academic professional members are elected by the full Senate (which allows for nominations from the floor).

Conference on Conduct Governance

With the Committee on University Student Life, review the duties specified in the *Statutes*, Article XI, Section 1 to determine which committee is responsible for the duties specified.

Educational Policy

See Recommendation #4.

Equal Opportunity and Inclusion

Work with the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to determine the overlap of this committee's duties with other University diversity or equity committees, and revise the *Bylaws* as needed.

General University Policy

Codify the committee's annual review of background checks, Faculty Policy Guide, and multi-year contracts (*Statutes*, Article X, Section 1a) as part of the committee's duties.

Information Technology

Consider a new duty to regularly report to the Senate to bring the committee's duties in line with other Senate committees' duties. Consider adding language to the committee's duties to ensure there are adequate provisions for teaching needs, administrative support, and research support. Consider the addition of the Director of the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA) as an *ex officio* member.

Library

Review the committee's membership composition, including the three-year terms for members and requirement for committee members to be a senator at the time of election.

Work with the Office of the Provost and the Library Executive Committee to review the *Statutes*, Article VI(e) to clarify the advice on the annual appointment process and the five year performance review process for the campus librarian. Codify these processes in the committee's duties.

Review the committee's duties to ensure they are in alignment with the *Statutes*, Article VI(f).

Senate Executive Committee

Review the *Statutes* to ensure the committee's duties are in alignment.

Although the SR is not compelled to recommend any specific changes to the membership of SEC, it is recommended that the SEC convene all committee chairs (including those in the *Bylaws*, Part E) to consider the composition of SEC and whether it is properly composed to execute its duties.

Consider codifying the long-standing practice of the Chancellor attending SEC meetings (e.g., a *Bylaws* revision to add the Chancellor as an *ex officio* member).

Student Discipline

Revise the Bylaws to explicitly affirm the Senate’s delegation to the committee for the duties specified in the *Statutes*, Article XI, Section 2.

University Student Life

With the Conference on Conduct Governance, review the duties specified in the *Statutes*, Article XI, Section 1, to determine which committee is responsible for the duties specified. Review the committee’s membership composition, including *ex officio* student members to determine if there are established student organizations or entities that would be well suited to serve on the committee. Explore establishing a means to collect suggestions of topics for committee discussion from stakeholders through tools such as a survey or Senate website link.

RECOMMENDATION #8:

REVIEW THE *BYLAWS*, PART E (GOVERNING AND ADVISORY BODIES) AND PART F (SENATE REPRESENTATIVES TO OTHER BODIES)

The SR recommends that the SEC work with the appropriate University office for each governing/advisory body listed in Part E to determine:

- if each body is considered a Senate committee,
- who each body is staffed by, and
- who is responsible for overseeing the duties/charges for each body.

The SR also recommends that the SEC work with each body listed in Part F to determine:

- the relationship of each of these bodies to the Senate,
- who each body is staffed by, and
- who is responsible for overseeing the duties/charges for each body.

Once these determinations are made for both Part E and Part F, appropriate revisions to the *Bylaws* should be made to clarify the bodies’ role within the Senate or to clarify the Senate’s relationship within non-Senate bodies. If it is determined that the body is a Senate committee, it must adhere to the OMA.

The Athletic Board and the Joint Advisory Committee on Investment, Licensing, and Naming Rights are individually undergoing a review. The SR recommends that the SEC requests to receive the final reports from each of these reviews.

RECOMMENDATION #9:

REVIEW THE VALUE OF SERVICE TO THE SENATE

Shifting the current cultural mindset on the value of Senate service is critical to improving participation in shared governance. The SR recommends that the SEC work with University administrators at various levels to better acknowledge and recognize Senate service. The SR also recommends SEC advocate for the inclusion of Senate and Senate committee service as part of Provost Communication #9: Promotion and Tenure (e.g., Section III, C.4.A and C.4.B).

Appendix A
Recommendation #4: Revise the Duties of
the Senate Committee on Educational Policy,
including *Standing Rule 13*

Background.

The Senate *Bylaws* define the duties of the standing Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EP) as:

a. Duties

The Committee on Educational Policy shall examine, and make recommendations to the Senate concerning appropriate action on, educational policy matters over which the Senate has legislative jurisdiction, including:

1. Degree programs,
2. Initiation, changes or discontinuance of curricula,
3. Requirements for award of degrees,
4. Grading regulations,
5. Review and evaluation of experimental educational programs,
6. Budgetary implications of the foregoing.

The Committee, with the assistance of the Senate Clerk, shall also be responsible for recommending to the Senate a calendar which defines the periods of instruction, examination and vacation for the Urbana-Champaign campus. Each such calendar shall specify the beginning and ending dates of the academic year, the division between the first and second semesters, and the official University holidays. The Committee shall also be responsible for recommending to the Senate the synopsis of policies governing the calendar.

The Eighth Senate Review Commission examined the role of EP by reviewing annual reports and committee minutes. In addition, SR examined the guidance provided in the *Statutes*, *Standing Rule 13*, and the Campus Administrative Manual regarding the role of the Senate and other units as related to issues of educational policy.

Findings.

Duty: Degree programs and requirements for award of degrees: *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.c states “each senate shall determine for its campus matters of educational policy including but not limited to: ... general requirements for degrees and certificates”. The *Bylaws* do not contain the word “general,” so it is unclear how far the powers of the senate are expected to extend. EP has consolidated information from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), the University of Illinois Graduate College and their own documents and forms on their website (<https://www.senate.illinois.edu/educationalpolicy.asp>). As of the SR’s review, proposals for new degree programs are submitted to EP using the required format, and include budgetary and staff implications, connection to the University’s mission, market analysis, and the planned use of tuition waivers. The *Bylaws* should be revised to better define the role of EP as related to these requirements. See Recommendation A.

Duty: Initiation, changes or discontinuance of curricula: *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.c specifies that the Senate may not extend their powers “over which the college is given jurisdiction by Article III, Section 2.c”. This latter section states that “the college shall have jurisdiction in all educational matters falling within the scope of its programs, including the determination of its curricula.” The inclusion of curriculum changes in proposals submitted to EP should be discontinued. See Recommendation B.

The EP minutes and reports indicate that the oversight of curricula has been expanded to include the formation of new units, changes in organization (termination, separation, transfers, merger, change in status), naming, and renaming. This may be due to the assigned EP task related to budgetary implications of such changes, which is discussed below. Currently, the “Levels of Governance for Program and Curricular Changes” document (<https://provost.illinois.edu/files/2017/08/Urba-Levels-of-Governance-Fall-2015-v7.pdf>), which reflects current practice, not policy, has EP, the UIUC Senate, and the University Senates Conference extensively involved in these processes.

- **Formation of new units:** As per *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.e, the Senate is to be involved in any “new line of work involving questions of general educational policy”, but whether or not that would extend to the formation of new units is unclear. *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.c does allow the Senate to set policy on the “relations among colleges, schools, and other teaching divisions”. *Statutes*, Article VIII, Section 3 indicates that new units may be proposed by the faculty or executive officer of that school or college, as well as officers of higher units. The Senate is part of the approval process, and may also propose new colleges, other independent campus units, or units organized at the University level. The Senate is also part of the approval process for units not requiring Board of Trustees approval. The *Statutes* and *Bylaws* may need to be revised to reflect the role of EP and the Senate. See Recommendation C.
- **Change in organization:** *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.c does allow the Senate to set policy on the “relations among colleges, schools, and other teaching divisions.” However, *Statutes*, Article IV, Section 2.c. states “The faculty of the department shall have power to determine such matters as do not so affect relations with other departments or colleges”, therefore it is not always appropriate for the Senate to have oversight of decisions. But, *Statutes*, Article III, Section 2.d states that “the transfer of any line of work...within a campus” should be made by recommendation of the senate. *Statutes*, Article VIII, Section 4 indicates the guidelines noted above for the formation of new units also pertain for a change in organization. The *Statutes* and *Bylaws* may need to be revised to reflect the role of EP and the Senate. See Recommendation C.
- **Formation, Termination, Separation, Transfer, Merger, Change in Status, or Renaming of Units:**
 - *Standing Rule* 13a states that when any “unit of academic governance or administration intends to make a significant change to the enrollment or faculty in a current degree, major, minor, concentration, or other educational program, it must first file with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy a proposal detailing its intent”. Late in this section it appears “significant” is defined as any that is “intended to last two years or more and that lead to an increase or decrease of faculty size by at least 25 percent or student enrollment by at least 25 percent (for programs with 100 or more students) or at least 50 percent (for programs with fewer than 100 students)”. Additionally, the broad phrasing in *Standing Rule* 13a of “lead to an increase” seems

to contradict *Statutes*, Article IV, Section 2.c, creating situations where EP is weighing in on matters of curriculum changes where colleges should have oversight. *Standing Rule* 13a should be rewritten or removed. See Recommendation D(i).

- *Standing Rule* 13b states that EP will collect statements in regards to any “proposal for termination, separation, transfer, merger, or change in status of any academic unit” and shall share that information with the Senate. Additionally, *Standing Rule* 13c states that “any proposal for the formation or change in academic organization (such as, termination, separation, transfer, merger, change in status, or renaming) of an academic unit, as provided in the *Statutes*, Article VIII, the advice of the faculty at each level (e.g., department, school, college, as applicable) shall be taken and recorded by vote of the faculty. Voting shall be as provided in the bylaws of each unit. The vote shall be reported to the Senate by the Committee on Educational Policy when the proposed change is considered by the Senate.” *Statutes*, Article V, Section 5 states that “termination, separation, transfer, merger, or change in status...of any unit engaged in academic activities the creation of which does not requiring Board of Trustees approval shall be referred to the executive committee of the campus senate”. These duties seem related to what is inferred by the *Statutes* in the other bullets listed here. It appears the Senate has informally conferred some of these duties in *Standing Rules* 13b and 13c to EP. These *Rules* should be moved to the *Bylaws*. See Recommendation D(ii).
- Naming and renaming rights: *Statutes*, Article VIII, Section 4 states that renaming of a unit should be handled like formation of a unit, which makes the Senate part of the approval process. The *Bylaws* add that the Joint Advisory Committee on Investment, Licensing, and Naming Rights “will also review proposals to name campus buildings, classrooms, or other physical facilities for donors or other honorees”. *Standing Rule* 13c adds only that the faculty of the department, school, and/or college should vote on such a change. Within these three documents, there is no senate committee with a duty to review general naming or renaming plans, only those for donors or other honorees. Article V, Section 4 of the *General Rules* allows the chancellors/vice presidents of each campus to determine their own internal procedures for the review and approval of the naming of facilities and programs. For the Champaign-Urbana campus, the interim Campus Administrative Manual policy on “Naming Campus Facilities” (<https://cam.illinois.edu/policies/apr-16/>) has the Chancellor consulting with the Joint Advisory Committee on Investment, Licensing, and Naming Rights, and seeking the advice of the Senate on this issue. There is no role for EP specifically in the naming and renaming process. See Recommendation D(iii).

Duty: Grading regulations: *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.c states “each senate shall determine for its campus matters of educational policy including but not limited to: ... educational policy on student affairs”. In the *Bylaws*, the Senate provides oversight of grading regulations to EP, “problems, needs, and concerns of students” as related to campus policy to the Senate Committee on University Student Life, and “conduct of the judicial function of the student conduct governance system” to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline. There does not appear to be a conflict here.

Duty: Review and evaluation of experimental educational programs: *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.e states that “No new line of work involving questions of general educational policy shall be established on any campus except upon approval of the senate concerned...”. The review and

evaluation of experimental programs seems to fit within “general educational policy”. There does not appear to be a conflict here.

Duty: Budgetary implications of the foregoing: The phrasing of this duty presumably refers to the budgetary implications of duties 1 through 5, although only the “Initiation, changes or discontinuance of curricula” appear to have budgetary implications. *Statutes*, Article III, Section 2.c states:

“the college shall have jurisdiction in all educational matters falling within the scope of its programs, including the determination of its curricula, except that proposals which involve budgetary changes shall become effective only when the chancellor/vice president has approved them.”

Therefore, curricula changes effecting budgets should be routed to the Chancellor/Vice President, not the Senate. The recent report of the Office of University Audits noted that the EP indicated a previous Provost asked that budgetary components be included in the EP proposal form and process. The *Statutes* give this authority to the Chancellor/Vice President, not the Provost, so this discrepancy must be addressed. See Recommendation E.

Duty: Academic calendar: This duty is consistent with *Statutes*, Article II, Section 1.c and Article IX, Section 4.e.

The report of the Office of University Audits also described potential issues related to the management of EP, based on interviews. The new proposal routing system under development, coupled with recommendations made by the Eighth Senate Review Commission, will address these, including: clarification of the role of EP, formalizing the routing of proposals, term limits on committees, and further guidance for committee chairs.

Appendix B
Recommendation #7: Review Each
Senate Committee's Duties and Membership

Bylaws, Part D – Standing Committees

- Senate Executive Committee
- Academic Freedom and Tenure
- Admissions
- Budget
- Campus Operations
- Committee on Committees
- Conference on Conduct Governance
- Educational Policy
- Elections and Credentials
- Equal Opportunity and Inclusion
- Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits
- General University Policy
- Honorary Degrees
- Information Technology
- Library
- Public Engagement and Outreach
- Student Discipline
- University Senates Conference
- University Statutes and Senate Procedures
- University Student Life