

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE AY 2023/2024
RESOLUTION 53-09**

Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes* (ST-83)

WHEREAS, one of the roles of the University Senates Conference (USC) is to propose revisions to the *University of Illinois Statutes* (hereafter *University Statutes*); and

WHEREAS, the ST-83 document outlines proposed revisions as a second round of revision to the *University Statutes*, following previously approved by ST-77; and

WHEREAS, the ST-83 document proposes a critically important proposed revision, new in Article 2, Section 1, which clarifies the definitions of faculty and staff positions, including placing non-tenure system colleagues into the definition of faculty for the first time. It also lays out the implications of this inclusion for governance and other issues.info;

WHEREAS, the ST-83 document proposes removing the vague and inconsistently used term “academic staff,” which for example sometimes includes faculty and sometimes not; and

WHEREAS, the ST-83 document proposes updating the current term “Administrative and Academic Staff” to “faculty and staff” as a more appropriate descriptor throughout the *University Statutes*; and

WHEREAS, the ST-83 document in Article 2, Section 2, proposes a new definition of the senate’s role: “The senate is the sole elected assembly jointly representing the faculty, students, academic professionals, and others it deems eligible to participate in shared governance discussions across the full range of university concerns.”

WHEREAS, the ST-83 document proposes new definitions in Article 2 with staff categories addressed in Section 6 and visiting faculty and staff addressed in Section 8; and

WHEREAS, the ST-83 document highlights minimal content revision but a complete reorganization of Articles IX and X for greater clarity, enhanced consistency, and increased topical coherence.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Illinois Springfield Campus Senate rejects the proposed revisions as a whole and submits the following revisions and concerns to the University Senates Conference.

- 90-91: Suggest rephrasing as “...can be classified as faculty and staff, each of which has different roles, rights, and responsibilities ...;”
- 96: Delete “director,” as the language is vague, and may be inappropriate at UIS.
- 239: Suggest “...others, subject to the existing provisions of these statutes.”
- If 263-268 is a new section, Senate has the following suggestion:
Civil Service employees should be added or academic professionals could be changed to "non-faculty employees holding 100% appointment" or similar.
- 264: What rights are meant, as opposed to privileges? It is not well-defined;
- 275-288: Civil Service employees should be added or academic professionals could be changed to "non-faculty employees holding 100% appointment" or similar.
- 306: Considering the clause beginning on 306 “excluding those who hold administrative appointments,” we believe this requires further clarification. Department chairs, schools heads, and “program leads” (and similar positions if they are named differently) should remain eligible for service on the FAC, while associate Deans and “above” in the administrative structure should not be eligible. **We suggest clarifying language be added here regarding type and/or percentage of administrative appointment to be excluded from FAC service.**
- 306-314: The proposal to delete lines 306-314 of Section 4: This language outlines a clear process for elections to the committee and stipulates that the Senate clerk provides assistance with said elections. Having that language is useful for FAC; otherwise, we need to make requests for administrative support for our elections. **We suggest rejecting this change.**
- 339-340: Last sentence does not fit in this portion of the Statutes since it is referring to FAC. Should be relocated to Article II, Section 7.
- 355-357: SUCSS uses term Exempt Civil Service to designate employees not eligible to specific employment laws (i.e., overtime). Positions exempt from the State Universities Civil Service Act are found in Section 36e of the Act.
- 387-388: Cross-reference with II.1 for clarity of “academic administrators,” as APAC has administrative leaders that serve, such as in Student Affairs.
- 426: “in the first sense” has no referent.
- 525: Change to include “and staff” should also be made in 530, 596, 627, 644, and other places throughout the document.
- 533-538: This does not always occur with Civil Service employees as they should generally originate from the Dean based on a request from a unit. If leaving "and staff" then it should be reworded to "and academic professionals." The origination of Civil Service and Academic Professional positions are completely different.
- 644: “or levels” is vague. Suggest clarification as to which sort of employee “levels” refers.
- 1232: Ranks changed (line 1229), but not the same in non-tenured faculty; doesn’t include visiting faculty in the proposed language in line 116-120 [DA] Also seen in 414-428, among others. The remainder of the document should be reviewed for this omission.

1243-1244: staff and academic professionals seem to be interchangeable in language proposed which is in conflict from this. [AS]

1243-1244: The staff comprise **civil service** and academic professionals ruled exempt from the **State Universities Civil Service System** requirements (as defined in Article II, Section 6).

1244: Suggest phrasing as follows: “..ruled exempt from the Civil Service ~~requirements~~ Act...”

1320: UIS allows “visiting” academic professional appointments to be renewed but not indefinitely. I don’t know what the policy is for UIUC and UIC. An academic professional appointment that includes in the title the term “visiting” shall be for no longer than one year, but may be renewable **for a limited period of time.**

1778 (and the following section): Change in section heading suggests that non-tenure-track faculty are not eligible for leaves of absence. Clinical faculty are non-tenure-track, but are currently eligible for leaves of absence. This needs clarification.

1862-1874: There has been an option for faculty to go on leave without pay for a year, and be able to return. This was intended for tenure-system faculty, but is not so stated here.

1983-1996: Seems like an odd place to put policies that may need to change frequently. Are there not employment manuals, or other documents? If so, which abrogates the other?

1985-1986: Student employees are typically part-time, non-status appointments that are exempt from the **State Universities Civil Service System (SUCSS).**

Article XI: seems to be a separate issue that should not be considered with this set of changes.

1983: In relation to students—was student government asked to review or comment on these items?

1990: Seems to conflict with line 1995, needs clarification

2101: Compare to line 90: clarify “employees.”

2109-2110: “Employees” needs clarification: cf. line 90.

2127: Who specifies in the case of otherwise?

Sections 5-6: Who has academic freedom and when? Does an emeritus/a faculty member have academic freedom in relation to their teaching? I see that the AFT has recommended a 2/3 role for T/TT in governance—I think that is in line with HLC expectations in general. But then, in terms of the operative function of academic freedom outside of governance: in the classroom? And what other limitations?

No reference made to Civil Service or deans represented on other senates, and there should be, e.g. “non-faculty employees holding 100% employment,” or “students, or other.” This is in conflict with 238-239.

Also, the Committee suggests that the administration consider providing Faculty with workshops and perhaps training regarding Academic Freedom.

The Senate, in consideration of expediting our feedback to the committee, includes this letter, but notes that it did not debate, endorse, or reject the recommendations in the letter. The Senate identifies this as a source of potential contention and conflict that we would like the USC, or the appropriate committee, to take into account when it develops its final version.

To: Celest Weuve, Chair, UIS Campus Senate; Amy Dunning, Vice Chair, UIS Campus Senate; William Kline, Secretary, UIS Campus Senate; Aaron Stewart, Parliamentarian and Civil Service Representative, UIS Campus Senate

From: Members of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

Dr. Richard Funderburg

Dr. Ahmad Juma'h

Dr. Sibel Oktay

Date: March 13, 2023

Subject: Review of Proposed Revisions to the Statutes (USC ST-83 following ST-77)

Three members of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee met on March 6, 2023 to consider Proposed Revisions to the Statutes (USC ST-83 following ST-77). Dr. Richard Funderburg, Dr. Ahmad Juma'h, and Dr. Sibel Oktay were present for the entire duration of the meeting. Dr. Michael Murphy, Chair of the Committee, could not be present for the meeting because Dr. Murphy is on sabbatical. Specifically, the Committee members were asked by the Senate Executive Committee to review Article 2, Section 1 and Article 10 of the proposed amendments. The question asked of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is Do we approve, disapprove, or do we have a suggested change to the revisions being proposed?

The Committee members have suggested changes to the revisions being proposed. We believe that assuring academic freedom to non-tenured, non-tenure track faculty is ethical and the right thing to do; however, there are multiple ways of looking at the issue. Committee members expressed concerns about the potential diminution of capacity of the tenured/tenure track (T/TT) faculty to exercise its primary role in governance. (Note that since Article II, Section 4 is specifically referenced at the end of Section 1, paragraph e, we had to consider the proposed language changes to Section 4 as well.) Specifically, the language currently proposed enables disproportional authority in governance to non-tenure system faculty, which would not be a positive outcome in the interest of protecting academic freedom. T/TT faculty simply have a greater stake in governance and academic freedom than non-tenure system faculty due to the hurdles of achieving tenure and in having greater job security in part as compensation for lower wages. The proposed language in the statutes recognizes this greater stake in stating that interests and rights are not identical (Article II, Section 1, paragraph e as proposed) and in maintaining that tenure system faculty have a primary role in governance, while non-tenure system faculty do not (Article II, Section 4, paragraph a as proposed). But while these statements are proposed, they could be backed up with greater substance. Tenure also provides T/TT faculty an independence to voice positions that differ from administrators that is not enjoyed equally by non-tenure system faculty.

To address the potential for disproportional authority in governance being granted to non-tenure system faculty, the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee suggests that the Campus Senate should consider two possible changes to the revisions being proposed. The first suggestion would be to add a requirement that at least 2/3 of the decision-making body must be comprised by T/TT faculty at all times. The second suggestion would be to clarify that any additional governance privileges and rights granted to others may also be rescinded by tenure system faculty. Together, the suggested changes would alter the revisions being proposed to Article II, Section 4, paragraph a as follows

- a. Tenure system faculty (as defined by Article II, Section 1 (a)) have a primary role in governance. They also may grant additional governance privileges and rights to others insofar that tenure system faculty comprise two thirds or more of the decision-making body at all times. Tenure system faculty may also rescind at any time any additional governance privileges and rights previously granted to others.

Committee members approved these suggested changes upon a vote 3-0 in favor.