

TO: Jon Hale, Chair
Senate Executive Committee

FROM: David Dalpiaz, Chair
Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures

DATE: October 23, 2024

SUBJECT: SP.25.02, Amended Proposed Revision to the *Statutes* (USC ST-83 Revised)

I write with a request from the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures, asking you to send the following to the University Senates Conference (USC), which has requested that only SEC Chairs communicate with them about senate matters (USC letter, 17 Nov 2021).

On April 1, 2024, the UIUC Senate formally acted on the ST-83 package of revisions to the *Statutes* that USC had sent to the three senates in September 2021. Our Senate voted (108 in favor, 3 opposed, and 5 abstentions) to fully reject the ST-83 package and to transmit to USC our rationale for the rejection of the package to aid USC in considering the issues needing remediation. This August, the University Senates Conference returned a revised version of ST-83 to the three senates, while simultaneously sending these revisions to the President for transmission to the Board of Trustees, noting that the senates have until the middle of December to send additional comments to the President.

Consistent with its mandate in the UIUC Senate *Bylaws*, the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (SP) has been working on how it should best guide the UIUC Senate's response. As part of that work, SP has reviewed the record of the Chicago and Springfield Senates. The Springfield Senate also voted 8 March 2024 to reject ST-83 (Resolution 53-09, attached): "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." As best as we can determine from the UIC Senate minutes, that Senate has only commented on the 2021 ST-83 and has not voted on the proposed revisions. This means that two senates have rejected the contents of ST-83 as transmitted in 2021, with all three senates sending proposed revisions or commentary.

The statutory step in August should have been for USC to return ST-83 in its current form (with summer 2024 revisions) to the three senates for proper review, including the "right to concur,

to modify or to reject any proposed amendment or proposed statutory text.” Not only were there substantial objections to the original ST-83, but the senates have been given no opportunity to agree to the newly proposed amendments—some of which radically change the prior version of ST-83. Instead, we should be following the example of how USC and the senates handled the prior package of this scope, ST-77. The USC can only fulfill its statutory role to “endeavor to promote agreement of the senates” by allowing the senates to continue to work with ST-83 as an item under consideration. Revisions as important as those proposed in ST-83 should not be rushed, especially in a way that minimizes the roles of shared governance that the *Statutes* assign to the senates.

The University Senates Conference should rescind the transmission of ST-83 to the President and then return ST-83 to the three senates to correctly continue the statutorily defined process, obtaining agreement among the senates before any amendments to the *Statutes* are forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

