

Executive Committee Minutes
February 12, 2001
(Approved)

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Present: Khalid Razaki, Curt White, Patricia Meckstroth, Cori Brown, Fred Noyes, Al Goldfarb, Lane Crothers, Charlie Biondollilo, John Walker, Paul Peterson

Excused Absence: President Boschini

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of January 29, 2001

Motion XXXII-90: by Senator Razaki, second by Senator Biondollilo, to approve the minutes of January 29, 2001. The Executive Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

Communications (oral):

- 01.30.01.01 From Barb Nouri: Council for Teacher Education Bylaws Revisions. (To Rules Committee)
- 01.31.01.01 From President Boschini: Update of University Physical Development Plan - Campus Master Plan. Senator White agreed to serve on the committee revising the Campus Master Plan in the place of a representative from the Administrative Affairs Committee. He reported that that the committee has an ambitious plan and that he was extremely pleased at how often they invoked the Educating Illinois Plan as a starting point.
- 02.09.01.01 From Randy Winter: Panel of 10 Nomination: Paul Walker. (To Rules Committee Chairperson)
- 02.09.01.02 From Norma Hohn: President Boschini absent from Senate meeting of February 21, 2001.
- 02.09.01.03 From Al Goldfarb: Invitation to Budget Presentations for Academic Affairs Area. (To Budget Committee). This is the three-day budget process that occurs annually. This year it is on March 21, 22 and 23. At these presentations, colleges relate their budget priorities. The Chair of the Budget Committee should be encouraged to attend.
- 02.09.01.05 From President Boschini: Approval of Senate Action Regarding New Senate Membership.
- 02.12.01.05 From Pat Meckstroth, Chairperson of Academic Affairs Committee: Revisions to the Policy on Community College Transfer Students.
- 02.12.01.06 From Mike Baum: Changes in Senate Membership. (To Rules Committee). Memo inquiring about AP representation on the Rules Committee and Executive Committee of the Senate.

Communications (distributed):

- 02.05.01.01 From Sharon Stanford: Senate Membership Apportionment-Revised. (To Rules Committee, Colleges and Milner). The College of Applied Science and Technology and the College of Education each received an additional Senate seat with the reapportionment, which was due to the addition of two tenure/tenure track faculty. The new membership was approved by the Senate at its meeting of January 24, 2001.
- 02.08.01.01 From Eric Thomas: Proposal for Tiered Program Admissions and B.A./B.S. Degree in University Studies. (To Academic Affairs Committee). There is a two-phase process for getting into a major. A student is accepted to the University and into a program, but may have their progress evaluated by the department at some point in time after the admission. With the two-tiered program, there can even be heightened requirements. Therefore, a student who is not able to meet these additional requirements will need a failsafe program in which to major, the University Studies Program. This would also apply to other students as well, for example students who chose one major, then decide not to complete it and are looking for alternatives. These are sometimes quite good students, so there are categories such as this of students who need another possible route.
- 02.08.01.02 From Betty Chapman: Program Review Reports. (To Senate Members). Reports on programs reviewed this year by the Academic Planning Committee are available at the reserve desk in Milner Library.

- 02.09.01.04 From Rene Smith-Byas: Update of Faculty Ethics and Grievance Handbook. (To Rules Committee) Rene Smith-Byas sent this letter recommending that Attorney Thomas Hustoles be retained as a consultant to advise the Senate and the Provost in the revision of the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Policy Handbook. Ms. Smith-Byas is strongly recommending that these policies be revised. Whatever suggestion Mr. Hustoles makes would then have to go to Rules Committee of the Senate.
- 02.09.01.06 From Betty Chapman: University Service Award Selections. (To Senate Liaisons). The Service Initiatives Award recipients for this year were Kathleen Keenan-Takagi, Music, and Mark Temple, Health Sciences. The Outstanding University Award was given to Nancy Lind, Political Science, and Steve McCaw, Health, Physical Education and Recreation.
- 02.12.01.01 From Martha Power, CAST Council: Memo re: Restructuring of Academic Senate. Dr. Power expressed concerns about the Senate's timeline in approving the new Senate membership.
- 02.12.01.02 From Saad El-Zanati: Faculty Ethics and Grievance Recommendations.
- 02.12.01.03 From Steve Friedberg: Plus/Minus Grade Proposal from Academic Standards Committee. (To Academic Affairs Committee)
- 02.12.01.04 From Barbara Kurtz: Request for Change in Due Date for Report on Commentary on the President.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting 2/21/01 at 7:00 P.M.

Information Items:

- 11.27.00.01 School Designation for Departments of Art, Music and Theatre (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committees)

Academic Impact Fund Report (Budget Committee)

- 02.12.01.05 Policy on Community College Transfer Students (Academic Affairs Committee)

Motion XXXII-91: by Senator Razaki, second by Senator Brown, to approve the Senate agenda. The Executive Committee unanimously approved the agenda for the meeting of February 21, 2001.

Discussion

02.12.01.02 Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee Issue

Senator White: Since we last met, I met with the Faculty Affairs Committee. I received the committee's support in terms of pursuing a course of action regarding the procedures followed by the Faculty Ethics and Grievance for a grievance that was filed. Dr. Lesch, Chairperson of the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee (FEGC), would only meet with the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding the procedures if the Rules Committee of the Senate asked him to do so. I talked to the Rules Committee and they formally requested that Dr. Lesch meet with Faculty Affairs. That apparently is all that it took and Dr. Lesch was very happy to meet with Faculty Affairs, which he did just before the last Senate meeting.

The Faculty Affairs Committee spoke extensively with Dr. Lesch and the Vice Chairperson, Dan Graybill. Following that conversation, the Faculty Affairs Committee unanimously adopted the following recommendation which they have given to us: "It is the opinion of the Faculty Affairs Committee that the steps followed by the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee in dealing with the case in question violated procedures outlined in the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee Policies and Procedures Guidelines as approved by the Senate on 3/16/88. It is recommended by the Faculty Affairs Committee that a new hearing committee be formed and that all parties previously involved in the FEGC case be recused from the hearing committee and that any informal resolution materials be excluded from all future hearings."

The Faculty Affairs Committee felt it would be appropriate for the Executive Committee to direct the FEGC to follow the recommendations. I would like to accept the recommendations and send a letter to the principles involved, as well as to the FEGC, letting them know that the Faculty Affairs Committee has found a problem with procedure and that the FEGC is going to be instructed to reopen the case. Before that letter is sent, we are going to want to let Rene Smith-Byas, University Legal Council, review it.

Motion XXXII-92: by Senator Crothers, second by Senator Walker, to endorse the proposal of writing the letter to the FEGC instructing that they follow the procedures outlined by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Executive Committee unanimously approved the motion. (See Item 02.12.01.02 for all details of the recommendations from Faculty Affairs Committee.)

Senator Razaki: Would Dr. Lesch appoint the hearing committee?

Senator White: No, he, or any other committee member previously involved, would have to recuse him or herself from further involvement with the case. He is either going to have to resign as chairperson so that another chairperson can be elected, or he is going to have to recuse himself and find someone else on the FEGC to appoint the hearing committee.

02.12.01.04 Extension of Deadline for Report on Commentary on the President

The Administrative Affairs Committee is unable to meet the March 1, 2001 deadline for its completion of the report on the annual period of commentary on the President of the University. The committee is requesting that the deadline be extended to April 1. They are working with Patricia Grogg to offer a series of focus groups on the performance of the President. The committee did not think that the questionnaire used last year were particularly useful. The Executive Committee did not object to extending the deadline for the completion of the report.

Retirements

Senator White: Bill Semlak is retiring soon and there will be a reception for him on February 28 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in the Founders Suite of the Bone Student Center.

Senator Noyes: Norma Honn of the President's office is also retiring. Norma's retirement is at 3:00 p.m. on February 23.

Executive Committee members additionally noted that Larry Quane would be retiring as well on April 30th.

Capital Campaign

Senator Crothers: I have a sense that private funding of higher education is going to grow increasingly important over the next several years as we reduce the percentage of public funding that comes to higher institutions. Therefore, I think the Capital Campaign is extremely important and I hope that it is successful. It also has an implication that is academic in that it concentrates most of that money in the administration's hands, which can then make what amount to academic decisions. Right now there is no process to deal with this. This can be done with no academic involvement. Is there any thinking about trying to create mechanisms of faculty consultation?

Senator Goldfarb: If the Academic Affairs area was involved with putting together a case that they might present for private funding, the deans would be asked to solicit input from department chairs in putting together the original case statements. My hope is that there would be academic involvement at that level. Additionally, the case statements are made public through the Provost's Advisory Council. In terms of any kinds of gifts connected back to a department, the proposal has come to me and I have worked with the dean and asked him to consult with the department chair, so again there is some faculty consultation in that the department chairs should be consulting with faculty.

Senator Crothers: Is that process specified anywhere or is it just a function of how it is currently working on an ad hoc basis?

Senator Goldfarb: I don't think it is specified anywhere.

Senator White: The way that Senator Crothers presented this problem in talking to me originally was very telling. It has been argued to us that endowing chairs is really a way of freeing money that is presently in line and that money once freed would play into all sorts of budget and planning processes. But, that first decision to create an endowed chair is beyond any process or academic discretion. I don't think that there was discussion with PAC or with anybody else. To a degree I know that the decision is dictated by the contributors, but to the degree that you are *proposing*

chairs in a given area, there is no planning on the academic side.

Senator Goldfarb: Deans are supposed to have requested that kind of information up front. Clearly, the deans are supposed to be the touchstone for departments where they have ideas of requests.

Senator White: So you are saying that that process has actually happened?

Senator Goldfarb: I would hope so. If we know of someone who has an interest in English, we are going to be using the college dean and the English chairperson in that process. The deans are also the ones who are also going out and meeting with donors.

Senator White: If you don't know about these processes, how does the President know about them?

Senator Goldfarb: My assumption is that the President is not going out and making decisions for endowed chairs right on the spot. There has been some cultivation of these individuals first and someone has been working with them. The President is not the first visit, so the deans, department chairs and Advancement should have been working with that person.

Senator White: I am not sure that does really describe the process that takes place. I think that there might be some cultivation from Susan's office, but I don't know that the chairs are involved.

Senator Goldfarb: They send the dean and department chair to work with those persons.

Senator Crothers: They send the dean and the department chair to work with them in the context that that person is likely to find meaningful. That is not really my concern. My question is that is there a way we can begin the public conversation about an appropriate process, other than through a dean structure, in which funding decisions involve faculty? Most of us don't know what is going on.

Senator Razaki: I agree with Senator Crothers. There should be a process where faculty is involved. Like you said, it may go to the chair level, but I have never seen it go below the chair level.

Senator White: We have been talking about describing ways that the campaign is in the interest of the faculty, but this makes me see another reason faculty might be reluctant to contribute. What input does faculty really have about where endowed chairs are placed?

Senator Razaki: There is going to be very little input about that anyway. What the administration can do is once they have identified someone who is not dedicated to a particular discipline, they could try to guide them into a place that there is a need.

Senator Goldfarb: I think that there is more open communication about this than you see in lots of environments. I think it is also a match. Sometimes a person says I have a great interest in one area. At that point, you would bring in the chair of that department and the college dean in and you create that type of interaction. Then hopefully, you would go back to the department and find out the department needs. There is not an exact science to this.

Senator Crothers: Maybe I am missing something. Perhaps this is specified in the updates we used to get that this was a procedural expectation. We are talking about something almost like the Memorandum of Understanding in that we are speaking about general expectations. While I am thrilled that the current process is working, I have not seen it. It does not follow that the process will always work this way unless there are some types of general expectations.

Senator Noyes: Are you saying that we need faculty who would work as an advisory committee?

Senator Goldfarb: Why set up an ad hoc structure? Why not again use the Senate? We could ask Advancement to come in and report to the Budget Committee or ask them to come to a general Senate meeting.

Senator White: Is it safe to assume that there is a general interest in the way that this campaign enhances the University? Because if you just left it to the people who are going to have available money to enhance a program, I think you would have a distinct imbalance.

Senator Goldfarb: The other possibility is that you could look at it as a way of freeing up resources. If we got certain endowments, that would mean that we could free up resources to do other things elsewhere.

Adjournment

Motion XXXII-93: To adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved by a standing vote.