
P. MacFarlane attended for C. Garcia; K. Brown attended for K. Kahn.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:  Bryan, Burgess, Caldwell, Creamer, Elsih-Piper, Ganesan, Gately-Poole, Hudson, Ilsley, Kolb, Larson, Montague, Morris, Payvar, Ridnour, Song, Stephen, Wade, Wolfskill, Woo

I.    CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II.   ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: I’d like to call the meeting to order. As far as the Agenda goes I have a couple of, I hope, minor modifications. We have, as you see, a few walk-ins. Most of these are informational items but the set of things all stapled together are some things from the Provost and the Provost is here with us. I propose to put these items into the Agenda under New Business. Could I have a motion to that effect?

The motion was made and seconded to add the walk-ins to the Agenda under New Business.

President Willis: Could I then have a motion to adopt the Agenda as amended?

J. King: I’d like to add another item.

President Willis: Yes.

J. King: This will all have to be under New Business I suppose. We could call it the Center for the Study of Applied Ethics.

President Willis: Okay. Any other additions to the Agenda? Could I have a motion to accept the Agenda as amended?
The motion was made and seconded to accept the Agenda as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 3, 2001 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 5-18)

President Willis: The minutes of the previous meeting are on pages 5-18 of your packet. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? May I have a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting?

The motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. President Peters will arrive at 3:30

President Willis: I do not have any lengthy announcements to make really which you’re probably all glad of. The main one that I have is probably going to be a disappointment to many of you which is that President Peters unfortunately will not be able to make it today. We have rescheduled him for the next meeting which is what, December 5, right? However, the Provost, as I mentioned earlier, is here and after he presents his items, he’ll be happy to answer any questions that anybody might have for him. So he’s not the President, but he’s the Provost; it’s good to be able to address questions to him as well. We will have, I hope, the President with us next time. As I’m sure you’ll understand, his schedule is subject to last minute changes.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

President Willis: We have nothing under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration or under the Consent Agenda so let me move to the Reports from Advisory Committees. Pat, you said no meeting? Okay.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry

No meeting.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and Dan Griffiths

President Willis: That hasn’t met, has it, Dan?

D. Griffiths: It meets November 15.
C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee  Sue Willis and Jim Lockard

**President Willis:** The Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee will also meet on the 15th of November.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Jenine Povlsen

**President Willis:** Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee has not met.

E. BOT – Sue Willis

**President Willis:** The Board of Trustees has not met since our last meeting. That was easy.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

**President Willis:** We can move to Reports from Standing Committees. Rules and Governance. Chris?

A. Rules and Governance – Chris Hubbard, Chair

1. Coordinating of [Start Dates](#) for Executive Secretary and the Faculty Senate Membership. (Page 19)

**C. Hubbard:** Okay, you have on page 19 of your packet a proposal which is, I hope, fairly simple. The issue simply is that the Executive Secretary takes office on July 1st and everyone else on the Senate takes office on August 16. The proposal is to simply make them both July 1, so that the Executive Secretary will have somebody to execute, I guess. Then the other consideration is that during the summer quite often the Senate is not all on campus, and so the second part of the proposal would be to add to Article 12.642 a statement which states, and it’s underlined here, “the Executive Committee appointed during the previous academic year shall serve in the capacity until the new Executive Committee is approved” so, that’s the essence of the proposal.

**President Willis:** Any questions for Chris? Would this be a first reading then?

**C. Hubbard:** It would be.

**H. Rubin:** I move to receive.

**President Willis:** Okay. Do we need to vote on that? Okay. All those in favor of receiving this as a first reading? Opposed?

The receiving of this proposal was approved.

**President Willis:** Anything else Chris?
C. Hubbard: No.

B. Academic Affairs – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair – report

President Willis: Academic Affairs, Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: The Committee met two weeks ago with Jay Wagle, who’s the current head of the Honors Program. This is in regard to consideration of moving from an Honors Program to an Honors College. We’ve collected a lot of information; he is at a conference this week where apparently there will be people from all over the country talking about advantages of Honors Colleges, so he is due to send us some more information next week. We will add that to our tentative report and hope to have that finished by the December meeting. We’ll have a motion ready for Senate at that time.

President Willis: Okay, very good. Any questions for Jody?

C. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair – report (Page 20)

President Willis: Economic Status, Jim?

1. Annual Report from the University Benefits Committee (Page 21-23)

J. Lockard: There is a report from our meeting two weeks ago in your packet on page 20 followed by the Annual Report of the University Benefits Committee that was on the web site. I asked Donna to include it so that you didn’t necessarily have to go looking for it because I do want to call your attention to some things that are in there.

First of all, we received left over business at the first meeting of the Senate this year having to do with the issue of employees being required to pay the very high fees that are associated with some off-campus courses. This was discussed in some detail at the University Benefits Committee last year and that is summarized on page 22 as a part of their report. Their conclusion, from the broad base of that committee which represents all the constituencies on the campus, is that this is really an issue for operating staff primarily, and of little or no concern to faculty and supportive professional staff. Therefore, the University Benefits Committee is not planning to take any particular action on that unless there is a swell of demand primarily from operating staff. As we talked about it in our committee, a couple of members realized that this might, in fact, be more of a faculty issue than we had thought. Not that faculty in general are interested in earning other degrees and taking courses perhaps in the MBA or whatever, but perhaps spouses or others who benefit from tuition privileges might be affected by it. Therefore, the committee is sitting at this point waiting for input from the faculty. If this is an issue that the faculty care about, we will investigate. If it is not, we will do nothing more than what the University Benefits Committee does. So on that score, I need feedback from you, from your colleges, departments, however you care to go about getting it. Is this a concern that needs to be investigated from the faculty perspective? That’s our charge. The University Benefits Committee handles it for faculty, SPS and operating staff people. So anything that you can drum
up in way of information about concerns let me know by e-mail and we’ll take it from there.

As far as other issues are concerned, four things are listed for you in the report on page 20. We hope to have some information to share with you on these at next month’s meeting. We think at this point that these are primarily areas where we just need to make sure that everyone has the most current, accurate information available. These are not things we can likely do anything about but we will report back. If you’re particularly interested in what happens to folks who’ve worked in a system like ours that does not include Social Security coverage and you’re approaching retirement, that was also taken up by the University Benefits Committee last year. We’re looking just to verify and make sure that it’s a complete set of information as it is in that report. A couple of the items are a little bit different but I’ll leave those until the next time.

Finally, the largest issue of things that have been brought to our attention, as always, revolves around insurance of one kind or another, or the lack thereof if you will, or the poor paying practices of the insurance groups and plans here. What we can do about it I don’t know but I can report this much to you. University Benefits Committee last year determined that they wanted to undertake a survey of area dental care providers to determine what customary charges are in the area, to compare that with what the dental plan actually pays. Anybody who goes to the dentist knows they pay a lot less than what the actual charges are, so we’re trying to put together some actual information about what it costs and hopefully can use that as a negotiating tool. I would call your attention on page 21 again as a part of the University Benefits Committee’s report to the rather, I think, helpful explanation of how benefits negotiations actually take place. This may slightly ease the minds of any of you who’ve heard that it’s the union that gets its way and we take whatever they settle for, etc. It’s not quite that simple. It’s a little bit more involved than that, and that is explained there. We know that dealing with anything having to do with insurance is a long time process. It’s not going to be quick; it’s not going to be easy. It may be futile but all we can do is try. So we’re thinking about such things as doing a similar survey of health care providers after the dental one has proven to work or not work, the way that’s being handled. We’re also talking about inviting the Social Security Administration, Burzynski perhaps since he’s taken an issue in health care issues, and so on, to meet with us as it seems to be appropriate as we progress. So we’ve got a number of things to do and hope to have some more information for you next month.

President Willis: Okay, any questions for Jim? Yes, Herb.

H. Rubin: Yes, on the fringe benefit, on the delivery fee issue. I’d suggest given that it’s a cross constituency issue that – hold on – since it’s a cross constituency issue, I really think in a sense of solidarity it should be something we should look into irrespective of whether there’s one person or two hundred people who are having problems. I think anything that seeks to deny us the few fringes that we have is wrong in principle.

J. Lockard: Absolutely, I don’t disagree with that at all Herb, but our charge, as a Faculty Senate Committee is to look after the welfare of the faculty. We can be supportive of UBC but if UBC chooses not to investigate it it’s not ours to initiate.

D. Jones: Okay, in the Benefits report, there’s one sentence that I’d like to know if you have
anything more to say or could give a little bit more explanation, Jim ---

**J. Lockard:** Sure.

**D. Jones:** And that’s the one under having to do with the government pension offset and Social Security where it says this bill, which is the one under consideration for the past two years, is very specific and it might better serve our employees a generalized lifting of the GPO. Was that the end of the discussion, or have they thought of a way to move on that, which seems a very important thing to a lot of people who have been paying into Social Security on extra jobs?

**J. Lockard:** Sure, I understand. I can’t give you a better answer, Dolly, because the report is from last year’s committee which I was not part of. This year they have thus far managed to schedule their two meetings for the semester on the same morning as the Trustees meet, which has been a problem, so I did not get to attend the first meeting either. However, they’ve just moved the one for November and maybe I can come up with some further information from them at that point. Right now, I wouldn’t have anything to add to what’s here. I would call your attention, though, now that you’ve called me back to thinking about that, if you look at the very bottom of page 22 there’s another issue here that might be of interest as well, and we’ll definitely look into that. As those of you who happen to have a spouse who’s also employed by the institution know, there’s a difference between both having to pay your own health coverage and the possibility of one being covered as a dependent. Right now, that’s not possible, but CMS has apparently gone on record as saying they would not oppose a change in the legislation to remove the requirement that all full time employees pay for health insurance, which would open the way for those who are both employed to have one covered as a dependent as opposed to being independently covered at, probably, a higher cost. That one needs to be looked into as well.

**President Willis:** Any other questions for Jim?

D. Resource, Space and Budget – Carole Minor, Chair – report.

**President Willis:** Resource, Space and Budget, Carole?

**C. Minor:** Last month we met with Vice President Williams. We will continue that discussion tomorrow afternoon; these meetings are informational meetings about the physical planning process and priorities. We expect to have a full report next month.

**President Willis:** Okay, any questions for Carole?

**C. DeMoranville:** I actually don’t know if this is for Carole’s committee or not, but last year there was some talk about changes to the intersection of Annie Glidden and Lucinda so there would be a pedestrian bypass of some sort. I was just wondering if there had been any additional talk about that, or if there was any plans in the works for changes there.

**C. Minor:** The committee hasn’t discussed that but we can ask that question tomorrow. Thank you.
President Willis: Okay, any other questions for Carole? Herb?

H. Rubin: Yeah, most of what goes on in the committee with the physical stuff is stuff the University actually owns but the city itself is now engaged in a planning effort for the Greek Row area of campus and you might want to find out to what extent the University is engaged, you know, as far as that study.

C. Minor: Could you repeat the name of the study, Greek Row?

H. Rubin: Yeah, the whole fraternity/sorority area of the town is subject to – is a planning issue in the city; I helped them with that and I think they would like some University help.

C. Minor: Okay, thank you.

J. Lockard: This isn’t for the committee but just as a general note to those of you who don’t get over to the far side of the campus very often. Just within the last few days a temporary traffic light was hung at Stadium Drive and Annie Glidden, which is already making a noticeable difference; the only problem being that the students still prefer the red light to the green light for crossing Annie Glidden. Other than that, the cars do now stop periodically.

President Willis: That’s a good thing. Okay. Anything else for Carole?

E. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Carol DeMoranville, Chair – report.

President Willis: Okay, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. The other Carol?

C. DeMoranville: The other Carol. Our committee met on the 17th, and the topic that we’re still considering is the Office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. This particular topic has become quite a bit more thorny than we originally envisioned; the topic of discussion has been focusing on work place issues, particularly for SPS faculty and personnel. We are meeting again on the 14th of November to continue discussion, and I envision we will have a report to the Faculty Senate about the Office of the Personnel Advisor, some work place issues for SPS and also what to do about those files, and that should be at our next meeting.

President Willis: Okay, any questions for Carol?

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report.

President Willis: Okay, Elections and Legislative Oversight, no report from them.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS
A. Walk-in items from the Provost

1. Proposal to change title from Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research and Dean of the Graduate School to Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research and Dean of the Graduate School

2. Search Committee structures – Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research and Dean of the Graduate School, and Executive Director for International and Special Programs

President Willis: Okay, moving on to New Business then, the first item on New Business is the walk-in from the Provost. Ivan, would you like to come up here and speak to this?

Provost Legg: Yes, I’ll be up.

President Willis: There are two items here; one is a proposal to change the title of the Associate Provost for Research to Vice Provost instead, and the other has to do with search committee structures for that position, as well as for the Executive Director for International and Special Programs.

Provost Legg: First of all I’d just like to respond to what Sue had said earlier, that John Peters is definitely going to plan – in fact, I met with John on another issue today and he said to tell you that he is scheduled to come here for your December meeting and I just wanted to reinforce that. He just got twisted on something else today and couldn’t come.

Now I’d just like to present to you the structures of two search committees that I have been working on for the last three or four weeks. They involve a search for replacement of Jerry Zar, the Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School, and for a replacement for Manfred Thullen, who is also retiring as Executive Director of International Programs. I have worked very closely, as closely as I can, with the bylaws which are related to the structure of the committee. I’ve done a lot of consulting because I am new on this, and I must admit that I am very impressed with the faculty governance that runs through this whole situation. In my previous employment I had make sure the committees were well represented by faculty because there were no guidelines whatsoever. In these cases they’re very well set, and the committee structures that I am proposing for you to review are as close as I could come to following the guidelines that are in the bylaws. So I put those up for your consideration and for your support.

President Willis: According to the bylaws, we don’t have to approve these things specifically, so the Provost is requesting our input and our support; but it’s not a formal vote that we have to take necessarily.

H. Rubin: Excuse me, this is my ignorance, but the bylaws aren’t 100% specific on this so there’s discretion in how it’s set up?

Provost Legg: Yes, if you read the bylaws in various places there is some uncertainty as to
exactly how it prescribes a search because they’ll say something like “the search for a dean will follow the basic tenets for a search for a chair” and then put some qualifiers for an area like International Programs, a center or a program. They will put in a clause that says “faculty that have been associated with the program” which can be probably defined too, or narrowly defined, so there is some uncertainty but I would say 80 to 90% certainty in the bylaws when you put them all together. You have to read through the whole set and marry them together to get the picture because no single bylaw describes the entire process for a given person.

H. Rubin: So to clarify, why don’t you simply present it to the bylaw committee so it could be incorporated into the bylaws once you figure how to clean it up?

Provost Legg: Well, I’m not too sure that it’s – if you look at the structure of the committee it meets the committees that have been put together, it does meet the basis involvement of the University community that’s involved with these positions. I’m not too sure it would be, I mean I leave it in your hands and I’ll certainly will go along with you if you want to do it, I’m not sure it would be productive. I think the bylaws do basically what they’re supposed to do but they don’t, you know, they’re not ironclad and I don’t know that they need to be ironclad. But I leave that to your discretion. You might want to review them at some other time and see whether you’d like to do it and certainly if you’d like to try it I would be supportive of looking into it.

President Willis: There’s one section that’s called “Deans and the Director of the University Libraries,” and it says how you select this person; it’s one description for all of them, so it’s a little bit general. Since the Dean of the Graduate School is a little bit – his constituency or her constituency – is a little bit broader than, for example, the Dean of, say, Health and Human Sciences, then you have to say, well, okay, what’s the constituency and who do we pick and that kind of thing.

Provost Legg: But I will assure you the bottom line, which I strongly support, and if I had not had the bylaws I still would have done it, is I think that the faculty have to be very much involved in these searches, and your bylaws, our bylaws, do say very clearly that the committee is involved throughout the whole search including the interviewing and making the final recommendations. I have always done that even without bylaws and I strongly support this. I’m a very strong believe in faculty participation. That is a bottom line issue.

President Willis: By the way, I misspoke earlier, it does say in the section about the Dean of the Graduate School that the Provost should propose a search committee structure for that person and then bring it to the Faculty Senate for the Senate’s advice and consent. So, now he’s doing that. Pat?

P. Henry: How are the committee members going to be elected?

Provost Legg: It depends on which search you’re looking at but basically by the councils in most cases. You’ll read that in the description, in the directions that are given in the bylaws, that councils do make recommendations. International Programs will be limited to twelve participants, but all councils will make recommendations, from which I will make the final selection on who will be involved in that committee. I’ll have a list of people who are candidates,
who, according to the councils, have had some experience in International Programs and therefore are qualified to do it, and I probably will make some phone calls and double check and cross check a number of times before I make the final decision.

C. DeMoranville: Do you have any plans through this selection process to ensure that there’s diversity on the committee?

Provost Legg: By definition yes. I will make, as much as I can, to the extent possible, and I must admit it was a lot easier in Memphis than it will be here. Incidentally, I do need your support on that, so when councils are voting on candidates, and when faculty are making recommendations on candidates for both of those committees, I’m as dependent on you as you are on me in making that issue a very prominent and important issue. So I ask for your help. You can call me, you can e-mail me, you can do whatever and say “Ivan, this is a person I think will fulfill the mission, has the background necessary to be a good member of the committee”. I think you should seriously consider it because it would add diversity to the committee or something of that sort. I welcome that kind of input.

D. Wagner: This is just for information, but to whom does the Executive Director of International Programs report?

Provost Legg: To me. That’s why I’m here doing this.

W. Baker: For clarification for Manfred’s replacement, is that SPS or is it faculty?

Provost Legg: It’s not SPS. I don’t know what – you raise a very good question. Manfred is a member of the faculty in Education so I imagine it’s viewed as would be for mainline administrators who have an identity within a department so that would not necessarily be SPS. I’m drawing a blank on that. Can anybody help me? What is Manfred’s position categorized as?

R. Orem: He’s tenured faculty.

Provost Legg: Yes, he is tenured in Education. That’s right. So that would not be SPS.

President Willis: No, that would be faculty.

Provost Legg: That’s right, yes. It would not be SPS because faculty are the only ones that are tenured.

W. Baker: Thank you.

Provost Legg: That answered it indirectly.

President Willis: Are there any other questions for Ivan?

J. Povlsen: I was just curious, I noticed that both the Supportive Professional Staff member and the Operating Staff member being chosen by staff within a division within International
Programs and not the councils. I’m just curious as to how that works or how you see that working?

**Provost Legg:** Well, that was where there was some flexibility in the directive. They asked for people who were connected in one way or another with International Programs or with the mission of that center – they didn’t mention International – but center and institutes and that was just a recommended – I got these recommendations from the Advisory Committee to International Programs.

**President Willis:** What it says in the bylaw for a search committee for an institute or center director is that the search committee is composed of faculty and SPS people elected by and from those regularly involved in the work of the institute, center or program. So here again with International Studies it’s a little fuzzy as to exactly who that is. That was what Ivan was trying to achieve.

**Provost Legg:** I would like to underline just philosophically that there have been some questions about where we stand - based on 9/11 - where we stand now on international programs. I think we should stand even more firmly than we have ever in the past. The world is going to internationalize and globalize despite what we’ve been undergoing, and I think the hire in this position will help our University become much more part of the global community. Preparing our students is a critical issue, and I’m going to ask, as we’ll run a very thorough interview, we will have opportunities for all faculty to meet with candidates and I’m looking for your input based on that issue. We want to have someone of real stature, of real commitment to the philosophy that it is a central issue to the University to have our student body and our faculty understand the importance and be prepared to serve in a world that is going to be very global in the future regardless of the 9/11 type incidents.

**D. Wagner:** I will ask my question. I asked the question I asked before because the Honors Director does not report directly to you and it seems to me that the Honors Program is of equal importance to the International Program. I don’t know if you want to respond to that but would you agree or disagree?

**Provost Legg:** Sure. Yes, I would agree completely with you, although it’s a little bit of an apples and oranges comparison, the Honors Program and the idea of going from an Honors Program to an Honors College is a very, very important issue that should be addressed. What I would want very much, and it appears that the Senate is taking this on at one point or another, is to very explicitly outline for me the differences between having an Honors Program and an Honors College. What do we gain if anything, what do we lose by going from one model to another. It would be nice to see it itemized; these are the advantages, this is what we do not get with an Honors Program which you get with an Honors College. Of course, you get some stature with it, and that may be one of the most important issues of all, but it would help in justifying it to see that differentiated.

**D. Wagner:** One of the things would be that the Honors Dean would report directly to you. That I think is fairly clear.
Provost Legg: That would be one possibility. I’m not familiar with enough models to say that one way or another but yes, that’s a possibility. Thank you for bringing that up because I did want to comment. I guess we’re going to have a question and answer period later too?

C. Minor: I have a question just for clarification about the Vice-Provost?

Provost Legg: Yes, I was going to make a very brief presentation on that.

President Willis: I would suggest, what I’d like to do is ask for a vote to accept these search committee structures and then we can move to the Vice Provost question. Are there any more comments about the search committees? If not, I’d entertain a motion to endorse these.

A motion to endorse the search committees was made, seconded and approved.

Provost Legg: I do seek your support to change from an associate provost model to a vice provost model. When I arrived at my new position in 1992 at the University of Memphis, the provost model was just introduced at that time. I was the first provost at the institution and it was a question of taking positions like vice president for student affairs and vice president for research and reconfiguring these under the provost position, like there are here, and they were changed from vice president titles to vice provost titles. That was – it just made sense; I didn’t even question it. I did hire a new vice provost for research while I was in the office of provost at Memphis and I remember attending one of the meetings that she sponsored, what we called the “Urban Thirteen” - the group is not that important in terms of what I’m going to say - and I was looking at the list of people in that group of people who were coming to the meeting of the Urban Thirteen universities – Cincinnati, Houston, Wayne State, etc. I saw mostly vice provosts, vice chancellors and vice presidents and then I saw an associate provost. At the cocktail hour before the meeting I went over to the associate provost and said, “Who’s your provost for research?” and he said, “I am the provost for research, but I am titled associate provost”. So, I began to understand and, of course, it got lost and disappeared until I came here and found out that our model here is to use associate provost instead of vice provost titles. I am now, as you know, we just discussed it, initiating a search for a person to fill the position of responsibility over research and the graduate school. I very firmly believe that changing the title, although there will be no change in anything else – no change in salary, no change in job description, no change in responsibilities – that it will make it much easier for me to recruit someone of real stature to the University by using this title versus using the associate title and it – I can’t really give you much more than that because I think that is a key issue in trying to develop the program. As a result, I would like to request – I have talked with John Peters about it. John Peters does support this. I’m asking you if you would be good enough to give me the endorsement, the support for doing it. It requires absolutely no – all it does is a title change on the piece of paper that describes his job. There is no official action that needs to be taken and I think in the long run, going from the associate model to the vice provost model will enhance our ability to attract and retain outstanding people that we need for the further growth of the University.

H. Rubin: I’m a little vague on this one because I think I’m probably having senior moments right now, but I vaguely remember John Peters either when he came in for recruitment or maybe
in some of his preliminary talks mentioning his desire to really have a very powerful person in charge of Institutional University Research and, unless my memory is totally wrong, almost separating that position from the Graduate Dean. I mean is this a step in that direction or what are we doing here?

**Provost Legg:** No, it’s not but let me respond to that. I have a collection of titles of most of the research universities that I reviewed before I came over here. I got it a few days ago. Two thirds of all the universities in the United States, mostly the upper-crust universities in terms of their comprehensiveness, use a title which is either vice president, vice chancellor or vice provost. The reporting lines usually are along that line. The vice president, if you have a president, the vice president reports to the president. If you have a vice chancellor, he reports to the chancellor. If you have a provost, then the vice-provost reports to the provost. Occasionally, but very seldom, you see a structure that, for example, has a vice president for research but in practice the vice president for research does not report to the president but reports to the provost. I think that’s not a good thing to do but I’ve seen it. It’s happened in a couple of universities. By changing the title, we change absolutely nothing except substituting the vice for the associate. I was trying to avoid saying that but it came out. That you could really run with.

**P. Henry:** But it does imply some change, not change, something about the chain of command in that a vice provost presumably comes after the provost in the chain of command like the provost vice president comes after the president. Is nothing like that implied?

**Provost Legg:** No, everything stays the same. There are two associate provosts in my operations – three, there are three in my operation. They all report to me just like the vice presidents report to the president so nothing will change at all, absolutely nothing. Just the substitution of the vice word for the associate word.

**J. King:** It goes without saying the other associate provost positions will be similarly renamed?

**Provost Legg:** Yeah, it’s changing the model, correct.

**J. King:** So what happens then to the assistant provost?

**Provost Legg:** The assistant become associate.

**J. King:** And will we down the road see some assistant?

**Provost Legg:** No, no. I am prepared for that because I know how people like to get their titles changed along that line. No, it is not at all my intention while I’m here to do that. Absolutely not. In fact, I put in my memo there would be no change in the number of people with the provost title in their name. That’s a very good question. No proliferation.

**S. Spear:** Then is the person’s title, would it become Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research and Dean of the Graduate School?

**Provost Legg:** Right. Yes.
S. Spear: The individual’s still dean.

Provost Legg: Yes, that’s another issue and I’ve debated separating them; but I guess you all know that I come from a very strong commitment that the mission of research is very closely linked to our educational mission, and that research and scholarship are closely tied to our teaching mission, and that’s why I like to keep those positions together - because the Dean of the Graduate School reflects students, research reflects activities of the faculty but these are inseparable in almost all cases if not all. So I’m going to keep those together although that was debated.

J. Lockard: I just want to clarify. The assistant provost title currently then becomes what?

Provost Legg: Associate vice provost.

J. Lockard: Associate vice provost. Okay. You lost me in your paper in the next to the last Paragraph, I guess, when you got down to saying what associate is.

Provost Legg: Yes.

J. Lockard: And you delineated specific roles. One of which is research. Now wait a minute. We just left now and now we’re back to it.

Provost Legg: I have to rewrite that. That section I would have rewritten. I’m glad you asked the question. Yes. The reason I put that in was to remind you that the associate titles in say, for example, an associate vice president has a very specific mission and that’s the only time – that’s why the associate title connected directly to the provost is a bit misleading. It suggests a sub focus mission under the provost person that’s in charge of research. This clarifies that by making very clear that the person who is – this being Jerry Zar today – has really primary responsibility of a major area of the University, the research and the Graduate School. When there’s an associate, the associate like in an associate vice president has a specific role with respect to that overall mission. That’s what I meant to say with that sentence and you caught that. I was looking at it as I was coming over and saying “gosh, I can’t change it now”. I’m glad you raised the question.

President Willis: Okay. Any other questions for Ivan about the vice-provost issue? Herb, you look like you want to say something?

H. Rubin: Well, it’s – I’m vacillating because it’s probably simply a name change but I’m thinking that before Provost Legg arrived on campus we did change or have changed in the Executive Cabinet one of the vice president’s positions and we ended up with basically two, I don’t know, gold star executive vice presidents, I forget the formal title which really did change the pecking order among the vice presidents and I’m still thinking carefully to see if this changes any pecking order among the next echelon in the University. I’m beginning to conclude it doesn’t but that’s what I’m thinking of.
Provost Legg: Let me make absolute – right up front with you guys. I want to recruit good people. I really don’t give a damn what we call them but it is important in the practical world to do it right. I just want to recruit good people and I think if I have that change it will help with it. That’s all. No pecking order. I don’t worry about pecking order. It’s there but I don’t worry about or I try not to anywhere.

D. Wagner: The change that Herb referred to was made without consultation to the Senate. You asked for our support which I think we should appreciate so I move that we endorse this policy.

President Willis: Okay, it’s been moved and seconded that we endorse this change. Any further discussion?

The motion to accept the change in title for Associate Provost to Vice Provost was made, seconded and approved.

Provost Legg: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

President Willis: Do you want to open it up for general questions now?

Provost Legg: Sure.

President Willis: Does anybody – I don’t know if anybody has ---

Provost Legg: A glass of your water?

President Willis: Yes, by all means. Should we cover the other item, the New Business first and then move to the questions? Why don’t we do that then while Ivan rests his voice a bit. Okay, why don’t we move to item B under New Business which is from Jim King about the Applied Ethics.

B. Center for the Study of Applied Ethics

J. King: Well, the title given to this agenda item is very misleading. There is no Center for the Study of Applied Ethics. Okay. I don’t even go so far as to say that there is a nascent center, but for two years a group has been meeting, essentially the faculty in Arts and Sciences, about a dozen people, and talking about the area of ethics and applied ethics and how we could strengthen it and make it be a more significant contribution to the institution. It’s been a lot of fun, a lot of good things have come out of that, and it is really growing. But we’ve reached a point - and we’re all agreed in this - that it shouldn’t be an Arts and Sciences show, and so for our November meeting, which is November 9, we want to try to reach out to the other colleges. In this connection, we don’t have the personal contacts to know who it is in your college who teaches ethics as a freestanding course, for instance, professional ethics or teaches modules about ethics in a course. I remember having been told that this is an accreditation requirement in business, that the majors receive an ethics module. I know that used to be true at the graduate level. I don’t know about the undergraduate level. That signifies to us that there are faculty in
the College of Business who are undertaking that teaching role. My e-mail address is jtking@niu.edu. If you would be kind enough to identify your colleagues whom I could contact and invite to our next meeting, we’d be immensely grateful. Thank you.

**President Willis:** Any questions for Jim? Yes?

**A Senator:** When’s the meeting?

**President Willis:** November 9.

**J. King:** At noon. I don’t know where yet. Okay? But it’s at noon.

**President Willis:** Okay, any other questions for Jim? Okay, why don’t we move back to the Provost, then, if anyone has any general questions for Ivan.

**C. Questions for the Provost**

**H. Rubin:** This is, you know, one of those things – I pick up lots of stories and rumors and stuff okay, this isn’t that well formed yet so maybe I should just ask it in a direct – could you state your sense of the role of the Provost in tenure and promotion decisions in light of the structure of the University governance?

**Provost Legg:** On paper, the structure is a bit different than what I’m used to in the past, it’s always been a little different when I’ve moved from one university to another but the basic model is one where the faculty pretty much make the final decision. What happens occasionally is that there are split votes among the faculty, division between the dean and the faculty, or the dean and the chair, or the chair and the dean, or some permutation of the above, and at that point the Provost gets involved, either with the committee as we have here, or in my previous employment, on my own to try to sort out whether the person should be tenured or promoted or both. It’s a slippery road because what you’re dealing with – there are people who are clearly tenurable and clearly not tenurable. But it isn’t a sharp division. There’s a continuum that goes over that line where you tenure or don’t tenure. Some people fall almost right on that line, and that’s when you see the split votes, but it happens very, very rarely. I think I may have recommended twice or maybe three times during my nine years at Memphis that, although there was overwhelming support for a candidate, that based on my assessment of the situation that probably was not the right judgement to make - but that was out of hundreds of cases.

**H. Rubin:** Is that consistent with our bylaws here?

**Provost Legg:** Good question. If it’s not consistent then I can’t do it. You’re absolutely correct.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I’d like to thank you for meeting with us today. Could you tell us what is meant by enrollment management? It’s an operational definition.

**Provost Legg:** If you had asked me that 20 years ago I would have said “I don’t know, I’ve
never heard of that word before”.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** Well, it keeps coming up.

**Provost Legg:** I’ll give you as short an answer as I can, then we can increase our conversation on it. Enrollment is kind of like research dollars. It’s an achievement to increase enrollment. It’s the American way to get bigger and better and presidents like to do it and provosts and other people like to do it “gee whiz, what happened in your enrollment this year?” “well, we grew 6%, “oh, really, well gosh, we only grew 5%,” you know, like those car ads – what does your car have, a 10 year warranty and everybody gobbles water and chokes. That’s really not the way to drive enrollment, and so enrollment management is more than trying to sustain enrollment. Of course, there’s a very practical reason also. It’s a show and tell item but it’s also – almost all universities are enrollment driven in terms of income and there’s a delicate balance between getting that income and having sufficient faculty to teach courses because enrollment is not the only source. Having said that, real enrollment management means looking at all the programs in the university, finding out where you have demand, where there is employment – demand and employment don’t always match. There may be students who want to be enrolled in a program where employment is not that great, so you have to analyze that issue also and then try to program your recruiting in such a way that you emphasize those areas. You have a limit on the issue that I just mentioned, and that is, do you have enough total funds, meaning i.e. bottom line faculty and support for the faculty to take that on. Balancing those variables is a tricky issue and enrollment management deals with that issue.

**President Willis:** Does that answer your question Jody?

**J. Newman-Ryan:** Yes.

**C. DeMoranville:** I’m not sure I have a question. I have to think about that.

**R. Orem:** Given the pending change in leadership in the Graduate School, has there been any thought to reviewing the Graduate School, examining the current structures and functions of the Graduate School?

**Provost Legg:** No, there hasn’t at this point. It may be that unless – I have not detected any real complaints or concerns about the Graduate School. If I had I might have done that before running a search but right now I don’t plan that and I need to have a replacement. In lieu of not doing it now, the fact is that in looking for a new candidate that could be an issue addressed in the search.

**C. DeMoranville:** I think I found my question. As far as enrollment management is concerned, you said you need to balance the demand as far as the students are concerned with potential employment in those areas with the resources available. I guess my question for enrollment management in your vision is as you project the student demand of employment and resources, do you view an enrollment management model that then seeks for additional resources and secures them or that limits the number of students? And what are you doing with that?
Provost Legg: No, by definition of the enrollment management group, they themselves will not seek resources but they will give us information on how we may distribute our resources. Also, they would recommend without additional resources this program cannot operate beyond what it has already gotten in its enrollment. That’s what I’m really looking for.

C. DeMoranville: But then what do you do if you’ve got students in the system and the system can’t meet the demands of the students?

Provost Legg: Well, one thing is you aim to not get into a situation like that, but in a transition you may find programs like that. Helping to manage the resource flow with the enrollment flow is what we’re looking for and it is clear that in some cases – you know, I’m visiting all the departments. I’ve done about twelve or thirteen, and I’ve got about forty more to do, and in some cases I’ve detected and had some confirmation where we are definitely over-enrolled. But, you know, defining what we mean by over-enrolled is a tricky issue. It’s not easy. There’s no clear number that we can use. It depends on the balance of part time instructors, regular faculty. Overall, our balance with instructors and regular faculty is quite good here compared to many universities. It doesn’t mean that we can put more part time in but it means that we don’t have to go the other direction necessarily and eliminate part time faculty and go to regular faculty. That’s a comfort factor that we can work with but we still have to look at the shuffle of positions between other areas that have demands or don’t have demands or where we have low enrollments.

C. DeMoranville: So I guess that in the transition, which may be occurring in the next year or two, there aren’t any current solutions.

Provost Legg: Yes, there are. I’m dealing with them myself - and I must admit that I’m in a slight overload right now - so that I really need to have an enrollment manager who has that as a full time responsibility. As some of you may know, we have a proposal that a committee chaired by Bob Wheeler put on the President’s desk before I came, to put an application fee in place which would help, if not cover completely, the hiring of an enrollment manager. But you’re right, in the transition Bob and I are going to have to handle it as best we can. It’s a very tricky issue. I mean, I can give you a case here, an example of what I was up against and John Peters and I both were involved in a long meeting on this issue. One of the areas that is extremely popular with students is elementary education. Students grow up wanting to be elementary school teachers. They go to universities in flocks to enroll in elementary education. There is no demand for elementary teachers. We are more than satisfying it. But that issue does not get out in the political landscape. The Board of Trustees – IBHE, Board of Higher Education and the State legislature are lobbied by parents – my student is a 3.0 student and can’t get into elementary education. We have to balance the politics against the reality against the demand. That is not easy to do when you’re running a university. It’s very difficult and Peters has been up the wall on that one. We met with the dean of the program and the chair of the department dealing with elementary education last week, and we were there for over an hour trying to get a balance between satisfying the political need with the reality need with the enrollment and resources we have. That’s the kind of stuff you’re up against when you’re in a president’s role.

C. DeMoranville: As a faculty member I have some concerns about generating revenues from
an application fee and using it to pay and hire – or hire and pay more administrators instead of being used for perhaps faculty resources to better serve the needs of the students or the demand of the students.

**Provost Legg:** That’s a very, very good question. The amount of money that would be raised would probably not put more than a dent in terms of faculty, but what we might get out of the enrollment manager is a much more programmed direction of the resources we do have, and so I would vote in this case for having an enrollment manager rather than two or three positions you might get out of it for faculty. Your question is a good question, but enrollment management in a way is a more effective way of directing resources, a more effective way than we’re doing it now and to the benefit of the faculty. I mean, I need to have someone who can reliably tell me that in computer science, which is in high demand, as an example, I just finished visiting computer science. Computer science can’t take any more people and we’re going to have to live with it unless I have another faculty position. If I find another program around the campus which is way under-enrolled and so on and a position comes free, I may try to move that position from that program into the other. Although here we’re very delocalized in our resource base. The deans pretty well control most of the resources. There’s a flow through my office but the deans have a lot to do with this so the deans can internally reallocate but if I want to reallocate I have to stop something between colleges. I have to stop something going through my office. So far, I have not been doing that. But again, I’m still green and I don’t want to make any decisions without enough information. But it would help enormously to have a good person in that role.

**R. Miller:** The example of computer science is a good one. Why not limit the enrollment, raise the quality of the program and overall I think, in the long run, that would bring resources to the institution. Seems to me that more is not better. Certainly if you constrain the resources to handle the more, who in the shop is paying attention to quality? The students are just not up to par with what they were five years ago.

**Provost Legg:** Let me give you an example of what we’re already doing - but we’re doing it in a piecemeal way because we don’t have the coordination over the whole university that an enrollment manager would give us. One of the issues that we dealt with was exactly the quality issue in our elementary ed and we are now in the process of raising the entry score of students from 2.75 to 3.0. That’s a quality move and doing that in other programs will be necessary. Going back to the diversity question, though, that I was asked before, that is an issue that becomes also a difficult issue to deal with because most of our minority students come from disadvantaged educational backgrounds and if we’re not careful how we handle this we begin to shut out more and more minority students in the process. So again, the enrollment manager has to do with that issue also. It is a complex issue and it is at times like this I’d just turn the provost role over to anybody in this audience.

**H. Rubin:** This is partially a continuation of the last question and then a slightly different one because you are talking about internal resource allocation and right now you’re talking about a demand driven model by students which has been a historic model around here. Before you came aboard, one of the things President Peters said he wanted the provost to be doing is to build centers of strength in the University, academic centers – places of strength and when he was talking he was brilliant about the resources we have in contrast to the state from which both of
you came. Okay, things have now changed dramatically. We probably will not have those new resources and if anything, we’ll be cut back on some of our present resources. Can we do – are you still thinking about internal reallocations?

Provost Legg: Very, very, very little I think. I think at this time it’s going to be holding the fort. I don’t plan both on my knowledge base and on the situation to do a lot. It will be scraping at the edges rather than doing any fundamental issue.

H. Rubin: Because it’s now true. We’ll have some.

Provost Legg: Yeah, right. On the other hand, I do want to point out that when I came here, I inherited an $800,000 deficit. I’ve taken care of that deficit without too much trouble. If I had had an $800,000 deficit in Memphis my academic programs would have folded. At least some of them. So overall, the base that we have here that we’re operating from is a lot stronger than the one I had before and I’ve made the argument and John supports me and I hope we can do it, that when and if we get a rescission - and that’s not for certain yet - when and if we get a rescission, the last thing we touch is faculty positions. I think I can hold to that, and John and I can hold to that pretty strongly, and if we’re lucky and we don’t get a huge rescission we may be able by reallocating resources one way or another to get that rescission paid for without holding any of the faculty positions or cutting.

D. Musial: Ivan, I’m a little bit behind on this enrollment manager. I’m still trying to understand.

Provost Legg: Me too.

D. Musial: Could you just share with me – I’m more concerned about the role of the enrollment manager, I think of a manager making decisions – you get this, you don’t get that but then perhaps but you were speaking about the enrollment manager maybe as a researcher, gathering data and giving reports to another body or person, yourself, to make the decision. Could you just speak a little bit about your vision of the power line when we start having words like manager and enrollment?

Provost Legg: Yeah, in fact that is one of the decisions that is being dealt with right now if we do go and seek an enrollment manager, if we are able to get the resources for it, where will that person report. That’s a very good question. Will it report through one of the associate provost positions or directly to my office. That model varies according to the universities across the state; so one thing I’m going to have to deal with is how it reports. As far as what the actual role is, it can range all the way from being a gatherer of data, period, and nothing more. It’s kind of like institutional research. I mean when I was a faculty member and teaching chemistry, I heard about this thing called institutional research; all I could think was they were doing research on an institution. But I’ve come to appreciate the importance of institutional research, and the best institutional research people I’ve known are not only people who are reliable in their data and can provide it, but know something about the academic programs and other issues at the universities they’re gathering data on, so they can present it in a meaningful way or respond to meaningful questions. That is the model that I would like to see for the enrollment manager.
Not just a data gatherer, but one who knows the interface between the data and the enrollment, the demanding enrollment issues that we have, so that the data can be put together in a readable fashion and in an interpretable fashion. I should add – this is a – whether it reports to me or an associate may not be the fundamental question, somehow or other we need to get faculty involved in this and I would welcome some suggestions on how to do that. John did say in his inaugural address, I think on the top of page 3 or 4 of his address, that Lynne had involved faculty in one way or another in the enrollment management. I don’t know to what extent that was done or not, but it is important just to stay in touch with reality but in a more constructive way, to get really good input, to have the faculty who are absolutely going to be at the end of the enrollment management process having input from the beginning. And I’ll work on that. I think that’s an extremely important point and I would welcome the Senate’s recommendation on how we might do that.

S. Bauman: One suggestion might be to have a faculty committee that would be charged with coming up with recommendations as to what criteria to use in terms of managing enrollment, in terms of quality of students. You mentioned a number of items such as employment opportunities but then also what are the quality programs that a university of our stature should be supporting in terms of determining the resources. So I think in terms of criteria and the guidelines and priorities that perhaps a committee could provide some input.

Provost Legg: Yes, I would recommend the Senate might consider that as a recommendation to us. I’d like to see faculty involved. How they’re involved is something we can work out together. How’s that sound? Okay? All right. I’m glad you raised that question. That’s an important issue. A very important issue.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Any other questions for Ivan? Okay. If not, are there any other comments or questions from the floor? I always look at Jim when I get to this item.

J. Newman-Ryan: I forgot earlier, I’d like to thank Donna for all her work on the Committees Book that we just got this week.

President Willis: Yes, she did a heroic task. Any other comments?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. University Council Agenda (latest available) (Page 24-25)
B. Noon Discussion Series – walk-in
C. Article from “College faculty find free speech is exercised at their own risk,” Aurora Beacon News, 10-13-01 – walk-in

President Willis: I’ve included a couple of information items as walk-ins. I’d like particularly to draw your attention to this little blue sheet here. I’ve been organizing a series of lunchtime
discussion sessions. We had the first one last Friday which was about bioterrorism, which I unfortunately missed because I was sick at home, although that doesn’t seem to have been any kind of terrorist attack, and then we had one today about multi-culturalism. This is the third, about foreign policy, and further sessions will also be scheduled. I’m trying to get these advertised as widely as I can so I’ve given this to all of you.

Provost Legg: I’d like to just add that I attended both and they were both very good discussions we had. It is worth taking a break at lunch to do and I hope we can continue doing them.

President Willis: That’s my plan. So if anybody has suggestions for speakers too, let me know. Particularly if you’d like to volunteer yourself.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

President Willis: I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

C. DeMoranville: I’d just like to thank Provost Legg for coming and answering questions.

Provost Legg: I am available anytime you’d like me to come.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.