

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Office of the Chancellor

112 English Building
October 1, 1971

TO: All Professional and Administrative Academic Staff Members,
Urbana-Champaign Campus

FROM: J. W. Peltason, Chancellor

SUBJECT: Report of the Ad Hoc Academic Professional and
Administrative Personnel Committee

Attached is the report of the Ad Hoc Academic Professional and Administrative Personnel (McPherson) Committee. This Committee was appointed in September of 1970 and asked to prepare a formal review procedure by which academic staff members who are not members of the faculty might express a grievance or a concern relating to their employment within the University. This Committee was to consider its charge in the broadest possible context, to make recommendations with regard to the constitution of any group representing these employees, and to recommend appropriate charges and reporting channels for such a representative group. This report is sent to you at this time for your information, and for any comments and suggestions you may have with regard to its recommendations.

The Committee's most important recommendation relates to the need for the establishment of a Professional Employees Advisory Committee (PAC) -- a committee analogous to the Faculty Advisory Committee. I concur with the Committee that such a representative group is needed and therefore have asked that we move as quickly as possible to elect a PAC.

The Committee has been asked to compile a tentative listing of the electorate and to recommend election procedures. As soon as this has been done an election will be conducted. The first election will be conducted generally in accordance with the guidelines followed in the election of the Faculty Advisory Committee.

Since the receipt of the enclosed report, the Ad Hoc Committee has submitted a supplemental report. The principal differences between the two documents involve the reduction in number of electoral districts from nine to seven and the exclusion from the PAC electorate of the chief executive officer (the dean or director) of the various colleges, institutes and schools. The latter exclusion was also recommended by the deans themselves. The committee report, together with its supplement, has been reviewed administratively and accepted in principle in order that the elections may proceed. Obviously, the electorate for future elections will be one of the early items to be considered by the newly elected PAC.

Attachment

Copy to: Deans, Directors and Heads of
Academic and Administrative Units

FINAL REPORT
OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

I. MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

That a Professional Employees Advisory Committee (PAC) be established as early as feasible in the autumn semester.

That the constituency of the Committee include all members of the academic staff (other than the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellors, and students) at the Urbana-Champaign campus who do not already have (1) access to a formal channel for suggestions and complaints regarding their employment conditions and (2) well developed formal policies covering their terms of employment, subject to the elaboration contained in Section II, 2 of this report.

That the Committee be authorized to clarify the boundaries of its constituency by recommending to the Chancellor that any group or category be added to or removed from the constituency.

That the Committee have the function of reviewing complaints of individuals on the professional-administrative staff regarding their employment conditions and seeking to resolve any dissatisfaction that cannot be handled successfully through existing administrative channels.

That the Committee have the additional function of consultation with administrative officials in the development of general policies and regulations regarding terms of employment of the professional-administrative staff.

That the Committee be required to adopt, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, carefully formulated Articles of Procedure to protect the right of staff members to confidential and equitable consideration in dealing with individual problems.

That the Committee consist of nine members, with one to be elected from each of nine electoral districts by the electorate in that district for a three-year term (after the first election), after nomination by five members in that district, each member to serve no more than two successive terms.

That the Committee be authorized to modify our demarcation of the nine-electoral districts by a two-thirds vote of the full committee and approval of the Chancellor.

That nominations and elections be conducted under the supervision of a PAC Election Clerk, who would initially be the Assistant Director of Admissions and Records.

II. DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Creation of a Professional Employees Advisory Committee (PAC)

In our opinion the need and justification for the establishment of a representatively structured committee to provide both a channel for reviewing individual complaints and a mechanism for consultation on policy matters is apparent from the current lack of definition in the overall status of the members of the academic professional and administrative staff.

The academic professional and administrative personnel on this campus comprise a major group of University employees that has neither detailed formal regulations and policies regarding rights and terms of employment nor a clear representative channel for the voicing of suggestions and complaints regarding the nature and conditions of their employment.* Although the University has operated for decades in this condition without serious problems and with little indication of dissatisfaction, we think the time has come for it to join with the few others who have taken the lead in establishing some form of review committee for the members of this staff. The present financial stringency, which developed some months after the appointment of our Committee, has lead to an acute awareness of the absence of both a specific review channel and a body of formally stated policies for their benefit. Although many in the group are among the most prestigious members of the campus community and all of them make a significant contribution toward achievement of the academic goals of the University, this historic treatment of their interests and concerns largely on an informal, individual, and ad hoc basis has in our opinion deprived them to some extent of the status to which they are entitled.

We believe that the creation of a PAC would immediately provide the members of this staff with a representative peer group to which they could turn for advice regarding individual problems concerning the employment relationship and for assistance in seeking to resolve any serious dissatisfactions. The creation of a PAC would also provide a representative body from which campus officials might obtain the views of the members of this staff and through which the latter might in turn express their needs and desires with a view to developing during the months ahead formal policies regarding mutual rights, obligations, and responsibilities. We sense and share a strong feeling of urgency among many members of the group in the prompt and expeditious development of such policies.

2. The Constituency of a PAC

We have attempted to define in our recommendations the approximate constituency of a PAC. We believe that the existing variety in the terms of academic appointments makes a precise definition of the boundaries of the constituency extremely difficult at this time. However, we seek here to elaborate on our initial definition of that constituency and we shall submit at a later date as Appendix V to this report our best offer to list its individual members. We feel that it is important that the nomination and election procedures be

* So far as we know the only formal statements of employment policies for these employees are those set forth in Sec. 26 of the General Rules and the protection for administrative officers dismissed during their term of appointment contained in Sec. 43 (a) of the Statutes. There must exist, however, a considerable body of general practices and procedures that constitute a sort of uncodified common law.

initiated at the outset of the autumn semester, even though some individuals who should be included in the electorate might be omitted inadvertently and, conversely, some who may not properly belong in the group might be included. We envisage that the PAC would devote attention, especially during its first year, to a refinement of the definition of its constituency and a clarification of boundaries. Consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) would be helpful in this respect. We believe that all members of the academic staff, with the possible exception of a few on short, temporary appointments, should be within the electorate of one or the other of these two committees. A few might be in the electorate of both, but we believe they would have recourse only to one or the other, depending on the nature of the problem.

In defining the scope of the PAC constituency, it is not our purpose to suggest which members of the academic staff should be classified as "professional-administrative" and which as "faculty." That matter is not within our jurisdiction. Rather, we have attempted to determine and apply the facts of the present composition of the academic staff of this campus. We recognize that some staff groups may possibly be shifted in the future from one to the other of those classifications. In that case, the constituencies of the FAC and PAC would presumably be modified accordingly.

It is our general intent that the PAC electorate would include all members of the academic staff (other than the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellors, and students) at the Urbana-Champaign campus, who do not already have (1) access to a channel for suggestions and complaints regarding their employment conditions and (2) well developed formal policies covering their terms of employment.

This definition of the constituency would include a large proportion of the persons holding positions generally categorized as "professional" or "administrative" on the academic payroll. In our report hereafter we shall refer to them frequently as the "professional staff," since those in administrative positions are in fact also professionals. It should also be understood that when we refer to the professional staff, we do not include those who hold professional or administrative positions on the non-academic payroll, since they have their own employment policies and channels.

Because of the wide variety of titles and appointments held by members of the professional staff, it is easier to list the groups of the academic staff that would not be included in the PAC constituency than those that would be. A major exclusion would be those generally characterized as "faculty members." This exclusion would apply to most of those who have an instructor or professorial title or whose title carries the "with rank of" designation, including librarians with the latter designation. With regard to persons holding dual teaching and administrative appointments, we suggest that they be excluded from the PAC electorate only if their appointments call for more than half of full-time service at the professorial rank. However, chairmen and heads of academic departments would be excluded, regardless of the apportionment of their time. We suggest that those on dual administrative-teaching appointments, (other than chairmen and heads), although they would be in the electorate of only the FAC or PAC, depending on the apportionment of their time, should have recourse to either (but not both) of the committees, depending on whether their grievance relates to their administrative or teaching function.

One way of approximating the "faculty" exclusion set forth in the preceding paragraph, is to suggest that persons in the Senate electorate or the FAC electorate should in general be excluded from the PAC electorate. Unfortunately for our purposes those electorates are not yet definite and final. It appears that the Senate electorate may be modified in some respects during the coming year, and the FAC electorate has apparently not yet been precisely defined. We assume, however, that those two electorates are very nearly identical, and that any present differences may well be removed in the near future. Their increasing precision will aid in defining more accurately some of the boundaries of the PAC constituency.

Our recommendation involves also the exclusion of persons whose title in lecturer or whose professorial title is qualified by the adjective "visiting," "clinical," or "adjunct." We recognize that they are not technically members of the faculty, that they are not in the Senate electorate, and that because of the brevity of their appointments many or all of them may not be in the FAC electorate. Nevertheless, we recommend that, since theirs is essentially a teaching function they should have access to the FAC rather than the PAC. We have discussed this matter with the 1970-71 chairman of the FAC, and he concurs in our view, as will be seen by his memorandum to us (Appendix I).

Our definition of the PAC constituency would also exclude teaching and research assistants, since they are students. The real reason for their exclusion is that provision for them is currently under consideration by the Teaching Assistant Study Group.

On the other hand, research associates would be included in the PAC constituency. They are perhaps a borderline case as far as their functions are concerned, but we think they clearly should be included, since they are not in the Senate electorate and since it is our understanding that they probably will not be a part of the FAC constituency.

The constituency of PAC would also include all full-time administrative employees and officers including deans and directors, their associates and assistants, and excluding only the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors. Concerning these latter we suggest that it would be inappropriate for them to serve on the committee whose advice they would seek, and that it would therefore be simplest to exclude them also from the electorate. Persons on dual administrative-teaching appointments as already implied, would be included in the PAC constituency if half or more of their full-time service is budgeted to their administrative position (except in the case of the heads and chairman of academic departments).

We have given particular attention to the question of including in the PAC constituency the staff of the Cooperative Extension Service of the College of Agriculture, which consists of the Extension Advisors, the Home Economics Advisors, and the 4-H Advisors. We believe that they are clearly a part of the professional staff on the academic budget, and should receive the same kinds of professional consideration as all other such staff members. We recognize that the terms and conditions of employment of the extension staff have been carefully developed over the years and are now formally established

in very considerable detail, in contrast to the situation of other academic professional employees on this campus. We recognize also that administrative channels already exist for consideration of individual problems and complaints, and that we have no indication that these channels are unsatisfactory or inadequate. It is our feeling, however, that the basic approach to the resolution of professional concern should involve peer consideration, and the possibility of recommendation to the Chancellor, as we propose in the case of the PAC. We also think that, while the terms and nature of the employment relationship are already highly developed and are influenced by Federal and State legislation, they might also be affected to some extent by the future development of general policies applicable to the rest of the campus professional staff.

We have considered the alternative of proposing the creation of a separate advisory committee for this extension staff to provide a means for peer consideration of individual problems. After evaluating all of the factors involved it is our opinion that to set the Cooperative Extension staff apart through a separate but similarly representative system would be to set them apart from the remainder of the professional employees at the Urbana campus. It seems to us that this would be undesirable from the viewpoint of both of these professional staffs. It is therefore our intent that our proposed definition of the PAC constituency be interpreted as including the Cooperative Extension staff.

Although the charge of our Committee relates only to the professional staff at the campus level, we cannot fail to note that similar staff members at the University level who are stationed on this campus have the same needs. We believe that it would be unnecessarily duplicative if a separate advisory committee were to be established for them, since the general policies on terms of employment to be developed through consultation would necessarily apply to both groups. We would hope, therefore, that they might be included in the Urbana-Champaign PAC electorate, even though we lack authority to make such a formal recommendation. If the PAC constituency were to be thus expanded, references to the Chancellor in this report would need to include the President or Provost under appropriate circumstances. We urge, however, that the creation of a PAC for this campus not be delayed until the officials of the General University Administration determine whether or not to accept our suggestion. If a favorable decision on inclusion should be made before nomination forms are distributed, we would recommend that the University-level professional staff be added immediately to the electorate. If such a decision is reached at a later time, we suggest that this group then be allowed to elect one of its number to attend the PAC meetings during the remainder of its first year with voice but without vote and that the PAC recommend to the Chancellor measures for including this group in its electorate for the 1972 election.

3. Role and Functions of the PAC

The proposed charge for the PAC contemplates that it would be an advisory body and a consultative resource. Since, as its name implies, it would have an exclusively advisory role, we believe that it could and should

be established promptly without awaiting approval of the Senate or the Board of Trustees. We suggest, however, that it eventually be recognized by mention in the Statutes. For this purpose we present in Appendix II our proposal for a statutory provision. In it we have followed closely the format and language of the provision in Sec. 6 (m) on the Faculty Advisory Committee. That language appears adequate to cover in general the role that we envisage for the PAC, even though we anticipate that its role will be broader than that of the FAC. For ready reference, our draft of a statutory provision indicates how it varies from the provision on the FAC in the pending statutory revisions. This draft would have to be revised to cover whatever similar structures may be planned on the other campuses.

In exercising its advisory and consultative role, the PAC would be acting in two major areas. One area would involve consideration of individual problems concerning employment relationships. In this area the PAC would act at the request of one or more employees, who would bring to that committee or to one of its members a complaint, grievance or dissatisfaction, or would act at the request of an administrative officer, who seeks advice concerning what action he should take with respect to one or more employees. It would not act in this area on its own initiative.

The other area would involve advice and consultation concerning the formulation and drafting of general policies and regulations relating to the employment relationship. In this area the PAC would act either upon its own initiative or upon request of an administrative officer. We shall characterize these two areas as those relating to "individual problems" and "general policies," bearing in mind that a particular problem may involve more than one individual.

a. The General Policies Area

In its early years the PAC may well find that its consultative and advisory role in the formulation of general policies and regulations applicable to members of the professional staff is its most time-consuming function. This role does not have a counterpart in the activities of the FAC. The corresponding role with reference to the faculty is vested not in the FAC but rather in certain committees of the Senate.

The Committee would need to investigate, more thoroughly than we have been able to, the exact extent of existing formalized policies and regulations and the nature of customary practices that should perhaps be formalized. One apparent need is for specific, practicable standards on the length of advance notice of resignation, on the one hand, and of non-reappointment, on the other hand. It is not the function of our Committee to outline in detail the various aspects of personnel policy that might be covered by formal regulations. The PAC would of course find guidance in this respect from a study of the regulations that are now applicable to the faculty or to the non-academic employees. Presumably the committee would seek to develop procedures that would assure its constituency due process in case of termination for cause, or of non-reappointment of long-service employees. Perhaps we might best illustrate the possible extent of personnel regulations by indicating the variety of types of leave that might be covered: annual leave (vacation),

sick leave, maternity leave, personal leave, military leave, jury duty leave, sabbatical leave, and leave for attendance at professional meetings.

We would emphasize that most, if not all, of the general policies that may be developed during the next year or two would probably be uniform throughout the University. It must therefore be recognized that the Urbana-Champaign PAC would be submitting advice on behalf of only a part of the total staff that would be covered by the policies and that it is in a position to supply only a part of the total staff input concerning policy development.

The task of the PAC in the general policy area would be greatly complicated by the variety of the committee's constituency. It seems unlikely that any one set of regulations would be equally appropriate for all members of this staff. For example, it seems clear to us that restrictions on termination and non-reappointment should not be applied to certain high-level administrators. Some of these should be considered as members of the Chancellor's "cabinet," who should serve in those capacities only at his pleasure.

We would hope that after the first two years the demands of committee work on the time of its members may be no greater than it is in the case of the FAC. At the outset, however, it would clearly be very considerable. As a means toward meeting this problem, we suggest it be understood that any subcommittees of the PAC, which might be appointed by the chairman to study various aspects of the general policies area, could include persons in the constituency other than committee members, when approved by vote of the committee.

b. The Individual Problem Area

Our emphasis upon the advisory role of the PAC indicates that we envisage for it in this area a mediatory rather than an arbitral function. In this area for PAC is the exact counterpart of the FAC, and we think it would do well to benefit from the experience of that committee and to follow closely the pattern that has been developed so successfully there. The appropriate informality, flexibility, and independence is best achieved if the recommendations of the PAC rest upon the persuasive and moral authority of its position and its reasoning rather than upon some form of arbitral power assigned to it by the campus or University administration or by the Board of Trustees. Such delegation would be contrary to the traditions in higher education, and we favor the retention of the collegial concept.

It is not possible to specify here exactly what types of individual problems should or should not be dealt with by the committee. That would have to be decided by the committee itself, perhaps largely on an ad hoc basis. Accepted problems would probably deal only with an allegation of unjust, illegal, inequitable, or arbitrary treatment in the employment relationship. They might include matters relating to termination or non-renewal of appointment, to promotion and opportunity for professional advancement, to denial of appropriate leave, or other benefits, or to questions of professional recognition.

In order to evaluate a complaint and to perform effectively their proper role in dealing with grievances that come within their jurisdiction, PAC

members should be equipped with general standards against which the behavior of individuals or the circumstances of employment could be measured. It appears to this Committee that there are five basic sources from which such standards could and should be derived:

- (1) The contract of employment.
- (2) Overriding legal requirements, such as those which proscribe discrimination on the basis of race, religion or sex.
- (3) Generalized notions of good management practice, such as those which would dictate that an employee be adequately informed of his duties, and of any respects in which he should seek to improve his performance.
- (4) Generalized notions of the traditional responsibilities of employment, such as those which would dictate that an employee perform his assigned tasks in a conscientious and competent manner.
- (5) Generalized notions of appropriate and traditional reciprocal courtesies which should attend professional employment, such as those which, affirmatively, would dictate a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation and, negatively, would proscribe conduct that would interfere with the effective performance of the duties and responsibilities of others.

In dealing with individual problems, PAC members would be using their own careful judgment in seeking to promote the best interests of the University and all its employees as a whole. They would not serve as representatives, advocates or protagonists of an individual, though they would have a responsibility to seek proper and equitable treatment for him. If they should decide that he has no just grounds for complaint, it would be their duty to tell him so and to explain to him their reasons. In dealing with this sensitive area of individual interests, they would have an obligation to protect the confidentiality of the information that is brought to their attention. It would therefore be of vital importance that the Committee's activities in this area be subject to carefully drawn standards of procedure, which the Committee itself should devise. This matter will be discussed further in the section on procedures in the individual problem area.

c. Subsidiary function

In addition to its two basic roles in the areas of individual problems and general policies, the PAC would need to review our recommendations with regard to the boundaries of its constituency. It should be understood that the committee would have the responsibility to clarify the extent of its electorate and make appropriate recommendations to the Chancellor for any modifications. It is our thought that the PAC might itself correct any misplacement of an individual in our planning of the initial election, but that the addition or removal of any group or category would require the approval of the Chancellor or his delegated representative.

There would be an obvious need for close collaboration between the PAC and FAC in this matter of constituent definition, in an effort to assure that no one is in the electorate of both committees.

4. PAC Procedures in the individual problem area.

We see no particular need for the formulation of any special procedures for committee action in the general policies area. In the individual problem area, however, careful formulation of committee procedures is necessary in order to protect the rights of the individual staff member to confidential and equitable consideration. Although such formulation would be one of the incidental functions of the PAC, we wish to set forth some of our views on the matter. We recommend that adoption of its Articles of Procedure should be subject to the approval of the Chancellor.

It is the strong feeling of our Committee that these procedures should be as informal and flexible as is consistent with the effective resolution of the problem. Formality and rigidity are inconsistent with professional employment.

It is to be expected that most problems or areas of disagreement can best be worked out by the parties themselves or with the assistance of supervisors within normal channels. When such resolution appears to be impossible, we believe that the staff member should be free to bring his problem to the attention of the PAC chairman or any PAC member of his choice. In the latter case, the chairman should be promptly informed. Before authorizing investigation of the matter by a subcommittee of one or more members, the chairman would initially determine whether or not the matter lies within the jurisdiction of the committee and whether normal channels for conflict resolution had effectively been exhausted. Before making these determinations, he might consult the full committee, unless the complainant has requested that he not do so.

We believe that the PAC would best perform its investigative and mediatory functions informally through a subcommittee, which, unlike subcommittees in the general policies area, would consist only of PAC members. It would listen to the details of the problem, gather from anyone else immediately involved additional information that would help to put the problem in its total perspective, propose to the parties any resolution of the matter that might be mutually acceptable, and, failing agreement, explain its conclusions to those involved. After gathering all pertinent information, it might seek advice or instruction from the chairman or the full committee. If the matter is not resolved, it would normally report to the committee for a decision regarding possible further action, such as a recommendation to the Chancellor.

We do not envisage that the committee would normally hold a formal hearing, but we would anticipate that any subcommittee, in its efforts to resolve conflicting statements or to effect an agreed resolution, might well meet with the individual and his supervisor jointly, as well as separately. A formal hearing, with the examination of witnesses, might be held at the request of an administrative officer or in cases of such seriousness that a recommendation to the Chancellor appeared necessary.

Most recommendations of PAC would be made informally with a view to using its good offices to resolve the problem. It would appear most appropriate to the nature of professional employment to retain discussion of a problem within the limits of those persons necessarily involved and at the lowest level of supervisory interest consistent with effective resolution of the problem, but with due consideration for courtesy to higher level supervisors when they should be informed of problems within their jurisdiction. Whenever an equitable adjustment cannot be achieved at the lower levels, the full committee might decide to submit a recommendation to the Chancellor.

We emphasize that the annual written report, that we propose be made by the chairman to the members of the constituency, should follow the pattern of the FAC reports in that it would omit any details of individual cases and give only a general indication of the volume and nature of the total workload. It is our thought that the report would best be presented, not at the end of the fiscal or academic year, but at such time in the spring as would permit it to be distributed with the nomination forms. Such timing would promote efficiency, and might help in providing information that would aid in the selection of nominees.

As a further guide in the formulation of procedures we attach as Appendix III a copy of the present procedures of the FAC, revised only to indicate its applicability to the different constituency. If that draft should be used as a pattern for initial PAC procedures, we would suggest three modifications: (1) paragraph 2 might be modified to permit the use of a subcommittee with only one member, rather than two, (2) a further revision of the same paragraph might well delete the two references to a "hearing," since we think that matter is adequately and better covered in paragraph 3, and (3) revision of paragraph 10.

5. The Composition of PAC

We suggest that the members of the PAC should be elected rather than appointed. This recommendation needs no supporting discussion.

We also propose that the PAC consist of nine members. We have ourselves found that to be a very satisfactory number to work together. It follows the pattern of the FAC. It permits representation of a considerable variety of types of employment and points of view. It allows for three-year terms, with three members to be elected each year. Moreover, we believe that the practice of Senate committees indicates that a three-year term is the best length, because it results in only a minority of new members each year, allows continuation of effective membership for a reasonable time after experience has been gained, and yet avoids the number of unfinished terms that might result from longer duration.

We also have no doubt that the committee members as a group should be familiar with the conditions in as wide a variety of the various types of professional employment as possible. It is therefore recommended that the committee's constituency be divided into a number of electoral districts, with one member serving at one time from each district.

This limitation of one member per district would dictate the division of the total electorate into nine electoral districts. We shall ourselves propose in Appendix V (to be submitted later) the boundaries that we think might best be used in the first election, by listing the individual members of the total constituency grouped by district. We believe that, for subsequent elections, the PAC should be authorized to modify the district demarcations by two-thirds vote of the full committee and approval of the Chancellor.

We suggest that the proper guideline in structuring the electoral districts should be an effort (1) to include within any one district staff members who are the most likely to be well acquainted with each other and who work within the same or similar administrative divisions and (2) to obtain in the total composition of the committee as wide as possible a familiarity with different types of administrative divisions and different types of employment conditions. Of very minor significance will be our attempt to obtain some rough degree of balance in the size of the electorate of the various districts. We consider this relatively unimportant because we envisage each PAC member as representing the entire constituency rather than a single district. In fact, we see no likelihood of any conflict of interest between the districts or the numerous groups that would constitute any one district. Since the objectives of the committee are to assure proper treatment for every member of the professional staff and to assist in the formulation of general employment policies covering the total staff, we would assume that each voter would be much less interested in electing a member of his own particular group than in selecting the person in his district in whose judgment, tact, and mediating skill he has the greatest confidence.

6. Election Procedures

The nomination and election procedures would be conducted under the supervision of a PAC Election Clerk. We believe that the only valid considerations in deciding who should have the honor of this appointment are those of ability, efficiency and economy. We therefore suggest that Mr. Gary Engalgau, Assistant Director of Admissions and Records, be asked to shoulder this additional burden. As Clerk of the Senate, he is in charge of maintaining the central records on the annual election of that body. He also conducts the FAC elections, which are roughly similar to those we propose. The fact that he would be a member of the PAC constituency seems to us no valid basis for objection. We suggest that the expertise and experience of his staff be utilized for this purpose, recognizing that the timing of the PAC election would need to be dovetailed with the others in order to distribute the workload. He has been consulted on the formulation of our election procedures. One of the professional members of our group will be available to advise him in case any unforeseen problems arise.

After the initial election next autumn, subsequent elections would be conducted at such time during the spring semester as would best fit the convenience of his staff. It appears at present that this would probably mean a distribution of nomination forms in late April and balloting in late May.

It is recommended that any member of an electoral district could be nominated by a form signed by five other members of that district. The FAC

requires only three nominators, but we think that five would give somewhat greater assurance of confidence in the nominee and might tend to limit the number of nominees to the point that those elected by a plurality of the votes would more nearly have also a majority.

After the first year, nominees could be named only in those districts that will have a prospective vacancy. This would mean an election in three of the nine districts, unless a committee member in another district is unable to complete his full term. In this latter case, he would not be replaced by special election during the year, but only at the next regular election.

The nominating form might provide for the signature of the nominee, indicating his acceptance of the nomination. This would show that he would be willing to devote the necessary time to the work of the committee and that he expects to be on campus throughout the three-year term. A suggested form for the nominating sheet is attached as Appendix IV.

Since some members of the electorate may not know all of the nominees in their district, we suggest that each nominee be required to submit a statement of not more than a hundred words, indicating his views of the task and responsibilities of the committee, such statements to be duplicated and distributed with the ballots.

We recommend that the constituency in each electoral district separately elect one of its own members. We think that this provision would best assure the selection of members who would command the respect of the entire electorate and of the administrative officials whom they will be advising and with whom they will be consulting. We are well aware that several persons at our open meeting urged that the constituency not be divided into electoral districts, maintaining that they are well acquainted with the professional staff in all areas of the campus. Our Committee, which includes professional staff members from seven of those areas, remains convinced that, while some may have such a wide acquaintanceship, this is not characteristic of the total constituency.

There would therefore be a separate election ballot for the electorate of each of the nine districts, listing in alphabetical order the names of the nominees in that district and enclosing the hundred-word statements they have submitted. The nominee in each district who receives the most votes would be elected. Any tie vote would be decided by flip of a coin by those who are tied.

In order to differentiate the length of terms in the first election, those elected will draw lots to determine which shall serve for one, two, or three years. The first year of all terms would, of course, be less than a full year, since it would run presumably from October to June.

We propose a maximum of two consecutive terms, with each of the initial terms considered as a full term for this purpose.

With the subsequent submission of Appendix V to this report our Committee will have fulfilled, we trust, your charge to us. One of the professional

members of our group, Dayton Pickett, will continue, however, to be available to the PAC Election Clerk for advice and consultation on nomination and election procedures during the first election. All of us will also be available during the coming year collectively and individually for consultation with you or the charter members of the PAC regarding any details that we may have overlooked in this report. In the absence of the original chairman, Helen Hay and John Desmond will serve as co-chairman of our Committee during the preparation of Appendix V.

COMMENTS OF THE CHAIRMAN

The other members of this Committee have been an extremely diligent and conscientious group. We have discussed each major point of our recommendations until we reached a consensus of those present. It was only on the question of including the Cooperative Extension Service in the PAC constituency that, after lengthy discussion, investigation, and reconsideration, the Committee position was reached by vote rather than consensus. It was still nearly a consensus. I found myself in a stubborn minority of one. Unfortunately, I consider the question of sufficient importance that I wish to express briefly my dissenting view.

The major relevant facts are well summarized in the body of this report. My difference of view is based chiefly on their evaluation. I submit that the CES staff has no need for the functions that a PAC would perform, and that it would be unreasonable to double the size of the constituency and to incur at this juncture a slight increase in operating costs by including such a large group that has little to gain from such inclusion. If the other professional staff members on this campus now had such a complete set of employment policies and such adequate grievance channels, our Committee would never have been appointed.

The CES staff Handbook formally sets forth a complete set of employment policies and regulations covering everything from study leave and convention travel grants to minimum notice of non-reappointment. And, while their grievance channels are not identical to the one proposed in this report, we are told that they have, not one, but three such channels in the County Extension Councils, an Extension Policy Committee, and an elected Field Policy Committee.

At our open meeting, three or four of the leading representatives of that staff took the floor to say that they had no interest in being included in the constituency, because they had no problems of the type that the proposed advisory committee is designed to meet. Subsequently I received a letter from the President of one of the three professional associations that represent the various members of that staff. He stated:

The IEAA Advisors request to be included in the formation of a Professional Employees Advisory Committee.

As Dale Hewitt . . . emphasized at your meeting, we are faculty members of the University of Illinois, Urbana, located throughout the state. County Extension Advisors are very interested in all matters that concern the University of Illinois and its staff.

On July 13 I wrote to him as follows:

Since the members of your group, unlike the other professional employees whom we are considering, already have well-developed terms of employment and clear channels for the presentation of suggestions and complaints, it is my personal view that your

request needs to be supported by a clear showing of the inadequacies of your present situation and real need for additional coverage by the advisory committee that we may recommend. Since we hope to complete our report near the end of this month, I must ask that any such showing as you wish to present reach me as soon as conveniently possible.

No response to this invitation has yet been received. The other two professional associations involved have not withdrawn the statements of disinterest presented at the open meeting.

I think we must also recognize that the CES staff, though they are certainly fellow-members of the total campus professional staff, have an employment context that is fundamentally different, in the degree of its control by Federal and State legislation and its close organizational ties to the County Extension Councils. If the staff does indeed have any need for a supplementary advisory committee, I think that such an organization would best be one of their own choosing. Then all of the committee members, and not just one, would be thoroughly familiar with the special background of any problems they may have.

If the two committees should by chance find that they have a common interest in some problem, consultation between their chairmen would not be difficult. In this latter case, a recommendation for the consolidation of the two committees could then be much better documented than at present. I submit that the formation of two committees would not set the CES staff members apart from their on-campus colleagues, but merely recognize the realities of the basic differences in the context and nature of any problems they may have. These basic differences cannot be removed by the simple, if inefficient, method of establishing a single committee to deal with dissimilar problems.

We are told indirectly that the CES staff spokesmen have little or no interest in additional grievance channels, but would like to participate in the development of general employment policies for the on-campus professional staff. It is interesting to note, however, that the argument in our report for including them in the PAC constituency recognizes that they already have highly developed employment policies and emphasizes chiefly the dissimilarity in their grievance channels. Actually, the CES staff members are entirely correct if they think they would have nothing to gain from access to the PAC as a grievance channel. Under our recommendations, PAC would not investigate a grievance until persuaded that all existing channels for resolution had been exhausted. It is to me inconceivable that any grievance that could not be resolved under any of the present CES channels would have merit enough to win PAC support.

Finally, I note that the members of the CES staff frequently refer to themselves as members of the University faculty. I wonder if they have thoroughly considered the implications of their inclusion in a constituency from which faculty members are definitely excluded.

APPENDIX I

June 24, 1971

To: Professor William H. McPherson
209 L. I. R. Building

From: S. Konzo, Chairman of Faculty Advisory Committee for 1970-1971

Subject: Status of Faculty Members with Special Adjectives Attached to
Professorial Titles

I would like to confirm the statement that I made to you over the telephone in regard to your inquiry about the status of several members of the faculty with special adjectives attached to professional titles. Although the matter has not been discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee, I am making a decision at this time in order that your Committee on Academic-Professional Staff will have a firm base for making decisions, as to who are members of the Academic-Professional Staff. If later Faculty Advisory Committees see the necessity of changing this arbitrary ruling, it seems to me that such discussions can be conducted with their counterpart Advisory Committee for the Academic Professional Staff.

It seems to me that the Faculty Advisory Committee should handle any case referred to it by persons whose appoints read:

"Lecturer"
"Visiting _____ Professor"
"Adjunct _____ Professor"
"Clinical _____ Professor"
"With the rank of _____ Professor"

It is possible that some of these persons may not have voted for members to serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee, but I have no information on this matter. Perhaps the office of Mr. Gary R. Engelgau should be notified of the final decision made by your Committee so that any person with the above titles do not receive notifications from both the Faculty Advisory Committee and the future Academic-Professional Advisory Committee.

SK:cgs

APPENDIX II

PROPOSED STATUTORY PROVISION FOR A PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 (showing the deviations from the pending statutory provisions on the FAC)

Sec. 6 (n). The academic professional and administrative staff (~~and~~ ~~these-having-the-rank-of-instructor-or-higher-rank~~) at each campus shall may also elect a Faculty Professional Employees Advisory Committee of nine members of such academic staff, three of whom shall be elected each year for three-year terms. No more than ~~two~~ one members, ~~or-in-the-case-of-the-Medical-Center-no-more-than-three,~~ from any ~~one-college,-school,-institute,-division,-or-other~~ administrative-unit-of-the-University one electoral district shall serve on the Committee at the same time. The Committee shall each year elect its own chairman at its first meeting held after the annual election of members. The Committee shall adopt its rules of procedure, copies whereof shall be sent to all members of the academic professional and administrative staff and to the Chancellor and President. The Committee shall make such annual reports to, the Chancellor, the President, ~~the-Senate,~~ and the faculty staff as it deems appropriate.

The functions of the Committee shall be to provide for the orderly voicing of suggestions for the good of the University, for affording added recourse for the consideration of grievances and for furnishing a channel for direct and concerted communication with administrative officers of the University and its colleges,-schools,-institutes,-divisions,-and-other administrative units on matters of concern to the academic professional and administrative staff or any member of it.

In performing its functions, the Committee, upon the request of the President or Chancellor, or any member of the academic professional and

administrative staff or upon its own initiative, shall make such investigations and hold such consultations as it may deem to be in the best interest of the University. A member of the academic professional and administrative staff shall be entitled to a conference with the committee or with any member of it on any matter properly within the purview of the Committee.

Those who at the date this section of the University Statutes becomes effective are already members of an established Faculty Professional Employees Advisory Committee shall be the first members of the Committee as established under this section of the University Statutes, with terms coterminous with those for which they were elected.

Any ~~person-of-the-rank-of-instructor-or-higher-rank~~ member of the academic professional and administrative staff may be nominated as a Committee member by a petition signed by ~~three~~ five members of the ~~academic~~ that staff and filed with the Clerk ~~or-Secretary~~ of the Senate ~~prior-to-April-1-of-each-year~~ at the appropriate time. The Clerk of the Senate shall conduct the election by University mail ~~as-soon-as-possible-thereafter~~ before the end of the spring semester. All members of the academic professional and administrative staff ~~of-the-rank-of-instructor-or-higher-rank~~ may vote, and the three nominees receiving the highest number of votes in each electoral district where a vacancy will exist, who-are-then-eligible-for-membership-on-the-Committee ~~under-the-foregoing-provisions,~~ shall be declared elected.

APPENDIX III

ARTICLES OF PROCEDURE, FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(as revised for possible applicability to the PAC)

1. Any member of the academic professional and administrative staff may present a suggestion or grievance to any member of the Professional Employees Advisory Committee. No member of the Committee may refuse to hear such suggestion or grievance. Any matter thus presented shall be reported promptly to the Chairman of the Committee.
2. Any member of the academic professional and administrative staff may request a hearing or an investigation into any grievance, or other matter he believes to be in the interest of the University, and if the Chairman believes the matter to be within the Committee's purview, he shall appoint a sub-committee of two or more Committee members who shall conduct a hearing or investigation on the matter, and make a report of its findings and recommendations thereon to the staff member and to the Chairman of the Committee.
3. The Committee, after review of the sub-committee's report shall:
 - (a) Refer the matter back to the sub-committee for further investigation and report,
 - (b) Grant a hearing before the entire Committee,
 - (c) Refer the matter to the Chairman to handle through appropriate University authorities,
 - (d) Dismiss the matter, or
 - (e) Take any other action it deems desirable in the best interest of the University.
4. A member of the Committee may disqualify himself in any matter in which he is personally involved.
5. The Chairman, being an elected member of the Committee, shall have a vote on all questions.
6. Six members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. The approval of a majority of those members present shall be required for the passage of any measure. A minority, however, may file an opinion to accompany any recommendation of the majority.
7. Any matter coming before the Committee shall be treated as private and confidential unless the staff member and the Committee agree otherwise, or unless the staff member first releases information of the matter to the public. The release of information shall be made only by the Chairman or his appointee upon the approval of a majority of the Committee.
8. Committee minutes and other records of the Committee shall be open to inspection by members of the academic professional and administrative staff only for good reason and upon written authorization from the Committee.
9. The Chairman shall report to the professional and administrative staff annually, and at such other times as the Committees may direct.
10. These Articles of Procedure may be amended at any time by a majority vote of the entire Committee.

APPENDIX IV

NOMINATING FORM

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To the members of the academic professional and administrative staff:

The Chancellor has approved the formation of a Professional Employees Advisory Committee (PAC) of nine members to serve in an advisory and consultative role in the resolution of individual problems and the formulation of policies and regulations concerning the employment relationship. It will hear any suggestions, complaints, or grievances of members of the professional-administrative staff and seek to assure proper and equitable treatment.

One member is to be elected from each of nine electoral districts. A list of the electorate in your district is attached. You and any four other members of that electorate may join in nominating any other member for election to the Committee by completing this form and returning it by campus mail to the PAC Election Clerk, 108 Administration Building, by September 20, 1971. You may sponsor only one nominee.

* * * * *

We, the undersigned members of the professional-administrative staff, hereby nominate for membership on the Professional Employees Advisory Committee (PAC):

Name of nominee: _____

Position of nominee: _____

In witness whereof we individually attach our signatures hereto.

1. Name: _____ Position: _____

2. Name: _____ Position: _____

3. Name: _____ Position: _____

4. Name: _____ Position: _____

5. Name: _____ Position: _____

* * * * *

Acceptance of nomination by the nominee:

I accept this nomination, recognizing that service on the Committee would make substantial demands on my time and might continue for up to three years. I submit on the other side of this sheet a statement of not more than 100 words concerning my views of the task and responsibilities of the Committee, to be distributed to the electorate at the time of balloting.

Signature: _____
Nominee