

BOARD OF TRUSTEES RETREAT

# Cost-cutting plans moving forward at UI

## Officials discuss expectations for new president, diversity issues

By JULIE WURTH  
jwirth@news-gazette.com

CHICAGO — Administrators hoping to move quickly on cost-cutting plans at the University of Illinois got an informal endorsement from trustees Wednesday.

During a board discussion of priorities for the coming year, President Michael Hogan said he hoped to get board approval this week to implement pieces of the Administrative Review and Restructuring report, which recommended up to \$60 million in savings over three years.

Specifically, Hogan cited plans to streamline information technology services, which could save \$18 million; use strategic, coordinated purchasing, saving an estimated \$22 million; central-

ize services through shared service centers; and develop a universitywide plan for human resources, now scattered among the campuses and academic units.

Hogan said he met with top administrators last week and "we're all ready to go." Subcommittees are being created to implement those plans, he said.

"I don't think the board felt you needed to come to us" for permission to proceed, board Chairman Chris Kennedy replied, at the trustees' all-day retreat in Chicago.

Hogan said he would give trustees regular updates on the initiative.

Trustees had already approved a major recommendation from the report in May — the consolidation of three

vice presidents' positions into two.

Hogan said other suggestions will require further study. The report, for example, suggested consolidating the number of vice chancellor positions and integrating fundraising across the university, including by the UI Foundation and UI Alumni Association.

Faculty at a UI senate meeting last week said they'd like to have more input, too.

"There will be some bumps in the road," Hogan said.

Trustees Wednesday drafted a laundry list of questions as it looked ahead to the coming year, about the UI's strategic direction, finances, political climate and educational mission. The questions covered everything from employee compensation and

economic development to diversity, tuition and the evaluation of administrators.

Hogan said he would try to prioritize the list before providing answers, concentrating "first and foremost on university finances ... and how we're going to protect all the things we do that are important to us."

Trustees were expected to discuss their expectations for Hogan during executive sessions Wednesday and today. His first formal review will come a year from now.

The board also held a lengthy session on improving diversity at the UI's three campuses, with an appearance by state Rep. Cynthia Soto, D-Chicago, member of the House Higher Education Appropriations Committee.

Soto said she's been "disappointed" by the numbers of underrepresented students at all state universities and said legislators would be scrutinizing budgets to see how money is being spent on diversity efforts.

"It's not about taking away money, it's about putting money where it's working," Soto said.

Later, Soto said she was heartened by Wednesday's frank discussion and UI officials' pledge to meet with concerned legislators about the issue.

UI Professor James Anderson outlined successes in recruiting minority students for graduate programs at the College of Education, which identifies prospective Ph.D. students when they are still undergraduates and gets them involved in research programs.

He said athletic depart-

ments don't wait for talented prospects to "show up at their door. They build the class they want" by working with students as early as eighth grade, and schools should do the same on the academic side, he said.

He also suggested the UI boost financial help for minority students and expand programs to make the campuses more "welcoming." Their small numbers, and the feeling that they must prove they can make it on their own, can lead to isolation and an early departure from the university, Anderson said.

Kennedy suggested a universitywide "enrollment management" system to enhance diversity recruitment. Hogan said it would pull together functions such as registration, financial aid and credit transfer to support students entering the university.

No Mention of UIC

CNSNews.com

**University of Illinois Says Professor 'Has Not Been Fired' for Teaching Catholic Doctrine On Homosexuality in Catholicism Class - He's Just Not Teaching Classes**

Thursday, July 22, 2010

By Adam Cassandra

**(CNSNews.com)** – Threats of legal action persist after the University of Illinois responded to demands by the Alliance Defense Fund to fully reinstate a professor relieved of duty for teaching Catholic doctrine on homosexuality in a Catholic doctrine class.

The university said that the professor had not been not "fired" -- and "there is no case or controversy" at this time.

As CNSNews.com previously reported, Dr. Kenneth Howell claimed that the head of the religion department at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) informed him last May that he would no longer be teaching on campus due to complaints of "hate speech" over teaching Catholic doctrine on homosexuality in an Introduction to Catholicism class.

In a letter to the Alliance Defense Fund, Steven Veazie, deputy counsel for the University of Illinois, in a letter to the Alliance Defense Fund, said that Howell is still on staff.

"(C)ontrary to some reports, Prof. Howell has not been 'fired.' He held, and continues to hold, the appointment of adjunct professor," Veazie wrote.

According to Veazie, Howell's teaching assignment for the fall semester "is as yet undetermined pending a review of this matter by the Faculty Senate's Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure."

Veazie went on to say that the University has not violated Dr. Howell's legal rights, and that there is "no case or controversy upon which legal action would be warranted at this time."

As CNSNews.com previously reported, the Alliance Defense Fund (ADF), representing Dr. Howell, had demanded that the University fully re-instate the professor by July 16, or face legal action.

In its response to Veazie's letter, the ADF reiterated that Howell's First Amendment and 14 Amendment rights were violated when the university relieved the professor of his duties, due to the content of his speech.

"While he continues to hold his appointment as adjunct professor, that title is virtually meaningless if he has no classes to teach," ADF attorney David Hacker wrote in a letter to the university.

Hacker pointed out that Dr. Howell was scheduled to teach during the fall 2010 semester, but currently has no teaching assignment.

Hacker also expressed concerns over the "review" of Howell's situation, saying that opinions among University officials are "tainted" against the professor.

For example, he said, the Champaign, Ill.-based News-Gazette published e-mail correspondence from Ann Mester, associate dean for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at UIUC, to Dr. Robert McKim, head of the religion department, in which she purportedly wrote that she believed "the e-mails sent by Dr. Howell violate university standards of inclusivity, which would then entitle us to have him discontinue his teaching arrangement with us."

Neither Mester nor McKim commented for this story.

Dr. Howell sent an e-mail to his students attempting to clarify the Catholic Church's position on homosexuality after an in-class discussion. That e-mail prompted a complaint to university officials, which stated: "(T)his hate speech at a public university is entirely unacceptable."

According to Hacker, the University continues to violate Dr. Howell's First and Fourteenth Amendment rights each day he is not fully reinstated, and that the professor does not need to hear the Faculty Senate Committee decision before exploring court action.

"Thus, absent written assurance that Dr. Howell will continue to teach his regularly assigned courses in the fall of 2010, he will proceed to litigation," Hacker wrote.

The legal group is demanding Howell's reinstatement by July 27.

**[Like this story? Then sign up to receive our free daily E-Brief newsletter](#)**

The Rail Professionals' Information Source

Philanthropy 7/22/2010

## CN contributes \$325,000 to Illinois university's rail engineering program

CN recently donated \$325,000 to the [University of Illinois'](#) railroad engineering program. Since 2002, the Class I has donated more than \$1 million to the program, which is part of the university's civil and environmental engineering department.

"This gift allows us to continue and extend our success in developing courses, conducting research and teaching students about rail transport and engineering," said Professor Christopher Barkan, the railroad engineering program's director, in a prepared statement.

Through the CN Stronger Communities Fund, the Class I aims to support health and safety programs for youth, transportation education and the United Way. CN contributes 1 percent of pre-tax profits to registered non-profit organizations in communities where it operates or employs workers.

"The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign provides its engineering students with a strong knowledge of railroading evident in the talented graduates and interns we have hired from this program in recent years," said Jim Vena, CN senior vice president-southern region.

### Comments

[Add a comment](#)

[Contact Progressive Railroading editorial staff.](#)

© 2010 Trade Press Media Group, Inc.

[Policies](#)



# SJ-R.COM

The State Journal-Register • Springfield, IL • The Oldest Newspaper in Illinois

## A few good sponsors wanted for this fall's UIS homecoming

By **CHRIS DETTRO**

**THE STATE JOURNAL-REGISTER**

Posted Jul 21, 2010 @ 11:40 PM

Last update Jul 22, 2010 @ 06:27 AM

Want your company's name on the official University of Illinois Springfield 2010 Homecoming T-shirt? It's there for \$500.

For just \$100, your name can be on one of the banners that stick to the side of cars carrying VIPs in the homecoming parade.

UIS marks its 40th anniversary this year, and the special theme for Homecoming Week activities Oct. 4-9 is "Where Stars Are Born."

Letters went out last week asking businesses to participate in the 2010 homecoming celebration and to consider sponsoring some events to have their business' name reach hundreds of alumni, students and faculty.

UIS solicited sponsors for last year's homecoming for the first time and got only a lukewarm response, said Cynthia Thompson, director of student life at UIS.

"We went out late last year, and it really felt like more of a save-the-date thing," she said. "It wasn't on a lot of people's radar, and there wasn't a lot of interest."

She said a sponsor did pay for the shirts worn by teams in the student vs. alumni/faculty/staff basketball game and got its logo on the shirts.

"We're on the radar screen this year," she said. "We've had quite a bit of response already."

She said if all the offered sponsoring opportunities sell out — which would bring in \$24,500 — it could pay the entire homecoming tab.

"That's not our intention," Thompson said. "We've budgeted as if we will receive nothing."

She said sponsorship money could be used to beef up homecoming activities or to redirect funds to other areas of student life.

"It would be very exciting if all elements got funded," she said. "If we got half of the six items, I'd be happy."

In addition to the six sponsorship and partnership opportunities listed in the letter, Thompson said she's open to other sponsorship suggestions.

Thompson said UIS had its first homecoming date when it was still Sangamon State University and has had three homecomings as UIS prior to 2002.

Since 2002, we've had a lot of new events that have become homecoming traditions, and that's very exciting," she said. The parade, for example, is just three years old.

"We have some new things in the works for this year, and we're strengthening the events we have," Thompson said. "We're working on broadening our base to invite more people to our events."

Chris Dettro can be reached at 788-1510.

### Tentative schedule

Oct. 4: Pep rally, 9:30 p.m.

Oct. 5: Lunchtime games — mashed potato sculpting, 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.; make your own spirit wear, 9:30 p.m.

Oct. 6: Wacky Wednesday/lunchtime games, 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Oct. 7: Lunchtime games, 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.; homecoming dance with DJ, 9:30 p.m.

Oct. 8: Brookens Library book sale, 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.; Mercy House service event, 1 to 4 p.m.; UIS women's soccer vs. St. Joseph, 5 p.m.; Pack the Field student cookout, 6:30 p.m.; UIS men's soccer vs. Bellarmine, 7:30 p.m.; fireworks following.

Oct. 9: 5K run/walk, 9 a.m.; educational technology showcase, 10:30 a.m.; "Through the Decades" brunch, 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.; UIS homecoming parade and pet parade, 5 p.m.; UIS homecoming barbecue and lawn party, 5:30 p.m. to 7 p.m.; UIS students vs. alumni/faculty/staff basketball game, 7 p.m.

### UIS Homecoming sponsorships

\* Entire week of homecoming, including all event costs, meals, giveaways, decorations, etc. Sponsor recognition on all printed

materials, in radio advertising and on the sleeves of T-shirts as well as announced at the events. \$15,000

\* Fireworks that will take place after the men's and women's soccer games Oct. 8. Sponsor recognition in printed materials for the day of, as well as a special announcement recognizing the sponsors. Need \$2,500 in \$500 increments.

\* Homecoming T-shirts handed out at events to more than 500 students and worn throughout the week and beyond. Sponsor logo on sleeve. Deadline is Friday. Need \$3,000 in \$500 increments.

\* Homecoming barbecue held shortly after the parade Oct. 9 before the students vs. alumni/faculty/staff basketball game. About 400 people expected. Recognition depends on level of sponsorship. Need \$2,500 in \$500 increments or in-kind services.

\* Stick-on banners for cars carrying VIPs in parade. Recognition on the individual banners. Need is \$1,000 in \$100 increments.

\* Basketball game T-shirts for the students vs. alumni/faculty/staff basketball game following the barbecue. T-shirts worn by the players, with sponsor logo on shirt. Expected attendance of 200. Need \$500 or in-kind contribution.

Copyright 2010 The State Journal-Register. Some rights reserved

[Contact us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Service](#) | [About our Ads](#)

The State Journal-Register | Springfield, IL 62701

Copyright © 2006-2010 GateHouse Media, Inc. Some Rights Reserved.

Original content available for non-commercial use under a [Creative Commons license](#), except where noted.

SEO by [eLocalListing](#) | [Advertiser profiles](#)

[www.chicagotribune.com/sports/college/ct-spt-0722-uic-jimmy-collins--20100721,0,1303780.story](http://www.chicagotribune.com/sports/college/ct-spt-0722-uic-jimmy-collins--20100721,0,1303780.story)

**chicagotribune.com**

## **Collins couldn't commit full time to UIC anymore**

**Longtime coach leaving job because he didn't want to let team, school or himself down**

By Shannon Ryan, Tribune reporter

10:36 PM CDT, July 21, 2010

Jimmy Collins would prefer a sabbatical.

"But basketball is full time," he said.

Thoughts of retirement crept into Jimmy Collins' mind last season, but he knew in the offseason that he would be leaving his post as the Illinois-Chicago basketball coach after 14 seasons. UIC announced on Tuesday night his plans to retire at the end of August.

"I have a lot of good players coming in but I'm not really preparing myself for a season," Collins told the Tribune on Wednesday. "You have to devote full time to players coming in and to the system you're going to run. I don't want to let them down, I don't want to let myself down and most importantly I don't want to let the school down."

Collins is the winningest coach in UIC history with a 218-208 record and guided the Flames to three NCAA tournament appearances.

His announcement comes on the heels of assistant coach Tracy Dildy's departure to take the head coaching job at Chicago State. Collins said he thought Dildy would replace him before he took the Chicago State job but declined to say who he would like to see follow him.

Dildy told ESPN.com that UIC is targeting Illinois assistant coaches Jerrance Howard and Jay Price, Minnesota assistant coach Vince Taylor and Wisconsin assistant coach Howard Moore as replacements. Price told the Tribune he "would listen" if contacted.

Athletic director Jim Schmidt is expected to launch a national search for Collins' replacement.

UIC's roster is filled for the upcoming season, so Collins' announcement will not interrupt recruiting.

While he has not brainstormed about many retirement plans, Collins said he would like to remain close to the game either as a broadcaster or acting as a scout. He also wants to spend more time with his wife and four children and hopes to start a mentoring program to help halt violence among Chicago youth.

As for September, when his retirement begins, Collins said, "I plan on relaxing for awhile."

Tribune reporter Chris Hine contributed.

[sryan@tribune.com](mailto:sryan@tribune.com)

Copyright © 2010, [Chicago Tribune](#)

 **[PRINT]** ESPN.com: Colleges

[\[Print without images\]](#)



Wednesday, July 21, 2010

## UIC hoops could be a sleeping giant

---

By Scott Powers

Jimmy Collins saw UIC as a sleeping giant before arriving to the program 14 years ago.

The program had touched success, but it had never done it at the highest level. Collins changed that. He convinced a couple local stars -- most notably

Martell Bailey and Cedrick Banks -- to stick around Chicago, surrounded them with competent players and quickly the program took off. Collins awoke the giant, sent it to three NCAA tournaments, one NIT and won 20 or more games four times.

Now as Collins steps away from UIC, others are quick to see what he once did. While UIC hasn't reached the NCAA Tournament since 2004, has hovered around the .500 mark five of the six last years, won just eight games last season and hasn't attracted much Chicago talent lately, potential coaches look at what Collins was able to accomplish and envision those same possibilities.

They're asking, "Why can't UIC be a tournament team again and even emulate what Butler has done in the same conference?"

It's the reason why some of the biggest up-and-coming assistants in college basketball are already vying for the position. The likes of Illinois assistant coach Jerrance Howard, who is interested in the job, according to a source, and Wisconsin assistant coach Howard Moore, two of the hottest recruiters in the Chicago area, very well could sway a big-name local player to UIC, gather a few other Chicago players, and just like that, UIC could be on the map again.

Right now is the perfect time for UIC to strike, too. The state's Class of 2011 is one of the deepest and most talented Illinois has seen in some time. While some of the bigger names have already committed and others have their sights on much larger programs, UIC -- with the right coach -- could interest someone who has been out of the Flames' league lately.

For example, De La Salle senior guard Dre Henley could be a starting point. [Phillip Greene](#) and [Macari Brooks](#) could also be possibilities. Former Marshall guard [Darius Smith](#), an UConn transfer, and former Iowa State guard [Chris Colvin](#), an Iowa State transfer, could be persuaded to return home as well.

It may not be fair to call UIC a sleeping giant any longer. Collins rid the program of that. It's probably more apt to say UIC is a giant that has nodded off and needs to be poked to get going again.

---

ESPN.com: [Help](#) | [PR Media Kit](#) | [Sales Media Kit](#) | [Report a Bug](#) | [Corrections](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Mobile](#) | [ESPN Shop](#) | [Jobs at ESPN](#) | [Supplier Information](#)  
©2009 ESPN Internet Ventures. [Terms of Use](#) and [Privacy Policy](#) and [Safety Information/Your California Privacy Rights](#) are applicable to you. All rights reserved.



## News

---

### Retooling the GI Bill

July 22, 2010

WASHINGTON – Gathered at a hearing here Wednesday, U.S. senators grappled with legislation that would attempt to simplify the often dizzying formula for calculating veterans benefits under the Post-9/11 GI Bill. But proposed legislation to simplify the process could wind up reducing benefits for some of those attending private colleges, higher education leaders argue.

At issue for the U.S. Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs is S. 3447, legislation that would revamp the benefit formula that has been in place since the Post-9/11 GI Bill took effect last year. While the proposed bill would make few changes for the funding of undergraduate education at public institutions, it would establish a new national cap on benefits for private colleges -- both for-profit and non-profit. Rather than base the maximum benefit on the highest tuition of any public program in a given state, the new cap would be derived from the average tuition and fees of all private and public baccalaureate programs across the nation. That baseline would be around \$12,000, meaning veterans at private colleges would receive less funding in almost half of states, according to the American Council on Education.

"In the process of [changing the formula], you could significantly reduce the amount of money some veterans would have available," Terry W. Hartle, ACE's senior vice president for the division of government and public affairs, said in an interview after the hearing.

ACE, however, supports the underlying concept of setting a national standard for benefits. In its current form, the GI Bill pays wildly different base benefits toward private education based on the state where a veteran enrolls. In New York, for instance, the quasi-public Cornell University is used in the public tuition calculation, bringing the maximum per-credit hour charge above \$1,000 – more than twice that of nearby New Jersey.

Erasing inequities between states has been a key goal for a number of groups, including Student Veterans for America.

"We do not want veterans to leave their chosen state so they can afford school," Brian Hawthorne, a spokesman for the group, told *Inside Higher Ed*. "We hate to use this term, but we want everybody to be 'worth' the same. This is an earned benefit. No one is worth more than anybody else."

While the language is still being hammered out, the legislation in its final form is likely to cover all tuition and fees for undergraduate, graduate or professional programs at any public institution. The proposed bill currently states that it would cover "established charges" for any public college program, but lawmakers seem to have no objection to changing the wording to "tuition and fees" to avoid ambiguity.

The establishment of a nationwide baseline benefit for veterans attending private colleges has widespread appeal because it would create equitable benefits, but veterans groups are pushing for a higher number -- some say \$20,000. Another option would be to develop an average based only on the tuition at private institutions, which would avoid deflating the number based on low-tuition public colleges throughout the country, Hartle said.

The Post-9/11 GI Bill already has a mechanism for covering gaps between the cost of private education and the base benefits available, but it requires private colleges to chip in, too. Under the [Yellow Ribbon Program](#), colleges can enter into dollar-for-dollar matching agreements with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Given that, "the veteran still has the potential of being covered in full, regardless of where they attend," said Keith Wilson, director of education service at the VA.

While that may be true, some college administrators say they worry about a potentially greater cost burden being shifted toward private colleges in states where benefits could decrease under the new formula.

"I don't have any take on that [criticism]," Wilson said.

Others do have a take, however, including Faith DesLauriers, director of University Veterans Affairs at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, a private institution with campuses worldwide.

"Now you're saying you'll pay the absolute highest cost there is for public schools, but private schools are going to be based on the national average. That just doesn't make sense," she said. "You're saying that you're going to do all this great stuff for people who serve [their] country, but now they're telling you you're limited to a public institution."

Embry-Riddle participates in the Yellow Ribbon Program at the maximum rate, providing scholarships equal to 50 percent of the unmet tuition charges for all eligible students. But only veterans who have served 36 months in active duty after Sept. 11, 2001 are eligible for the program, and DesLauriers said that leaves a substantial number of students without the gap-covering assistance the program provides.

The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities also urged lawmakers Wednesday to tread carefully in developing a new benefits formula.

"The reason behind the drive to adopt a national number has merit, in that it would reduce the confusion that many vets now face in considering a private school option," Susan Hattan, a senior consultant at NAICU, said in a written statement. "The key thing is to set the national tuition and fees figure at an appropriate level. In the process of opening up greater opportunity for students in states that now have benefits far below average, it is critical that every effort be made to minimize the financial impact on students elsewhere."

In addition to grappling with the thorny issue of calculating benefits, the legislation also attempts to cover more veterans by extending benefits to more members of the National Guard and Active Guard Reserve, about 30,000 of whom were not covered by the original law. The current Post-9/11 GI Bill covers members of the Guard who have served in federal Title 10 status, but not those on state active duty or Title 32. The new legislation would extend benefits to state Guard duty.

The bill would also extend housing allowances to students taking courses purely online. While the current GI Bill provides no allowance to students taking only distance education courses, the legislation would provide those students with 50 percent of the allowance given to residential students.

While the housing allowance is a form of progress, it still doesn't sit well with some administrators whose colleges have robust distance learning programs and significant veteran enrollments. Russell S. Kitcher, associate vice president for regulatory and government relations at American Public University System, was critical of the "discrimination" inherent in the housing allowance.

"Providing some form of a housing stipend for individuals taking courses online certainly is a step in the correct direction, but I remain unconvinced that there should be any discrimination based on learning modes," Kitcher wrote in an e-mail to *Inside Higher Ed*. "Online students, the majority of whom are adult learners, have comparable living expenses as do those taking courses at traditional brick and mortar institutions, and to suggest otherwise is to overlook the realities of contemporary learners."

— Jack Stripling

© Copyright 2010 Inside Higher Ed



## Views

---

### BP and Academic Freedom

July 22, 2010

By Cary Nelson

On Friday, July 16, Ben Raines, a reporter for Mobile, Alabama's *Press-Register*, published a [story](#) detailing extensive efforts by BP to employ scientists engaged in (or likely to engage in) research about the massive oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. *Inside Higher Ed* has since conducted independent interviews for [its own coverage](#). The contracts offered by the giant company, according to both sources, restrict the scientists from publishing research results, sharing them with other scientists, or even talking about them for as long as three years, a serious restraint in the midst of an ongoing crisis.

Both during the immediate crisis and for an extended period as government leaders and the courts figure out how to respond to the Gulf tragedy, the work these scientists do will essentially belong to BP, which will be free to suppress it or characterize it in any way it chooses. Faculty members under contract to BP, meanwhile, would be unable to testify against the company in court and would be available to testify on the company's behalf. Several faculty members in the area have confirmed to the American Association of University Professors that they have been offered contracts by BP in exchange for restrictive confidentiality clauses. A notably chilling provision directs contracted scientists to communicate through BP's lawyers, thus raising the possibility that research findings will be constrained by lawyer-client privilege.

The oil spill is not only a catastrophic economic and environmental disaster for the Gulf region; it also has major implications for energy policy in both the United States and the rest of the world. The ability to share research results promptly and freely is not only a basic tenet of academic freedom; in this case, it is also critical to the health of the region and the world. While more investigative work is needed, the very prospect of an interested corporation worth billions of dollars blocking the free exchange of university research and controlling the work scientists choose to do is deeply disturbing. If knowledgeable scientists cannot testify in court, the ability of injured parties to win just compensation is also jeopardized. But the long-term threat to American society is still more grave: we need independent faculty voices, perhaps more so now — in a knowledge-based society — than ever before.

In its founding 1915 Declaration, the AAUP warned of the "danger of restrictions upon the expression of opinions" that "call into question the moral legitimacy or social expediency of economic conditions or commercial practices in which large vested interests are involved." Our 2004 "Statement on Corporate Funding of Academic Research" establishes the fundamental standard: "Such contracts should explicitly provide for the open communication of research results, not subject to the sponsor's permission for publication."

Universities that prohibit faculty members from doing research that violates this principle, in my view, are protecting academic freedom, not restricting it. Of course in recommending that universities enforce this principle I am going beyond current AAUP policy. The world has changed. The increasing impact of corporate funding on the integrity of faculty research is among the changes higher education must confront. The decision about whether to sign restrictive contracts is not simply a matter of individual choice. It has broad implications for higher education and for the society at large.

At least one university has refused an institution-wide contract with BP for exactly these reasons. Many individual faculty members are declining BP offers or withdrawing from existing ones. Perhaps this is the time to reexamine the increasing role corporations are playing in funding and controlling university research. Universities should work with faculty to set ethical standards for industry collaboration that champion the public interest and discourage faculty members from selling their freedom of speech and research to the highest bidder.

Meanwhile, we urge other news media to join the effort to interview area scientists, gather copies of BP contracts, and publish the results. This story needs to be told in full. Universities should also consider where the public interest lies before permitting faculty members to sign contracts that limit the free exchange of information and bar public testimony. BP itself should certainly invest in research related to the spill, but it should do so without curtailing either faculty members' free speech rights or their academic freedom. To do otherwise could prove hazardous to all of our health.

*Cary Nelson is national president of the American Association of University Professors.*

© Copyright 2010 Inside Higher Ed

# THE CHRONICLE

of Higher Education

## Do Your Job Better

Home Advice Do Your Job Better

July 20, 2010

### **E-Mail: the Third Shift**

*By Mary Ann Mason*

Many academics have a love-hate relationship with e-mail. We know it has made communicating with colleagues in our own departments and around the world far, far easier. But we are also aware that e-mail is devouring a great deal of our time.

For faculty members, it is not just e-mail messages from professional associates, friends, family, and spammers that demand our attention. Students, sometimes by the dozens, e-mail their instructors daily, seeking an immediate response. For faculty mothers and fathers, e-mail eats up the extra hour or more a day after they have put the children to bed and prepared for the next day's teaching—or perhaps the hour before the children or the sun rise.

It is the third shift in an already overcrowded day. It means less sleep, or less time for weekend activities with the family away from the computer. Many faculty members enjoy the easy communication with students online. The problem is, there are no guidelines for how to hold the beast to reasonable limits.

The heightened concern about the demands of the third shift was brought home to me at a recent visit to the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. According to a 2009 survey at the university, faculty members there are putting in between 60 and 70 hours a week on teaching, research, and service; including mothers and fathers, who simply added their second shift of housework and child care to their 60-plus hours of university work.

Our 2003 survey of faculty members at the University of California showed a similar second shift for faculty parents, but the time devoted to university and professional activities averaged about 10 hours less in the California survey than was reported at the University of Massachusetts six years later. A spirited discussion led to the likely culprit: students' growing use of e-mail to contact professors, often with trivial or inappropriate questions, like "Sorry I missed class today, can you send me the lecture notes?"

There is no doubt e-mail use is exploding. According to the Radicati

Group, a company that publishes statistics on the use of e-mail and instant messaging, worldwide e-mail messages totaled 247 billion a day in 2009. By 2013, that figure is expected to double to 507 billion messages a day.

Today's students were introduced in grade school to instant messaging and Facebook; immediate access is the new cultural norm. The formal barriers between student and instructor in the university world have come down, with no real etiquette to replace them. Students expect instant replies, not a five-day wait until office hours on Tuesday.

What are universities doing to deal with this communication revolution? My quick survey revealed that many universities (including my own) have set up policies over the past few years to guarantee e-mail access to students and teachers, and to insist that much university business will be conducted in this mode. In addition, there are stern warnings about inappropriate behavior. The policies also warn that confidential and obscene messages are a bad idea.

The policy of Brooklyn College, part of the City University of New York, provides more detail than most. It defines inappropriate e-mail as: chain mail that misuses or disrupts resources, or e-mail sent repeatedly from user to user, with requests to send to others; virus hoaxes; spamming or e-mail bombing attacks or intentional e-mail transmissions that disrupt normal e-mail service; unsolicited junk e-mail that is unrelated to university business and is sent without a reasonable expectation that the recipient would welcome such mail; e-mails that seek to defraud the recipient or misrepresent or fail to accurately identify the sender; and messages containing obscene material or offensive language.

Beyond those kinds of rules, however, colleges offer little guidance. No campus policy that I could find, for example, specifically states that it is inappropriate for students to e-mail their instructors several times a day.

A few campuses have attempted to present vague rules about appropriate use of e-mail in the context of a course. The language for those rules seems to have been copied from the same model, or perhaps it developed virally on the Internet. As the student e-mail policy at the University of Colorado at Boulder states: "Faculty may determine how e-mail will be used in their classes. It is highly recommended that if faculty have e-mail requirements and expectations they specify these requirements in their course syllabus."

In other words, you're on your own.

On the same visit to Massachusetts, I asked female faculty members at Mount Holyoke College, most of them mothers, to tell me how they deal with the excess of e-mail from students.

First I heard the cautionary tales. "I just don't allow e-mail," a senior professor said. "They can come to office hours if they want."

That comment elicited a low gasp from the other faculty members. "But the students will certainly knock down your evaluations, if you do that," a younger woman said. "Access is something they really care about."

A third woman offered, "I just say I will answer within 24 hours, not immediately."

Then the group grew quiet as Melanie Guldi, an assistant professor and mother of triplets who are now toddlers, spoke up. "I rarely check my e-mail after I leave the office at 5:30 and before I return the next morning," she said. "If I do check it at night, I generally do not respond to student e-mails until the next day. Almost the only exception I make to this rule is that I will answer e-mails at night if I am traveling."

One way she limits e-mail messages, she said, is to direct students to an electronic blackboard where she posts general answers to common questions—or sometimes other students do. She also explains the course requirements to students upfront, including the e-mail guidelines spelled out clearly in her syllabus. Finally, she said, "I know how to say no, and I'm not afraid to do so."

By necessity, this mother of three has figured out how to tame the e-mail beast. But she and other faculty members—parents or not—could probably use some help from their institutions.

Shouldn't it be routine university policy to promote clear guidelines about the use of e-mail between faculty members and students? That would benefit not only parents, of course, but, particularly for mothers, limiting the third shift may make the difference between academic survival and burnout.

*Mary Ann Mason is a professor and co-director of the Berkeley Law Center on Health, Economic & Family Security and the author (with her daughter, Eve Ekman), of Mothers on the Fast Track. She writes regularly on work and family issues for our Balancing Act column, and invites readers to send in questions or personal concerns about those issues to [careers@chronicle.com](mailto:careers@chronicle.com) or to [mamason@law.berkeley.edu](mailto:mamason@law.berkeley.edu).*