I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: I’d like to call the meeting to order. Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda. All those in favor of adopting the agenda?

The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 16, 2002 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 5-17)

President Willis: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting which Appear on pages 5-17? Are there any amendments or changes we need to make to the minutes? Okay, if not, then all those in favor of approving the minutes? Okay, thank you.

The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: Let’s see, President’s Announcements, I don’t have very much. As far as I know, there is nothing known about the budget in terms of exactly how much money we will be expected by the state not to spend this year. So what we heard back in December is still the best that we know. Also, I did want to mention we do have one walk-in which I forgot to sign – it is
for me. This has to do with New Business item A and so we will take it up at that time. Other than that, I really don’t have much in the way of announcements.

V. ITEMS FOR SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

President Willis: Also, I don’t believe we have any reports of Advisory Committees but let me just run through them.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – Report

President Willis: FAC to the IBHE, Pat has told me they were snowed out and so she will be reporting next time. I believe none of the Board of Trustee’s sub-committees have met but they’re meeting, I think, next month so I don’t believe we have any reports from them. So, we can move quickly to reports from Standing Committees.

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

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Bev Espe

E. BOT – Sue Willis

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Jody Ryan, Chair

President Willis: Jody, Academic Affairs.

J. Ryan: No report.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair

President Willis: Jim Lockard, Economic Status.

J. Lockard: No report.

C. Resource, Space and Budget – Carole Minor, Chair

President Willis: Carole, Resource, Space and Budget.
C. Minor: I have no report. The committee is going to meet tomorrow but I do have a request. We’ve received thirteen responses to the survey. Just to remind you, the questions were “what are the three biggest concerns you and the faculty in your department have regarding space and facilities” and “what are the three biggest concerns you and the faculty in your department have regarding programs and budgets”. The responses are very interesting but we don’t have the majority of the departments reporting yet so we would appreciate it if you haven’t responded if you could e-mail me the answers to those questions as soon as you can and they will be useful.

President Willis: Let me remind you of the squeaky wheel phenomenon. All right? It would be helpful if you could give responses.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Carol DeMoranville, Chair

President Willis: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Carol? I know you have things.

1. Reporting Procedures for Faculty Personnel Advisor – ACTION ITEM
   (Page 18)

C. DeMoranville: I have a few items. Starting on I believe, page 18 of the packet. We have three resolutions we’d like to present to the Senate and then one brief report. On page 18 of the packet the first resolution. This came out of our looking at the Office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. It was brought to our attention that there was no operationalization of reporting procedures so we would like to recommend that those reporting procedures be specifically operationalized. The resolution asks the University Council to amend NIU Bylaws Article IX to keep this language. “The faculty personnel advisor shall make an annual report which will summarize the activities of the advisor, in such a way as to keep clients’ identities anonymous, identify the strengths and weaknesses of the personnel process, and make recommendations for changes in the personnel process.”

“The faculty personnel advisor annual report shall be submitted to the Committee for Review of the FPA, the Executive Secretary of the University Council/President of the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the Associate Vice Provost for Administration and Human Resources/Director of Affirmative Action.”

“The FPA Annual Report will be submitted by July 31 of each year.”

Subsequent to me bringing this to the Executive Committee, I got some input that there were two other individuals who probably should be on that circulation list and I tend to agree with that recommendation. Those two individuals are the Vice-President for Administration and the Ombudsman so it would be good if we could add those two into that third paragraph there.

President Willis: You’re making this as a motion?

C. DeMoranville: As a motion that the Faculty Senate passes this resolution.

President Willis: Okay, discussion? Okay, are we ready to vote on this? All those in favor?
Opposed? Okay, then this would go to the University Council.

The motion passed.

2. **Role** of Faculty Personnel Advisor in Grievance Procedures – **ACTION ITEM** (Page 19)

C. DeMoranville: The second resolution also is to be forwarded to the University Council for a change in NIU Bylaws and is also in regards to the Faculty Personnel Advisor office. In this case this was brought up at the last Faculty Senate meeting that the SPS grievance procedure precluded attorneys from attending sessions and the fact that the FPA could be an attorney even though it wasn’t the grievance attorney, they were acting in behalf of the Faculty Personnel Advisor there’s a possibility that they could be precluded from this meeting so our resolution asked that the language by added to the Bylaws that the Faculty Personnel Advisor cannot be precluded by any other rule from any hearing, meeting or discussion if his or her presence is requested by the grievant or the party being assisted. What am I supposed to do here, make a ??? – whatever I’m supposed to do, I’m doing it.

President Willis: That would be a motion then. Do we have any discussion on this one? I did get a ruling from George Shur on this issue that supports this interpretation that the Faculty Personnel Advisor is not acting as an attorney regardless but it would help to clarify the Bylaws as well I think.

B. Espe: We really appreciate this. We’ve addressed it at our council also and we believe that the intent of that language was not to preclude the Faculty Advisor and we greatly appreciate that.

President Willis: The language says something like “somebody in the grievance process can’t be represented by legal counsel” which is not the same as having a Faculty Personnel Advisor so I think it should be clear. All right, any other comments? Okay, all those in favor? Opposed? So we’ll pass this on to the University Council as well.

The motion passed.

3. **Statement** of Professional Ethics – **ACTION ITEM** (Pages 20-21)

C. DeMoranville: The third item, also a resolution, this is that the Faculty Senate adopt the attached statement of professional ethics. We recommend that the University Council adopt it as part of the NIU Bylaws. The Statement of Professional Ethics you will find on page 21. You’ve seen it before. We had passed a statement, I believe it was last spring, that was sent to the University Council, they made some minor modifications and sent it back to our committee. Our committee had no problem with any of the changes that the University Council made so we’re happy with that. The only thing we changed from what came back from the University Council, it was a typo, somewhere it said member and it should be members so we just made that change but this is the same document that came from the University Council and I think the University Council had sent it back to this body because they wanted the statements to be the
same between both bodies. So, we make a resolution that we adopt this Statement of Professional Ethics and send it back to University Council for adoption into Bylaws.

President Willis: Okay, discussion? Okay, are we ready to vote on this? All those in favor? Opposed. Okay, everybody must want to go home.

The motion passed.

C. Minor: I didn’t bring this up before but there is another typo in number 5 in the third line, there’s some extra punctuation there.

President Willis: We’ll fix that. It’s a piece of punctuation I don’t even recognize.

4. SPS Workplace Issues – ACTION ITEM (Page 22)

C. DeMoranville: The last item is just a report. To give you a little background, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee while we were looking into the Office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor, there were a lot of issues about SPS workplace that came up that we’d considered quite serious and people needed to be made aware of it so we’re doing that through this body and we suggest that this be shared with a number of people. I don’t think I included in the report who it should be shared with but I know I did in Executive Committee. Sue, I think you have a list of who we’re going to distribute this to. Anyhow, if I may, I’d like to read this into the minutes.

President Willis: Please.

C. DeMoranville: “The Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee was recently asked to review several aspects of the office of the FPA. During that process, we were made aware of allegations of serious SPS workplace issues. The allegations included persistent mistreatment and harassment of SPS workers in specific departments on campus, the inability of SPS workers to get fair treatment during the grievance process, retaliation against workers who bring grievances or make complaints, and the lack of follow-through, even to the level of non response, by the university administration. Some specific examples include harassment, lack of annual reviews of many SPS employees, not holding supervisors accountable to recommendations coming out of the grievance process, and unconscionably lengthy delays in the grievance process. It appears from our discussions with various personnel that the university is aware of the problem, but chooses to look the other way. Problems are swept under the rug instead of being properly resolved. If these allegations are true, it indicates a fundamental flaw in the university personnel process. It results in ongoing mistreatment of SPS employees and exposes the university to substantial legal liability, which could ultimately negatively affect all employees of the university.

We strongly urge the university to carefully examine the SPS grievance process and outcomes and ensure that the process is fair to SPS employees and that the recommendations that come out of the process actually occur as they are supposed to. We recommend an in-depth investigation of SPS workplace issues that should include identification of problem departments and harassing
parties that might exist and application of enforceable guidelines to stop the offending behavior. Any investigative committee must include knowledgeable and unbiased parties from both administration and SPS, as well as neutral parties. The Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee will be happy to share our findings with such an investigative body. We firmly believe that the university and its community would be far better served by stopping workplace offenders rather than hushing up the complaints.

**President Willis:** I wasn’t sure if you wanted us to endorse this or recommend some action. I put action on there just in case.

**C. DeMoranville:** Yeah, the action I think is included in that second paragraph; that we think an investigative committee might be called for on this particular issue.

**J. King:** Can we have a motion on that issue?

**President Willis:** Sure, I would entertain a motion.

**C. DeMoranville:** I think I would like a motion that the Faculty Senate endorse this report.

**President Willis:** Any discussion?

**J. King:** I suppose that confidentiality considerations prevent you from blowing the whistle on the offenders in this context but you could put my mind at ease if we take the pie representing the university and cut it in one big slice academic division and everything else. Are you finding these offenses in both divisions?

**C. DeMoranville:** No. This was primarily SPS work places. It’s not teaching faculty. As far as the tenure process is concerned, that protects most faculty members but SPS do not have tenure. They are also not unionized like many other employees in the university are who are protected by some union rules, so they’re certainly left in this void and that’s, I believe, what’s allowed some of these allegations to occur.

**J. King:** Well, I agree with the motion. The only trouble is you kind of sense the fox is to guard the hen house. I mean, if the administration has been dragging their feet on this and I read the statement as suggesting as much, then putting them on the committee really isn’t going to help. I don’t know what a solution to that is Sue, but I think that you know the Faculty Senate membership and I suspect that you could readily draw on us to fill vacancies on a committee like this and help serve – provide some ballast. I’m not making an amendment to the motion, I’m just suggesting to you personally that you might add faculty to the – draw from the Faculty Senate – to include administration, SPS and faculty/senators. Okay? In that connection, I’m so mad about it just reading about it, I’ll do something that violates all of my values and I’ll volunteer.

**President Willis:** There is a committee which has been meeting a couple of years now which has been rewriting all the grievance procedures and some of the things which they, if they are implemented which, of course, is another process once they finish writing them, I think may help
because it provides some outside oversight of what goes on with the grievances and I agree with you. I’m not sure what we can do about it exactly but I think that just making people aware that there’s a problem is step one.

J. King: Especially the big people. Okay?

President Willis: Yes, right. Yeah, he’s seen this.

J. Wolfskill: I’d like to ask speaking in ignorance for a point of information. Can you explain first of all from what body would this investigative committee be drawn, that is, from the Faculty Senate or from some other body or some combination and then second, what body would have to authority to form a committee? I mean, can that be done by us here or does that have to be passed on to some other group.

President Willis: I think it pretty much would have to be passed on to the University Council because that’s where you have representation of all the constituent groups so particularly if you want to form a committee that has SPS and administrators and faculty and what-not on it, we can’t really make anybody do that but we can certainly pass the recommendation on to the council.

D. Wagner: I don’t quite understand what we’re voting for. We recommend an investigation but shouldn’t this be sent on explicitly to at least the University Council and maybe to the administration. Is that, I mean, just adopting this as a report doesn’t effectuate anything.

C. DeMoranville: The intention here is that this report would go to the University Council and I think Sue and I had also discussed about circulating a report to other members in the administration as well. You know, I think our major goal here – first of all, needless I think a lot of the committee was shocked by what we were hearing and quite dismayed and part of the problem is that it has been swept under the rug and people don’t know about it so one of our major goals here is to make these problems public.

D. Wagner: Shouldn’t that have at least been included in the motion then?

C. DeMoranville: I’m happy with that.

President Willis: Okay, so you want to amend the motion that we endorse this and then asked that it be sent to University Council? Does the second--- yes, okay.

J. Lockard: I’m wondering if that does it or if perhaps the first line of that last paragraph really should say “we strongly urge the University Council” and put it right there, the university is so vague nothing will ever happen.

C. DeMoranville: I would be very agreeable to changing the word university to University Council in the hopes that some action will come out of it.

President Willis: Is that acceptable as a friendly amendment? Any other discussion? So the
motion is accept this report with the modification that it says we strongly urge the University Council and then to send it on to the University Council. All right. All those in favor? Opposed? Okay, very good.

The motion was passed.

**B. Espe:** I would just like to thank Faculty Senate again. We really appreciate the time and effort you've put into this and where this is going.

**President Willis:** Carol, did you have anything else?

**W. Baker:** Could I briefly say that I think thanks especially should go to Carol for her hard work on this.

**President Willis:** Yes, very much so.

**W. Baker:** And while it was a committee, you need somebody to put it all together.

**President Willis:** Yes, thank you. I think this is such an important thing that has been ignored for too long. I’m glad we’re looking into it. Okay, very good. Rules and Governance, Chris?

E. **Rules and Governance – Chris Hubbard, Chair**

1. Executive Secretary [Substitute] – **ACTION ITEM** (Pages 23-25)

**C. Hubbard:** Okay, on a more mundane note, the option – on page 23 there is a memo from Jerry Zar which went initially to Rules and Governance in the University Council who in turn forwarded it to us because some of the provisions in it would affect us and asked for our recommendation. He outlined four different options for providing an alternative Executive Secretary should the current one be ill or indisposed in some way. Essentially, the way these options work is that Option 1 suggests that an alternate Executive Secretary be elected by the Faculty Senate. Option 2 provides for alternative Executive Secretaries from existing Faculty Council members, the first would be the Chair of Resources, Space and Budgets and the second would be the Chair of Rules and Governance. The third option suggests that the Executive Secretary Alternate be chosen at the time the person is needed and the fourth option asks the previous Executive Secretary to take over the role. So, the committee has evaluated these various options and made the recommendations listed at the end of this document and Options 1 and 3 first of all would require changes in the Faculty Senate Bylaws so that would present some difficulty in implementing either of these two. Option 4 didn’t seem to be a very viable option since the past Executive Secretaries may be retired or not want to do it, indisposed, whatever, so that probably wouldn’t be too good so the best option we felt was Option 2 since it would not require any change to the Faculty Senate Bylaws and it would utilize existing individuals to take the role. The chances of this happening anyway are fairly slim so, actually, there being two alternate choices for the Executive Secretary may not even be necessary. So those are the options and we can discuss it.
President Willis: Okay, so then we would pass this back to the University Council?

C. Hubbard: That’s right. This is simply a recommendation back to them.

President Willis: Okay. So that’s a motion, right?

C. Hubbard: Right. I’ll make a motion that we adopt motion 2.

President Willis: Okay, is there a second? Okay. Any discussion?

M. Morris: Could you explain why you wouldn’t have the office of Vice President assuming the person is on the council be the next logical choice? I could understand if they weren’t in the council, but it’s conceivable the Senate Vice President might be a member of the Council and that might be the logical choice.

C. Hubbard: Well, it’s an option that’s true.

M. Morris: I would mean just to add it as a preference to these other two. In other words, the succession would be the Vice President if a member of the council, otherwise then – since that is an elected official.

C. Hubbard: That’s an option if anybody wants to discuss it. I’m just opening this up for everybody. We’ve hashed it out so it’s your turn.

M. Morris: My colleague has urged me to make a motion here, but I would move we amend that to add that the Vice President, if a member of the council, be the first option.

President Willis: Would you accept it as a friendly amendment?

C. Hubbard: I would be happy to.

President Willis: Okay.

J. King: I’d like the idea but I’m obliged to point out that we have a tradition of not electing a University Council member as Vice President. We have made a kind of distinction between Faculty Senate pure and simple and Faculty Senate ex-officio by being on the University Council and when the time came to elect vice presidents they’ve typically not been. I would be happy to be corrected by anybody here but I don’t remember in the twenty-odd years or so that I’ve been on the Faculty Senate that a Vice President was from the University Council. I certainly like the idea because otherwise, is it not the case – maybe I haven’t read this carefully enough – but is not the case that the President of the Faculty Senate in the event of the Executive Secretary’s not being available to perform duties, that they’ll be two separate people. The Executive Secretary of University Council would be the person in the line of succession that would be the Chair of the Resources, Space and Budget Committee and the head of the Faculty Senate would be the Vice President.
**President Willis:** Yes, that’s right.

**J. King:** That’s why I like the idea but there’s no way to assure that the Vice President will satisfy the condition in the motion namely also be a member of the University Council unless, of course, you want to change the Bylaws and say the vice president must be a member of the University Council. Don’t know what to say.

**M. Morris:** Not to disagree with you Jim because I think you’re right, but the motion is only if the person were, so there would be nothing to preclude us from voting a council member to be the Vice President and if we didn’t, then fine. We do have the fallback position of the chairs of these respective committees.

**P. Henry:** I will betray enormous ignorance. I have no idea who our Vice President is.

**President Willis:** Oh, it’s Jody.

**P. Henry:** Okay, that was our first guess.

**President Willis:** We did elect her at the first meeting.

**D. Wagner:** Are the chairs always members of the University Council?

**President Willis:** These are University Council committees.

**D. Wagner:** Oh, I thought they were Senate committees.

**President Willis:** No. It doesn’t actually say there, but it’s implied. They are the University Council committees. Is there other discussion or questions? Okay, so we have a motion to pass this back to the University Council with our recommendation that option 2 seems best. What?

**D. Wagner:** It was a friendly amendment.

**Unidentified:** Yeah, so we have to vote.

**President Willis:** Right, I’m just going over what it is that we’re doing. So with the recommendation of option 2 with the amendment that we would add – do we have to vote on the amendment first?

**D. Wagner:** Well, it was accepted as a friendly amendment.

**President Willis:** That’s what I thought so we’ll just vote on the whole thing. So, with the amendment that the first alternate would be the Vice President of the Faculty Senate if that person were also a University Council member. Okay, so that’s the motion that we have on the floor.

**C. Minor:** This may not be a popular question but why do we have a Vice President if the Vice
President is not to serve in the absence of the President and why do we shy away from changing the Bylaws if that’s what we would want to do. I mean, I think we shouldn’t shy away from changing the Bylaws if that’s what we want to do.

**President Willis:** Well, the Vice President would serve as President of the Faculty Senate. The question is, and we have that provision in the Faculty Senate, the problem is that there’s no provision in the University Council if the Executive Secretary for some reason can’t serve and the Vice President of the Faculty Senate isn’t necessarily a Council member so that’s why we’re going through all this song and dance. As to why we’re shying away from amending Bylaws, you’d have to ask Chris. It’s just quicker not to I think.

**J. Lockard:** Does that mean that Jerry’s original comments then are wrong. His indication on number 2 is that either the Bylaws or the Constitution needs to be changed.

**President Willis:** It would be changed in the University Bylaws but not in the Faculty Senate Bylaws. We’ve got two different sets of Bylaws. If we made a change such as in 1 or 3 we would have to change both the Faculty Senate Bylaws and the University Bylaws so it would be two sets of By-law changes. We have kind of a baroque structure here. Are there any other questions, comments, discussion? All right. All those in favor? Opposed? All right, so we will pass this back to the University Council.

The motion passed.

**President Willis:** Chris, you didn’t have anything else did you?

**C. Hubbard:** No, that was it.

F. **Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair**

**President Willis:** Elections and Legislative Oversight, Gretchen?

**G. Bisplinghoff:** No report.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**President Willis:** Let’s move then to new business.

**A. Review** of President Peters – walk-in

**President Willis:** One thing that has bring brought up by a couple of people now was that the Faculty Senate at one point in the past had decided to take upon itself the job of evaluating or reviewing the performance of the president of the university and it was suggested that now that President Peters has been here a little while, perhaps we should do that again. So after asking some people for some guidance as to just when this had been, went and dug up what had been
done in the past and so this walk-in is what I found. There was a set of six areas and then there were two things added to two of them which were areas to be considered in evaluating the president so that’s the first bit. That’s from the April 30, 1997 meeting of the Faculty Senate and then apparently nothing happened on this for a while but eventually, about a year later, the process was set into motion which was to – and the plan of the process was that written responses would be requested from the president to these above areas so it would be like writing a faculty service report except it’s a president’s service report. Each senator receives a copy of these responses, takes it to the department, gets input from the faculty, and then this all goes back to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee puts together then an evaluation and shares it with the president. It then goes to the University Advisory Committee, to the Board of Trustees which may share it with the Board. Now, as far as I could tell from reading minutes, when this was done in 1998 it got to about step 3 and I was not able to track it any further than that. So if anybody knows if it ever went any further, I’d be curious to hear about that. I did talk to Jim Norris who said that as far as he could recall there had never been an effective evaluation of President LaTourette done and Charlie Larson is in Minnesota where one of his parents is extremely ill so I didn’t talk to him directly but apparently he doesn’t remember it either.

**J. King:** I think that what went wrong in that evaluation process was two-fold. I think part of it was the time – we started too late and there wasn’t an actual timetable. People didn’t stick to the timetable so at the end it was kind of ragged. Then secondly, I think that it was clear that John LaTourette was leaving and that took sort-of the point of it out. For instance, we were supposed to alternate, do an evaluation of the president one year and the following year the provost and it was clear that Moody was leaving, nobody felt motivated to undertake that. So, you’re job is to jump start the process and if I may offer an observation, so you don’t have to pass me the microphone again, I think that item 6 is exceedingly important and ought to be spelled out a little bit because I think staff sounds kind of vague. I think that selecting and supervising vice presidents and staff – that we specify the vice presidents. There’s an awful lot of stuff that goes on in the institution. If it’s the provost, we can access the provost and the provost is pretty responsive to us but to my mind, the other vice presidents hide behind the president’s skirts and they’re protected from any kind of direct contact with us and also evaluation by us. So if the president chooses to hide them behind his skirts then he has to accept responsibility for what they do and part of what they do is his evaluation. To make that clearer, if anybody thinks it ought to be part of the evaluation of the president if we specifically suggested something like supervising or overseeing the work of the vice presidents it would be I think, both truthful and helpful.

**President Willis:** Okay, yeah as far as I could tell from reading the minutes of the meetings back in 1998 it looked like it did start too late and by the last meeting they had gotten something like three responses and the Executive Committee was going to meet but I was never able to find any further information about what had happened for that. I’ve been thinking about that and it seems to me because this is – well, many of you may have been members back then. I think I was but nevertheless I haven’t looked at or thought about this for awhile, so I would suggest that perhaps we could just take this and think about it. I would welcome some input and maybe what we can do this spring is get the whole structure set up and then start the evaluation process itself in the fall rather than have it run off the end of the academic year again.

**C. Minor:** I have a question about the procedure, the process. Specifically number 5. It says
the evaluation is then sent to the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees which may then share it with the Board. It seems to me it ought to be shared with the Board. I don’t understand why it isn’t.

**President Willis:** Well, the reason why I wrote it that way was that part of what seemed to hold it up last time was dealing with the Board and whether the Board wanted to – because you know, the Board does its own evaluation. So negotiating with the Board and all that kind of thing seemed to have held it up. It seems to be even if all we do is evaluate the president and share it with him, that it’s a useful exercise and I would certainly support sharing it with the Board as well but I wouldn’t want to see negotiating with the Board as to exactly how that gets done hold up the whole process again so that’s why I put it that way.

**J. King:** Would you be advantaged with a motion to carry it over to the fall?

**President Willis:** Yeah, I think what I’d like to do is put this on the agenda for the Executive Committee to look at and I would ask for any feedback or input that anybody has after they’ve had a chance to look at this and digest it. So yes, if we could have a motion to what – accept this or begin this process that would be helpful.

**J. King:** So moved.

**President Willis:** Is there a second? Okay. Discussion?

**J. Ryan:** Do we have any idea when the Board of Trustees evaluates the president? It seems like our timing of this, whatever we do this year or next year or something, it seems like if we’re going to proceed with this it would be nice to know when the Board of Trustees evaluates him so that we could get something to them before then.

**President Willis:** I don’t know off the top of my head but I will find out.

**J. Ryan:** Okay, thank you.

**F. Bryan:** It’s in the Bylaws – that it’s in the beginning of the sixth year.

**President Willis:** Beginning in the sixth year? So they wouldn’t – I thought the Board of Trustees evaluated him every year. The University Council evaluates him at the beginning of the sixth year.

**F. Bryan:** It’s in 17.71. Review of the President.

**President Willis:** Right, but that’s a review by the University Council. I believe the Board of Trustees also has an annual performance review which is independent of that.

**W. Baker:** Point of clarification. Do we evaluate the provost?

**President Willis:** At the moment, no, but we could certainly, as Jim said, the original idea when
this was set up was to alternate – to do it in alternate years – alternate evaluating the president and the provost.

**W. Baker:** So should that not then be added to – did you suggest that should be added to ---

**J. King:** Would you accept that?

**President Willis:** Sure, I think that would be a good idea. I would think the areas would be slightly different and I think the idea of doing it every other year is a good one because we don’t want to be trying to do too many things at once. But yes, I would add that we also develop a procedure for evaluating the provost in alternate years.

**J. Lockard:** I don’t have anything in front of my to refer to but I would think the areas to be considered in both cases ought to in some way parallel the job descriptions of the individuals since that presumably is what their real supervisors are evaluating them on.

**President Willis:** Okay. Is there any other comments or discussion? All right, so we have a motion to get this process underway essentially. All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion was passed.

B. Approval of [Search Committee](#) for Associate Vice Provost for Resource Planning (Page 26)

**President Willis:** The other item of New Business is on page 26. This is a Search Committee for the Associate Vice-Provost for Resource Planning. I think this is the position which is presently occupied as an interim by Frederick Schwantes and so there is a desire to have this position filled in a permanent way and so there will be a search committee and – this will be an internal search and not an external search. This is the proposed composition for the search committee so this body is supposed to approve such committees so the provost has sent this to me and I’m bringing it to you. Are there any questions or discussion about the search committee? I think it’s nice we’re actually getting these things.

**J. Lockard:** With all the changing titles I’ve lost tract of people. Who is the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Support Services currently?

**President Willis:** I’m not sure.

**J. Lockard:** Is that Virginia?

**President Willis:** It might very well be Virginia. Yeah. No, it’s not Virginia? I can find out.

**J. Lockard:** I thought we replaced associate with vice – wasn’t that what ---

**President Willis:** We replaced associate with vice and then assistant with associate vice. So this used to be an assistant provost. Okay, Admasu Zike is the person. Sorry, I know these
people but I don’t necessarily know all their titles. Are there any questions about the composition of the search committee? Okay. Could I have a motion to approve – did I get that already? Okay. Second? Any further discussion? Okay. All those in favor of approving the composition of the search committee? Opposed.

The motion passed.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Are there any comments or questions from the floor? I did want to make a comment about one of the information items. The election for Executive Secretary and President of the Faculty Senate, that process starts at the March meeting and so there’s a letter there from me saying that – and also a list of faculty who are eligible to serve and if you look in there you will find my name. I would be interested in continuing if you will have me. We will take nominations next month at the March meeting and then the election will be in April and so I thought I would point that out.

L. Gregory: Would it be appropriate to suggest that people on the list who have no interest in serving announce that desire to be removed from the list to save a lot of energy and cut the list down to people who are really serious about attempting to get the position.

President Willis: Sure.

L. Gregory: Would you want to do it verbally here or would you want memos or how would you want to do that.

President Willis: You could just contact me. I think that would be fine.

L. Gregory: Okay, thank you.

President Willis: Or Donna or whatever.

J. King: What about the people who aren’t here - on the list?

President Willis: Donna says she can e-mail them after looking at the attendance list. Or we can assume if they’re not coming that they’re not interested. No, we will contact them. All right. Are there any other comments or questions from the floor?

S. Spear: What is the timeframe on the search?

President Willis: On the search for the vice-provost? I believe it’s relatively short but I think he wants to have it done by the end of the semester but I don’t know exactly. I could find out and get back to you with that. Okay. Any other comments or questions? If not, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS
A. University Council Agenda (latest available) (Pages 27-28)

B. Letter from Sue Willis (Pages 29-30)

C. List of eligible faculty to serve as Executive Secretary/President. Nominations will be taken at the March Faculty Senate Meeting. (Page 31)

D. Article from State Journal-Register, “State Revenues to Fall Short” (Page 32)

E. Article from State Journal-Register, “Pension Funds May be Diverted” (Page 33)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.