
A. Tio attended for R. Carter.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 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? It’s been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. Are there any additions or changes to the agenda? Those in favor of adopting the agenda say aye.

The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6, 2002 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 5-27)

President Willis: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the March 6, which are on pages 5-27. Second? Any changes or corrections to the minutes? Okay, if not, all those in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Okay.

The minutes were approved.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

President Willis: I would like now to move that we go into Executive Session and I will turn the chair over to Jody who’s writing very fast over there. Could I have a motion to go into Executive Session? Second? All those in favor? Okay.
A. Report of the Committee to Evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of the University Council (Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair, Richard Greene, Patricia Henry, Sherilyn Spear, R.J. Gravel)

The motion was approved to go into Executive Session. At 3:20 we returned into regular session.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: Let’s move on to President’s Announcements. My first one – I know the number before 1 is 0, I’m not sure what the letter before A is but anyway, most – virtually all of you know this already but let me just say this again, I am going on medical leave starting tomorrow. I’m having a hysterectomy tomorrow and will be gone probably through the end of the semester, although one never knows. You may send me back here in three weeks, we’ll see. My guess is probably not, but in any case Malcolm, as the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, will be presiding in my absence. Jody is also going to be gone for the next meeting so that’s all I have to say about that I guess. Be nice to Malcolm. I expect to be in touch via phone and e-mail starting in about a week or so, so you can’t ignore me totally. I’ll know what’s going on.

A. Status of Item Referred to the University Council by the Faculty Senate, 2001-2002.

(Page 28)

President Willis: The question came up as to what was happening to things that the Senate had referred to the Council. I went through all the old minutes with the aim of trying not to miss anything although, of course, I may very well have. In any case, these are the things that I found which the Senate had referred to the Council. The first one is the coordination of the start dates for the Executive Secretary and the Faculty Senate membership because I start on July 1, you all start on August 16. We said let’s have everybody start on July 1. The Council had a first reading of that at its last meeting and it will be an action item at the next meeting, which is next week. The Honors College was referred to the Honors Committee and the Academic Policy Committee. The Academic Policy Committee has also been considering the fall break and so they’ve been a little bit busy, but they are still considering that item. They have not reported that out yet. Let’s see, recommendations for the Office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. There were two sets of those, one of which we passed at our December meeting and one of which we passed at our February meeting. They all came up for first reading last time and will, therefore, again be action items next week. Let’s see, the Ethics Statement. We now have a common version between the Senate and the Council that has been referred to the Rules and Governance Committee along with everybody else’s Ethics Statements. Once they’re all complete, then we’ll have to decide exactly where to put them. They’ll go into the Bylaws or into the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual or what have you. So they are awaiting finality on the other Ethics Statements until they are finally placed somewhere. Let’s see, the SPS work place issue was referred by the Council to the Steering Committee. I went to the Steering Committee with a proposal for a committee and a charge to the committee to do some relatively formal investigation. The Steering Committee thought it would be more useful to do a little informal “nosing around” first before doing something formal, and so I said that I would do that and I’m
in the process of doing that. I have spoken to a number of people from Human Resources and also a number of people who have had either formal grievances or else complaints which did not get to the formal grievance stage. Obviously that’s going to be put on hold for a little while now, but I expect to continue pursuing that over the summer and into the fall, so that is on-going. Then finally, a substitute for the Executive Secretary. This actually is not quite right. There was a recommendation that we passed that went to a first reading for the Council. It is not an action item. Actually it was tabled and there is an item under new business which addresses that because some modifications were recommended in it. So those are all the things that I could find that the Senate actually referred to the Council this year and their status. If anybody thinks of anything that they thought we did that I forgot, let me know and I will see if I can figure it out. Does anybody have any questions about any of those? Yes, Dave.

**D. Wagner:** I don’t have a question. Jim King last meeting recommended that this item be put on the agenda for a particular initiative. I think it should be included in every agenda for two reasons. One, I wrote a letter earlier in the semester after citing Dowen’s remark that the only power the Senate has is they have moral suasion. I argue that perhaps the Senate could take a more active role by focusing on initiatives and to call attention to the initiatives at every meeting I think would be very useful. Even if there were none, that would be useful. Secondly, I’ve been a permanent alternate on the Council this semester and I do think the most interesting discussions have centered around initiatives primarily from the Student Association Senate, but I take it the discussion of advocacy that arose from our initiative is going to provoke some argument too. So in some ways the most interesting topics on the Council have come from initiatives of this body and the Student Association Senate. So I think that should always be recognized in the agenda. I don’t know if that needs a motion or what.

**President Willis:** Well, I’m certainly happy ---

**D. Wagner:** A permanent inclusion in the agenda of the status of initiatives.

**President Willis:** I’m certainly happy to do it as part of my announcements every time.

**D. Wagner:** I think it should be part of the agenda every time.

**President Willis:** Yeah, if you want to make a motion to that effect and have the body just discuss it will be fine.

**D. Wagner:** I move that the status of Senate initiatives to the University Council become a permanent part of the agenda – a permanent agenda item.

**President Willis:** Okay, it’s been moved and seconded that the status of items that the Senate has referred to the University Council be a permanent agenda item. Is there any discussion? No? Okay, we’re ready to vote? Okay, all those in favor say aye. Opposed?

**The motion was passed.**
President Willis: A couple of other things that I wanted to say, one is that we are in the process as we get election results from the departments, of sending out forms to for you to indicate your preference for committee assignments, and also whether you want us to contact you by e-mail or by paper mail. If you would return these, that would be nice. I’m going to assign you to a committee anyway and if you don’t tell me which one you like you might find yourself on one that you don’t like. So, please return those. Originally, I wanted to be doing that over the next month. It’s not going to happen, but I do want to do those as soon as possible because doing it in July is a real pain. Okay.

Another thing that has come up in the Council is a letter from the Student Senate expressing their dismay and concern about the use of social security numbers as student identifiers. This raises privacy concerns and all that sort of thing. Changing that in the software that the university uses to generate grade sheets and class lists and what have you is not a trivial matter. However, they did ask me to remind you all and ask you all to remind your departments that we really are not supposed to use social security numbers or any part of them, like the last four digits, to post grades. What I have done is asked students to pick a nickname or an alias or something like that and I tell them that I will use that to post their grades rather than their ID number, and if they don’t give me one then I don’t post their grade. They’re just going to have to find it out some other way. In any case, I wanted to remind you of that. Please don’t use the social security numbers. The other thing that someone requested is that grade sheets, which have all those social security numbers, rather than just kind of piling them up in the recycling, if your department has a shredder it might be nice to shred those.

The last thing I wanted to do was to recognize one of our Senators, who I think is not here today, but Paul Ilolsley who has gotten a Fulbright Scholarship. I was very pleased to see that and wanted to offer my congratulations to Paul. Actually, after I wrote that down I also saw that Dorothea was in the news today also, Dorothea Bilder, you didn’t read that? – about her exhibit in Brazil which is also very exciting. So congratulations to both of you. That’s the end of my announcements.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

President Willis: I have nothing under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration or the Consent Agenda so let’s move to Reports from the Advisory Committees, Pat?

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report – walk-in

P. Henry: Just a very short sort of sub-report. The next meeting is going to be this Friday and I won’t be there nor will we have a rep, but I assume I will get some minutes and let you know about that. What I have as a walk-in is this report that I sent to the FAC for them presumably to pass on to the IBHE concerning the report on non-tenured faculty, this report called “All Faculty Matter” that we’ve been talking about. Again, just briefly, after having talked with several
groups, mostly in LA&S I must confess, but also with the union representative of UPI. I
gathered together a few comments. One of them had to do with some dissatisfaction with the
way in which the report itself was framed and how it seemed to make it so general that you
couldn’t really see what was going on and that some questions were framed in such a way that it
would be difficult to really gauge instructor satisfaction. There’s also, concerning the
recommendations, there was some question about – involving instructors or tenure track faculty
on committees. It was felt that some departments where instructors have long-term standing
with the department could often and would well be involved in several types of committees such
as curriculum, development, technology and pedagogy. Assuming this would be part of their
overall evaluation, that this would not necessarily be true certainly for all committees or all
departments especially, of course, personnel committees, since instructors are represented by
UPI. In terms of campus-wide committees, that was seen as somewhat problematic precisely
because there is such a difference between the different kinds of instructors and the different
statuses they have in different departments, and I end basically with the notion that, again, the
survey tends to blur these differences. I hope that the IBHE will be reminded that one size will
not fit all and that we need to make sure that whatever recommendations they come up with do
not reflect this or do reflect the fact that there’s a lot of variation and that everybody felt that
increased reliance on non-tenured and part time faculty would compromise integrity of an
institution’s programs of studies and, even though we’re in a budget crunch, we shouldn’t do it
too much.

President Willis: Okay, thank you Pat. Are there any questions for Pat?

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and
Dan Griffiths – report (Page 29)

President Willis: Okay, moving on to the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and
Personnel Committee, Dolly Jones and Dan Griffiths.

D. Jones: I think the report can stand on its own. I have the full committee report if anybody
wants to see it.

President Willis: Okay, Dolly has a report on page 29 and we do have booklets of the entire
committee report so does anybody have any questions for Dolly?

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard –
report (Page 30)

President Willis: Okay, if not, then moving on to the Finance, Facilities and Operations
Committee. I wrote a report for that most of which I suspect you’re all familiar with. Most of it
had to do with the budget and tuition and fees. This is the committee which first saw the request
for increases in tuition and fees and there was some discussion and some regret that such a move
was necessary but recognition that it was indeed necessary and this request was – particularly for
the tuition increase which was the largest percentage increase in any of the things – was passed.
Then, of course, the president talked about the budget which I think we’re all pretty familiar with
by now. Any questions about that committee report?
D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Bev Espe – no report

President Willis: Okay, the BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee has not met since our last meeting so Bev you don’t have any report from them.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report (Page 31)

President Willis: The full Board of Trustees also met on the 21st of March and I wrote a rather short report there. Essentially what they did was they took all the things that had been referred to them from the committee reports which you see on pages 29 and 30 and passed them all. So I didn’t see any need to list them all again. Again, there was a lot of discussion about the budget and the effect of the rescission and the shortfall for next year and what not and for that meeting also we have full booklets that have details on all that stuff. Our office has them and, of course, the Board of Trustees’ Office has them as well. So is there any questions about the Board of Trustees?

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

President Willis: Okay, moving on to Reports from Standing Committees, Academic Affairs, Jody?

A. Academic Affairs – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair

1. Committee Progress Report Standardized Tests in the Admissions Process (Pages 32-34)

J. Newman-Ryan: We have a report on pages 32 to 34 that I believe is just a summary of what we found from doing a little bit of research, certainly not tons, but a little research and talking to people across campus. This is not a randomized, controlled study but we talked to a variety of people in different offices. I don’t know that we need to take action on this, but we have some conclusions and recommendations. The history of this as I understand it is that President Peters was quoted in Time magazine as saying that we might want to get rid of the SAT as is the University of California system. Well, we don’t require the SAT so – he said he was misquoted but – after the University of California system president said that he wanted to get rid of standardized tests, President Peters said we might also want to. Without having resources to do a lot of research into this, we just surveyed people across campus. Certainly the arguments against requiring standardized tests seemed to center around cultural bias and the idea that we have math and English placement tests, and we get enough information from that. There seemed to be a lot of arguments for maintaining standardized tests even if we don’t pay a lot of attention to them, which seems to be the case now. We admit a lot – well, we don’t admit a lot – we admit some people with very low ACT scores now so I don’t know how much emphasis is placed on the tests at this point. We don’t have a recommendation about whether to get rid of it, but certainly we have sort of a compromise proposal. If the administration wants to consider more creative ways to look at admissions, we would support that, but do it as part of the process now before getting
rid of the standardized tests. Certainly there are some people in certain departments that seem to really want that information. If we want to look at portfolio reviews or interviews or whatever else other schools are doing as part of their admissions process, that would be fine, but start doing that now before we get rid of the standardized tests as they stand. We might also recommend that they look at schools who don’t use standardized tests and see how the admission’s process works there, and actually give us some of that information before deciding what to do. That’s basically our recommendation. I don’t know if we need a motion to refer that anywhere.

President Willis: Okay, are there any questions for Jody? It seems to me it’s the sort of thing we might want to keep an eye on, and after some other places which have gotten rid of this - have had a couple of years experience with it, maybe look and see what their experience is and whether it makes any sense for us to revisit the idea. Pat?

P. Henry: It does seem like this should go somewhere besides just us in terms of Admissions.

President Willis: Okay, I can transmit the report to the Provost, for example, and to the President. I can send it to the President and the Provost, sure.

J. King: It was the President who asked.

President Willis: That’s true, yes it was. So you’re correct. That would be a good idea. Does someone want to make a motion to that effect?

D. Wagner: I just have a question. Is there no cultural bias in the English placement test?

President Willis: I rather suspect there’s cultural bias in everything.

D. Wagner: Well, maybe not there.

President Willis: I don’t really need a motion to hand this to the President and Provost but if somebody wants to make a motion I’d certainly entertain one. If not, I’ll just go ahead and give it them anyway unless somebody objects.

J. Newman-Ryan: Would you like me to move that faculty be involved in this process if they decide to go ahead? I don’t know how to word that exactly, but I guess the committee feels that it would like this not to be just the President’s and the Director of Admissions’ decision. There be some faculty input to that.

President Willis: Yes.

J. Newman-Ryan: Should I word that somehow?

P. Henry: If that’s the motion, I’ll second it.
President Willis: All right, I can certainly transmit that and say that faculty governance bodies should be involved appropriately at all stages of any decision that’s made. How does that sound? All right, any other questions or comments for Jody?

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

President Willis: All right, Economic Status of the Profession. Jim Lockard could not be here. He will have a report next time.

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

1. Graduate School: Budget Situation (Pages 35-38)

President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget. Carole Minor couldn’t be here either but she does have a copy of the report that was given by Jerry Zar on pages 35-38. Is Gary there? Oh yeah, there’s Gary. Gary, of course, is the University Council Chair of that committee and so if anybody had any questions about Jerry’s report, then certainly Gary, I think, would be the appropriate person to answer them. Carole, I believe, expects to give a full report at the next Senate meeting. So, are there any questions about Jerry’s report at this point? Okay.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Carol DeMoranville, Chair

President Willis: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Carol DeMoranville, do you have a report? No report, okay.

E. Rules and Governance – Chris Hubbard, Chair

President Willis: Rules and Governance I believe has no report.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

President Willis: Elections and Legislative Oversight I believe has no report either. They’ll have a lot of stuff to do at the last meeting, but not now.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XI. NEW BUSINESS

President Willis: I have no Unfinished Business but I have several items of New Business, which have come up.

A. Alternate for the Executive Secretary (Page 39)

President Willis: The first of those is the Alternate for the Executive Secretary item, which we did already refer to the University Council. At the moment that item has been tabled by the Council because members have found themselves in the position where they were trying to
rewrite it on the fly. It was felt that this was not really the best way to do things. I listed here two possibilities, this is on – I’m on page 39 now. After talking it over with Malcolm, probably the second possibility won’t work because, if you look carefully at the wording of the bylaws, the alternate to a council member represents that member’s constituency and so my constituency, for example, is LA&S which is who elected me to the Council. So that’s really not what we want. My favorite option would be to keep essentially what we went with last time which, let’s see, in the event that the Executive Secretary of the University Council is unable to perform the duties of that office, those duties would be assumed by the Acting Executive Secretary until the Executive Secretary can resume the duties or until the next year’s Executive Secretary takes office whichever occurs first. All right, fine. So who’s the Acting Executive Secretary? It says the Acting Executive Secretary will be the Vice President of the Faculty Senate if that individual is also a member of the University Council and then otherwise it’s the Chair of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. Now, the sticking point that came up was that if the Vice President of the Faculty Senate is not a member of the University Council, which apparently is traditionally the case. Thus, should the Executive Secretary be unable to serve, you have the Vice President of the Faculty Senate taking over the Faculty Senate and the Chair of Resource, Space and Budget taking over the University Council, so you have two different people. Now, if it’s a brief period of time, that’s probably not a big deal but if you have an extended vacancy in that office for some reason, then having two different people in those roles – Donna goes crazy real quick and it becomes confusing for other people also who want to contact the office. They’re not sure exactly which person they want. So it is felt that it really would be a good idea to have the same person preside over the Senate and the Council regardless. So, it seemed to me that keeping the spirit of this proposed amendment, which is that the Acting Executive Secretary will be the Vice President of the Faculty Senate we could fix that essentially by having that person automatically be an ex officio member of the University Council if they’re not otherwise a member of the Council. That way we don’t have to have all these “if, ands and buts” in there. The Vice President of the Senate is automatically an ex officio member of the Council and so in the absence of the Executive Secretary and President would take over both bodies. Now, the Senate as is often the case in these matters, is really not in a position to tell the University Council who its ex officio members are. That’s a matter of the Council bylaws. But I thought that it would be a good idea if the Senate endorsed that idea and that would give the Council something to go on and would provide some support for that idea. So, I would entertain a motion to have the bylaws changed to have both the Vice President and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate be ex officio, non-voting members of the University Council if they are not otherwise members. Is somebody willing to make such a motion? Second? Discussion? Or did I talk too long already? Okay, are we ready to vote on that? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay. So, it’s up to you Sue. All right, I think that makes sense.

C. DeMoranville: One thing that concerns me is if a situation occurs where the Executive Secretary is gone for a while and say the Vice President of the Faculty Senate has to step in is what happens to this person’s other responsibilities? Because, you know, they’re probably doing their research, they’re teaching their full load, etc. and they’re serving on a number of committees, etc. and they wouldn’t have the release time that the Executive Secretary has. So I don’t know at the University Council whether that’s something that would be considered as well that in the person who steps into that role should get release time. I don’t know how that would happen.
President Willis: I don’t know that we would have to specify that ahead of time. This has actually not been necessary so far and hopefully it would be a rare event so it might make more sense to just negotiate it at the time should an extended replacement be necessary. You try to make reasonable provisions for things that might happen but at some point you just say, “Well look, we’re all reasonable people, we can figure out what to do in extraordinary circumstances and just deal with it.” That would be my inclination. Any other comments or discussion about that? All right.

B. Fall Break (Pages 40-41)

President Willis: The second item of New Business is on pages 40 and 41. This is the infamous “Fall Break” issue. You all got this already. What I gave you here is a summary of the responses that I got concerning the fall break. The full text of the responses went to the University Council members in their packets at the last meeting and came to, I think, 23 pages. We decided that since there are a number of University Council members who are on the Faculty Senate and already had all 23 pages it didn’t make sense to kill quite so many trees. So what I have given you here is the summary. There was a desire expressed by some Senate members to have the Senate at least discuss this issue as a body because there are a number of other bodies which also discussed it. So I bring that to you if anybody has any comments, or there’s any consensus of the Senate about this issue. Let me just make one further remark. It seems to me that there are two kinds of issues surrounding a fall break which we might profitably weigh in on. One, and to my mind the less important one, is the details of exactly when it is, how many days you make up, and which days they are. All this kind of thing can get into endless minutia. The other is what is the motivation for a fall break? Is it a good idea? Does it make academic sense? Are there pedagogical reasons to have such a thing in the first place. It seems to me that’s where the Senate could weigh in because either there is or there isn’t. Again, it’s certainly a matter of discussion but it seems to me that that’s where it makes sense to look at least initially. If it doesn’t make any sense then we wouldn’t have to discuss it further. If it does make sense then it seems to me that working out the details is something that could be handled. But it doesn’t make sense to me to work on the details if we haven’t decided whether the whole idea makes sense or not in the first place. You can see what other people thought about it. There was clearly no strong consensus across the various constituency groups among the campus. If anyone cares to speak to this issue, I’d certainly be happy to entertain it. Jim, did you want to?

J. King: If you want to talk about the particular issue, no. But at the end, if there were discussion, I wanted to say something about the idea of consultation which is behind your report.

President Willis: Right. Okay, does anyone have any comments on the fall break issue? Pat?

P. Henry: I was on the committee that discussed this. The question of pedagogical rationale was definitely something that was looked at and a good deal of information was obtained from other schools that have this. Among those that have it, in general, the feeling was that it did serve a pedagogical purpose. It did give people a chance to sort of break, and clear the deck much like spring break does. Of course, there’s always the problem that it’s hard to get started up again especially for classes where there are projects that require a lot of time. It made sense
to a lot of people to have that in the fall as well as in the spring, and speaking as one who has a
class five days a week, I can tell you November or Thanksgiving looks like a long way away at
the end of Labor Day. I don’t know that everybody has that problem.

President Willis: Okay, are there other comments?

J. Kowalski: Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art. I wonder if when research was being done,
was any attention paid to whether the universities or the colleges which have a spring break tend
to be – I’m sorry a fall break – regional universities, that I mean do the preponderance of their
students come from sort of the immediate region as I think may be the case for NIU or are they
institutions that might draw from at least a state-wide or a national group of students? I assume
that part of the reason that they take the break is that they actually take a break. We’re thinking
of the pedagogical and academic reasons. They can get their projects accomplished but it’s
called break and you can read that in different ways. Some of them may go home and visit
family members and things of that sort. So, was there any attention paid to that issue or not?

M. Larson: I did a sample – not as random as Jody did – in terms of using my National
Communication Association list to just get a response from whomever I got a response from, and
what did we get, 37 replies, I believe. It seems to me there wasn’t really a trend. There were
small liberal arts colleges, there were Big Ten institutions – there didn’t seem to be a pattern.
So, that doesn’t answer your question.

President Willis: Yeah, Jeff?

J. Kowalski: Just as a follow up, I mean there’s a kind of popular vision of what spring break is
that is put out by MTV and other sorts of, you know, organs of the media that suggest that people
are down in Florida or Cancun or various other places not paying great attention to their studies
during spring break. I don’t know how, just popularized that image is, but it’s worth
considering.

President Willis: Yes, Dave?

D. Wagner: I don’t know if I’m the only one that remembers this but there were two years on
this campus where we had a week off at Thanksgiving which I thought was really very useful
and it didn’t run into the problem of spring break. A long time ago, you know, the semester
ended in January and there was a lame duck period. Some of the comments that were made
suggested there would be a lame duck period following a Thanksgiving break but it didn’t work
that way. The students really made use of the week off at Thanksgiving at that time. I have
another suggestion which is to change Labor Day to October.

President Willis: That would help. You did mention the Thanksgiving week and I was going to
look that up, I have not yet done that so I’m not sure exactly how that fit into the schedule. All
right, are there other comments?

M. Larson: We could sure use any comments that you have because the University Council –
was “wild and crazy.” No consensus.
President Willis: Yes, Kathryn?

K. Gately-Poole: Kathryn Gately-Poole from Theatre Arts. Our students have been telling us for years that they don’t understand why we don’t have a week at Thanksgiving. They have not said that they’d go out and just relax or go away or take a break, but it would get them caught up and time to rest. We might be unique but they’ve been talking about this to us for as long as I’ve been here, for eight years. I did just want to share that with you. Thank you.

President Willis: Okay, thanks.

J. Novak: John Novak, School of Music. Are they considering a full week break? Is that what is being thought of?

President Willis: The suggestion was to have two days – a Monday and Tuesday – after the eighth week of classes which would be early to mid-October.

P. Henry: Then have the Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of Thanksgiving week.

President Willis: Right, and then a full day – have the whole Wednesday off before Thanksgiving. So, you’d have Monday, Tuesday in October which would make a four-day weekend and then Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of Thanksgiving.

J. Novak: Okay.

President Willis: That was the specific suggestion.

J. Novak: So, they’re just not considering the full week off then.

P. Henry: It wasn’t what we considered.

President Willis: That wasn’t the specific suggestion but as I say the question is whether the fall break a good idea and if so, then what kind of fall break.

M. Larson: We also found out interestingly that it counts as a week if you met one day during the week in terms of the regulations about what constitutes a week.

President Willis: Yeah, that has to do with student loans and students being counted as full-time students and that kind of thing. Having partial weeks does not impact adversely on that. Yes, Carol?

C. DeMoranville: It seems to me that most of the argumentation takes place about how you would structure a fall break if you had one. But I’m not hearing any compelling reason to have a fall break. Do our students get by currently without a fall break? Yeah, of course they do. Would they like one? Probably. So would a lot of us but I don’t see a compelling reason to have one. If we do have one though, I think that splitting it up between two weeks is not a very smart
way to go because if you’re going to have a break one of the nice things about the spring break is that you have the whole week. If you wanted to go somewhere you can. If you want to work on your school projects you can. It would make logical sense because in the fall there’s already a half-week, that we don’t go during Thanksgiving, but then obviously you would have to go further in December and things like that. So, if the argument is getting hung up on how do we structure it and less on whether it’s valuable, it seems to me that we probably shouldn’t have one, as much as I’d love a couple of days off.

President Willis: Okay, other comments? Yes?

J. Wolfskill: I have a couple of things to say. One is that this whole proposal reminds me very much of a very famous classical review of a piece of mathematical literature in my discipline which is that paper “x” fills a much needed void in this area. I’ll let you think about that for a moment. Now, this may vary from one discipline to another but I can tell you that in our mathematic courses we have a very serious problem whenever there is a break in the academic term. I am not making this up. On Thursday before spring break we had a call in our department office from a student who claimed seriously to want to know if there were going to be classes on that Friday because he wondered if students would have a day off in order to prepare for spring break. The fact is that the day before any break, if we do not have an exam or some other seriously required assignment, at least half the students do not show up.

President Willis: I must say that it has been my experience as a professor of physics also. Any evidence that the students have spent spring break thinking about anything that has anything to do with physics whatsoever is sorely lacking.

J. Wolfskill: Yeah, I’m with you all the way there.

President Willis: Which isn’t to say that other disciplines could be different, but that’s been my experience.

J. Wolfskill: Again, some variation from discipline to discipline but in my field, we really count on students retaining material from day to day and week to week and the loss of continuity just kills us. I’ll say it flatly, it kills us.

P. Henry: Should we eliminate spring break maybe?

J. Wolfskill: I would seriously consider such a thing but I know I would be in a great minority.

President Willis: Yes?

A. Tio: Adrian Tio from the School of Art. I came to NIU from a university, a state university, that had a fall break and the idea of a fall break in terms of timing was it was a period of time right before mid-terms. In part, it was to help with the transitional students, new students and transfers to give them kind of a leg up, many of them taking mid-terms for the very first time. They were also graded at that point, so all first year and new students on campus actually received a mid-term grade so everybody needed a break to prepare. When they instituted it for
the first time, it was the Thursday and Friday before the middle of October. So, just pick a weekend in the middle of October, split the semester in half and it was those two days. It kind of worked and it kind of did not work because the average student took off on Thursday night and went home or did what they did to take their break. The university did stay open for the two days because you can’t close the dormitories so it’s kind of a wash in terms of the budget. The more entrepreneurial students, of course, left on Wednesday and some of them actually left on Tuesday. The same issue we have with Thanksgiving. So the second time around, the Faculty Senate in this case, voted to close down one of the days and just trade it off. They had two reading days before the end of the semester, a Thursday and a Friday, traded the Thursday for a Friday break, and made it a three-day weekend – too small for people to travel very far, still used it to prep for mid-terms but then continued one reading day in front of the final semester and that worked out much better. We didn’t have the transitional break up problems. It took the pressure out of the semester but it was the best solution they could come up with. They also did, I might add, drop classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

President Willis: Other comments? Yes?

E. Kay: Could I ask is there any support from the students for this initiative? I think the faculty are quite mixed for good reason. I’m also concerned because our students have only part of the semester in session and then they go out to hospitals to work the second half. It would have a big impact on faculty if we compress their class time even shorter than it already is to get the semester work done.

President Willis: There was a resolution passed by the Student Senate in support of that. On the other hand, there was at least one group, -- the Graduate Student Advisory Committee that -- did not see any advantage to it. So the undergraduate students and the graduate students did not seem to agree. That goes along with everybody else who also don’t seem to agree. Yeah, Pat?

P. Henry: Would there be more support do you think, back to something that was mentioned earlier, with a full week off for Thanksgiving?

President Willis: That seemed to be somewhat more popular. My impression is that a lot of students aren’t around that whole week anyway. So, I’m not sure how big a difference it would really be to what’s going on now.

P. Henry: If people were interested that could be plan B if you want to discuss it further.

President Willis: My goal at this point is not to come up with the answer. I did want to kind of get a sense of how people felt about it. I will write just a brief description of what was said because I was expected there would not be consensus since there isn’t one anywhere else. I will write up something fairly brief for the Council to say well, the Senate discussed it and there were sentiments expressed on this side or that side and here’s what they are. Yes, Carol?

C. DeMoranville: We’ve decided back here that we will move Labor Day to October and move Thanksgiving to October and take the week off.
President Willis: Well, the Canadians actually have Thanksgiving in October which makes much more sense. Yes, Kathryn?

K. Gately-Poole: I guess as I listened to this it seems so clear that so many different schools have so many different needs. That’s the thing I’m most struck with and that’s why it seems hard. I mean, our students who are in school, plus training, plus shows every night, you know, have been asking this for years. Yet I hear other professors say this would hurt the momentum of their work. It seems like it’s such an individual thing with each school and the particular needs of each school that’s what I’m most struck with here as this goes forward. Thank you.

President Willis: Too bad we all can’t have our own schedules but that would be unworkable I’m sure. Jeff?

J. Kowalski: There’s one thing I would like to get a sense of from the Senate and if – I don’t know how to do this – but, I do have a feeling and it may just be an impressionistic and wrong headed feeling that there’s kind of a wide consensus or a wide agreement that whatever else is done with regard to fall break that we’d like to see Wednesday morning before Thanksgiving be made a break and not tell some students they need to be here that day and others they don’t.

President Willis: We could just take a straw poll. How many people would be in favor of having the full day off on Wednesday before Thanksgiving? Okay and how many would not be in favor of that? Well, all right. That seems pretty definitive. I didn’t count but most everybody seemed in favor; nobody opposed and a few people didn’t raise their hands. Sorry?

M. Morris: Do the same thing for a fall break.

President Willis: Okay. So how many people would in principle support the idea of a fall break either, well, adding up to a full week whether it’s a full week at Thanksgiving or three days at Thanksgiving plus two days some other time? How many people would be in favor of that? Okay, how many people would be opposed to it? Okay, I get 23 opposed and 10 in favor. Let me just ask one other question. How many people would be in favor of having a full week off at Thanksgiving specifically? Okay, even fewer. Okay. I’ll write something up for the Council. Jim?

J. King: I appreciate the discussion of this issue. None of you has been as critical of the idea of a fall break as what I get at home. My wife says no spring break, no fall break. Okay, ‘ya gotta play hardball. I’m grateful also to Sue and whoever helped her, I’m sure there were a lot of people who helped her, put together the digest of information that you see because this was a major undertaking to collect the information and provide it in the fashion that it was done. The instrument that generated the input was what, one sheet, or was it front and back? The invitation to submit opinions on Fall Break that you circulated to University officiers. It was one sheet, but it was pretty small print, it looked like it was 10 point. So, there was a lot of information on that sheet. And now that we have done this and we haven’t done consultations like this very much. I think it is time to look back and see well, what have we learned about the process, and I’m not absolutely sure that we learned enough, to suggest that we ought to be doing a lot of these. I mean, should virtually every important issue that comes before the University Council go to
consultation? Or is the University Council sufficiently representative? If it is sufficiently representative, then what’s the criteria that the Secretary and the President will use to suggest in some cases you’re going to go to consultation and others you won’t? Now this one was pretty easy because you had to know what the impact of the fall break was going to be. Some of it was absolutely predictable. I was told when I launched this idea that I was bringing almost universal hatred down upon myself, for suggesting that the faculty report to work three days early. I also must say that our administration was very temperate in that it didn’t even scrum – that this was going to cost money, and the input that we’ve gotten suggested that it would. Nobody even pointed out that it’s going to cost air conditioning money and that you’ve got to cool the dorms earlier then you otherwise would. I don’t know that they’re going to save very much, some of the grad students are off campus. By the way, a lot of undergraduates do not go away. I checked with mine. One of them went away. If you’re going to Florida, it’s a mixed bag. Some students went down to the beaches but the sociology group went down to Pensacola to build houses for Habitat for Humanity. So, it’s hard to generalize. I want to recommend two things for your next survey. First, that the discussion that occurs in committee articulate the issues more amply than happened this time so that the various bodies that examine this can have at hand a list of pros and cons. Each one of them went away. If you’re going to Florida, it’s a mixed bag. Some students went down to the beaches but the sociology group went down to Pensacola to build houses for Habitat for Humanity. So, it’s hard to generalize. I want to recommend two things for your next survey. First, that the discussion that occurs in committee articulate the issues more amply than happened this time so that the various bodies that examine this can have at hand a list of pros and cons. In cases where there is obvious impact, like an impact on student housing, on food services, to me not so obvious at the time, but since then it’s become obvious, health services. Orientation for students. I think some sort of consultation with those bodies before the survey instrument goes out would be helpful. The second thing and I don’t know how to put my finger on it, but I think you have to control if you can for cases where the chairman of a particular body, whether consciously or unconsciously, when that body is not one which is as open a forum and does not have a history as the Faculty Senate and University Council do of free discussion where, in other words, the body is a rubber stamp for a dean, it’s history is to be a rubber stamp for a dean. I think that when consultation occurs with those bodies that you probably should do what I did as Executive Secretary when it was my turn. I went and sat in on the meeting. That’s it.

President Willis: Okay, thank you. Are there any other comments? All right.

C.  **Position description** for the Director of the University Honors Program (Page 42)

President Willis: Let us move on then to the last item of New Business which is something that was brought to my attention which is the position description for the Director of the University Honors Program. I quoted the text there from this description. The search is open now and applications are being received. It says, “It is preferred that the Director hold tenure in an academic department of the university by the date of appointment. However, other teacher-scholars holding an earned terminal degree in their academic field are also welcome to apply”. This allows that the Director of the University Honors Program could, in fact, be an SPS employee who is not a faculty member. So the question is, “How does the Senate feel about that?” We can’t really do anything about it at this point because the search is already open but I would like to discuss that here. If there is a sense of the Senate I will transmit it to the President and Provost. Yes?
W. Baker: Could you clarify for us what actually the ad does say?

President Willis: The full position description says well, the date of appointment is July 1, 2002, salary is commensurate with responsibilities and present rank and salary. It’s a full-time appointment for three years with possibility of renewal. Release time for teaching one course a year and other appropriate activities in the academic discipline. The full position description is what I wrote there with an additional sentence in the front which says “the Director of the University Honors Program shall be a teacher/scholar responsible for administering the Honors Program.” “Qualifications: exhibit a commitment to a strong and diverse Honors Program, be effective in working closely with students, faculty and staff and have had experience working with an Honors Program such as teacher of honors courses, member of an honors committee, etc.” There was a whole list of responsibilities.

W. Baker: Why is this issue, coming up now? Why wasn’t it raised earlier?

President Willis: I’ll let Carol address this. This was approved by a committee which Carol serves on, so I’ll let Carol speak to that.

C. DeMoranville: There is a search committee for the new Honors Director and this topic was discussed at the first meeting of that search committee. The pros and cons of having a tenure/tenure track faculty member versus an SPS person was discussed and there was a vote taken. It was voted in favor of including the language that an SPS person could be – would be welcome to apply. My personal views on this are that I am strongly in favor of having a tenure/tenure track faculty person in that position for a variety of reasons one of which is that the Honors Director has to represent Northern Illinois University at various national conferences and regional conferences, and the directors of other honors programs in Illinois and across the nation generally almost without exception, are faculty members. So, number one, they have much more credibility representing Northern to external constituencies. Second, they have much more credibility if they’re a faculty member representing the Honors Program within Northern Illinois University if we’re trying to encourage faculty members to teach honors courses and get people involved in it and working with students. They have a higher level of credibility if they are a tenure/tenure track faculty person. They also probably are much more familiar with the research process having gone through probably either an EdD or PhD program and can better represent the program. In addition to that, under consideration as we speak, is moving the Honors Program to an Honors College. If that’s the case then typically the director of that program would need to become a dean and you would want a faculty person in that position. Finally, last but not least, especially based upon some of the conversations we’ve had recently in this body and in my committee with SPS workplace issues, I see a huge problem if an SPS person is put in this position because they serve at the discretion of their supervisors. If you put an SPS person in this position, it’s a three-year position. It’s limited, it can be renewed, but what happens at the end of three years? I’m sure that SPS person’s position has already been replaced. Now where do they go? Plus, if their immediate supervisor isn’t happy with what they’re doing in the Honors Program, they could be fired. I am very uncomfortable given the things that we’ve heard about SPS workplace issues with some of this happening. That’s my opinion.

President Willis: Yes, Bill?
**W. Baker:** I’d like to thank you for that detailed response. I don’t know whether other members of this Senate are slightly – or as troubled – as I am slightly troubled by the fact that the search is already underway. The fact that this discussion is taking place somehow to me doesn’t seem right once a search is in progress. Now, other people may not feel that but something might be said here which could influence that search. Once you’ve had a search, you’ve approved the search, you’ve made decisions in committee then there’s a sense that those things should be allowed to go forward and to follow their course rather than the Senate having a discussion after the fact. But other members may not agree with what I’m saying.

**President Willis:** Well, I would have had a discussion before the fact if I had known about it before the fact.

**W. Baker:** Obviously, obviously. But ---

**President Willis:** Point taken. Yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** Will this go forward – would this be something that would influence future searches?

**President Willis:** I would hope so. Jim?

**J. King:** I was going to say I think that’s a good point. We don’t want to interfere in the search. At the same time, given that this seems to be the first occasion in which something like this has happened in the institution, it is noteworthy. If we remarked on it as a novelty and let it go, it seems to be at least complacency and invitation that this should be the case across the board wherever possible. I don’t know that it’s a very good idea myself and I certainly wouldn’t hesitate to express to the President a sense of the Senate, if that is indeed our sentiment, that in general we think that positions in academic offices such as this should be held by persons who are tenured faculty members. Now, if you think that the timing is wrong and we should withhold such a motion until after the search is completed as a matter of courtesy, I would certainly not make the motion now. If you don’t think that making such a generic motion would interfere with the research underway, I guess I would be prepared to make a motion to that effect.

**President Willis:** Wilma?

**W. Miranda:** It seems to me that there’s some irregularity here in the way this came about in terms of what has a traditional – what has been our past practice -- and I wouldn’t agree that we should wait until after the search is finished since we had no way of being, I’m assuming, we had no way of being informed earlier. What if we have an SPS person who actually gets the job and then we come up with the statement that’s in effect saying well, the committee – and the person were not – legitimate. So I think that if we had a statement – some kind of statement of concern – I’m not sure that we want to be directive or make a big scene, but I do think that the reasons that Carol presented are very compelling and certainly within our purview. I’m wondering, and not to get into the debate itself at the committee level, if there were compelling reasons for the decision to go to the SPS option. Do we have any insight into that?
President Willis: Let me let Carol address that, but first let me say that it occurs to me that rather than waiting until after the search is over and an appointment is made, that if we sent something now that it might be a little more clear that we were not directing this against an individual who might actually be appointed to that position but rather to the idea in general because it seems to me that is indeed where we are. It’s the general idea and not any particular individual that we’re looking at. In any case, Carol did you want to address the rest of the issue.

C. DeMoranville: Yes, I guess two things – one in response to Wilma about the reasons for including SPS in the search, the other is that a question was raised as to how many faculty typically apply for this position. If I can recall correctly, I think it was usually about three. It’s not an overwhelming number but there’s certainly sufficient number to select from. It was thought that if SPS personnel were allowed to apply that it might increase the pool. So that was discussed. It was my sense, although it was nothing overt – I don’t know if overt is the correct word or not – but it’s my sense that there is a person who is on SPS staff that many people on the faculty feel would be an appropriate or a very suitable and very good director. It’s my sense that perhaps an exception was made in this case so that the person could apply for this position. I don’t know this person and I’m not saying that an SPS person couldn’t do an excellent job as an honors director of the program, but I just think in a general sense that, for the reasons I mentioned, it should be a faculty member. I would strongly support the Faculty Senate making a motion to support the appointment of a tenure/tenure track faculty person to the Director of the Honors Program at this particular point because at this point the search committee has not met again. I don’t know who has applied. Nobody knows who’s applying for it, so it’s not personal at this point. I think that if a statement from the Faculty Senate comes out after an individual has been selected, then it does become personal. I don’t think that we necessarily would do that. I think that in general I would like to see us support the appointment of a faculty member.

A. Tio: If you are going to take that course of action I recommend you contact Affirmative Action to make sure that this doesn’t taint the search. It sounds like a condition is being levied once the search has been “okayed” and the advertising has been done. Once that happens, you may indeed just shut the search down. As the chair of a school, I’m very conscious of those little things that can happen that really come back and haunt you later. What I might recommend instead, since this is after the fact, is that the Faculty Senate highly encourages as many of the faculty as possible participate in open forums to hear the candidates speak and talk and to put in letters of recommendation, letters of support or just give an evaluation of that performance to champion who they feel might become the best next Director of the Honors Program rather than get caught up in what might become due process issues regarding the search.

President Willis: I spoke with Bob Wheeler about this and he suggested that the best way to ensure that, in fact, a tenured faculty member was put in this position was to make sure that there are numerous applications – that there are a lot of applications from qualified faculty members. I also spoke to the President and Provost and mentioned this issue to them and neither of them had been aware of it. Jeff?

J. Kowalski: Would it prejudice or taint the search in some way if the Faculty Senate was simply to reaffirm the statement that it is preferred that the director hold tenure in an academic department of the university and express it’s support for that statement?
President Willis: Offhand I think that would be all right.

M. Morris: I’m going to ask Carol a question. Carol, I’m a little confused. Your committee – the search committee, is that what your committee?

C. DeMoranville: I’m a member of the search committee.

M. Morris: Well, the committee you’re on, yes. Now, there was a pre-existing job description. You didn’t’ create a new job description did you?

C. DeMoranville: No.

M. Morris: And the pre-existing job description included these requirements as provided on page 42 which is “It is preferred that the Director hold tenure in an academic department”?

C. DeMoranville: I believe that the previous description said that the Director will hold tenure in an academic department. It’s limited, previously it was limited to tenure/tenure track faculty.

M. Morris: So, I guess what I don’t understand is by what authority your committee changed the job description. Wouldn’t that description have been created in the bylaws, the Constitution, or somewhere else? I wouldn’t think a search committee could just change a job description at its whim.

C. DeMoranville: I don’t have an answer to that. I don’t know. I don’t know where the original job description came from.


President Willis: I don’t think it’s in the bylaws.

M. Morris: No, okay, so Carol am I correct in concluding that your committee - not your committee, the committee you serve on – in writing the advertisement actually redefined the job description to the extent these two sentences exist? Because you seemed to indicate previously it read “a person shall hold or will hold”.

C. DeMoranville: Yes, that was a change. The committee reviewed the rest of the job description as had been written for the previous search and there may have been some very minor modifications to it. For example, the extent of involvement in scholarship activities, not scholarship activities doing research but scholarships for students. But this was a major change – the only major change that was made in the job description.

M. Morris: Just one last question. Is an SPS person a teacher by definition that is, would an SPS person fit into the new description?

C. DeMoranville: It’s possible.
M. Morris: It’s possible?

C. DeMoranville: Yes.

M. Morris. Well, my feeling is that I can’t envision supporting a job description that was created by a committee unless I was assured the committee had the jurisdiction to create the job description. I would say that we may be at a point where we have to go back and restart the search with an advertisement that complies with the job description as it previously existed unless whoever has the power to change the job description actually changed it.

President Willis: Yes, Jim?

J. King: Let me try something that may synthesize what several people have said. The idea of reaffirming the notion that the person that occupies a position like this should be a tenured member of the faculty. That’s a long-standing tradition at Northern and as far as I know it’s not subject to exception. So it seems to me that some general statement like that would send a message and perhaps not interfere in the present search. So, here goes. The Faculty Senate reaffirms the long-standing tradition that the administrative leader of academic offices, such as the Honors Program and the several academic centers on our campus, be a tenured member of the faculty.

President Willis: You’re making that a motion?

J. King: Yes.

President Willis: Okay, Jim’s motion has been seconded. Is there any further discussion?

D. Wagner: Who’s the person in charge of – oversees education. I think he should – that person should be mentioned by name also.

J. King: I said such as.

D. Wagner: Such as people running centers. Does that include the oversees ---

J. King: You can amend it.

D. Wagner: Okay, I move to amend it by including the Director of ---

President Willis: Of what?

D. Wagner: Oversees education – oversees study whatever that program is.

President Willis: International Programs.
D. Wagner: Yeah, International Programs. Okay, I move that the Director of International Programs be included in this listing.

President Willis: Has that person traditionally been a faculty member as well?

D. Wagner: Yeah.

President Willis: Yes? Okay, Sheri?

S. Spear: I don’t know if this is out of order but I would suggest we might want to add “tenure or tenurable” because if you have an external person, they are not tenured in any department here but would be voted tenure by whatever department. It sounds like a small point, but ---

President Willis: All right. Okay, so Jim we’ve had a couple of amendments. Do you accept any of them as friendly? Both? Okay. All right. Does the seconder accept them as well? Yes, okay. Any other discussion? Okay, are we ready to vote?

R. Orem: Can you read back the motion?

President Willis: Yes, okay, get a mike Jim.

J. King: Thank you.

President Willis: Did you get the amendments?

J. King: The Faculty Senate reaffirms the long-standing tradition that the administrative leader of academic offices such as the Honors Program, the International Studies Program and the several academic centers on our campus be a member of the faculty with tenure or tenurable – if tenurable is a word.

President Willis: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, the motion carries.

The motion passed as amended.

President Willis: Yes, Malcolm.

M. Morris: Notwithstanding Jim’s motion and it having passed, it doesn’t address whether this current search can continue because the committee invited people who may not be qualified to serve under the presently authorized job description. Unless someone can show me that the committee is authorized to change the job description, I don’t see how it can proceed.

President Willis: Would you like to look into that?

P. Henry: Yeah, are we the proper body to make that statement anyway?
M. Morris: Well, it came before us. I’m not criticizing the committee. I’m trying to ascertain where the authority comes from. It may very well be the committee is authorized to make the change, in which case we have no problem. I’d be surprised if the committee was so authorized. But, I’m often wrong, as my wife is quick to point out.

President Willis: Yes?

A. Tio: If I could just add, referring to Affirmative Action protocol, “any position description must go through Vice President Zike’s office and be signed upon before an advertisement can take place”. So, it’s not on the committee. Whatever changes take place, his office had to pass it before it went out and left the campus so, you may just want ask Vice President Zike.

President Willis: I’m not going to be doing any asking. That’s why I was asking Malcolm if he wanted to do it.

M. Morris: I’ll call Admasu.

President Willis: At least not until after the search is closed. Okay, are there comments? Yes, Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: The hour is late so I don’t want to start a new long discussion but it relates somewhat to this issue. Jim King has brought up repeatedly, I think, if I understand him, that we always have to assert ourselves in matters like this. I think since we have a new Provost and a relatively new President, although he’s been here awhile, that it might be nice sometime early next fall to invite them here to have a discussion about their perception of faculty governance and what that means right now. I think, my own cynicism, I keep getting these committee reports from things all over campus. Yes, these committees have faculty on them but you see things like guests and they have a huge number of non-faculty guests who seem to control some of these committees. I think it would just be a nice time to find out what our role is supposed to be in their eyes and to maybe assert ourselves in a more broad way about some of these issues because we’re always fighting these things. We had to about whether the President had to have tenure or not, and it seems like we just keep doing this over and over and over again and feeling like we don’t have any power, and that depresses me.

President Willis: The President is currently scheduled to attend the next meeting in three weeks and so you may certainly ask him about that at that time.

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: I think we’re into Comments and Questions from the Floor. Are there any others? Okay, yes Pat?

P. Henry: A motion to wish you a speedy recovery.

President Willis: Thank you.
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XIV. ADJOURNMENT

President Willis: Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.