
T. Smith attended for R. Butler; T. Singh attended for C. DeMoranville.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Baker, Bukonda, Caughron, Clayton, Cearlock, Creamer, Espe, Fox, Frank-Stromborg, Garcia, Ghrayeb, Henry, Kolb, L’Allier, Loubere, K. Miller, Mohabbat, Musial, Payvar, Robertson, Smith-Shank, S. Song, Stephen, Wade, Zerwekh

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA – added VII.F, report from CIUS; approved as amended

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 FS MEETING - approved

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The budget situation is still undetermined; updates will be given when available.

A. Anne Kaplan and Frederick Kitterle will be attending to discuss the P-20 Initiatives and [hand-out] – walk-in

President Peters put together a committee to look into P-20 initiatives for teacher preparation and development, consisting of A. Kaplan, M. McConachie, C. Sorenson, H. Kafer, S. Richmond, F. Kitterle, and P. Vohra. This committee has identified areas where NIU can make a contribution: science, math and technology, approaches to special need students, fine arts, and applied research. Also, they have organized a P-20 summit of deans from Illinois public universities to encourage cooperation, and will produce a white paper. They are also looking at creating an information clearinghouse, for communication with state politicians and with the public at large.
D. Wagner said that P-20 doesn’t distinguish the 17-20 enough from the P-16, and suggested calling it P-16 +4. F. Kitterle replied that the focus was both on preparing teachers and also on student learning, and that the emphasis was on making the process seamless. S. Willis asked if the committee wanted anything from the faculty at this point; F. Kitterle said that right now this was just an information item.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sue Willis – report

Keith Saunders has primary pulmonary hypertension and is resigning from ISU; we sent him a card. HB2805, which would put a faculty member on the IBHE, passed the house. The possibility of a new SURS board is a concern; the governor has said he might appoint all new board members (who now have staggered terms), plus the chair and the executive director. This would considerably reduce the board’s insulation from political pressures.

The IBHE submitted its budget request last December but the appropriations process will not begin until mid-April. The FY03 rescission should be final soon. It is possible that next year’s cuts may be targeted (we would be told what to cut); the IBHE did an administrative cost study for the Bureau of the Budget but it has not been made public, as it is a “draft”. We need to keep an eye on it to see that it emerges from draft status at some point. There is a lot of public misunderstanding of the role and functioning of higher education; this tends to lead to a lack of sympathy.

The Illinois Articulation Initiative has some drawbacks – it is voluntary and therefore sometimes ignored; it tends to lead to additions of requirements for majors without dropping any, so that the requisite courses cannot be completed in four years.

Statements of concern were drafted about the SURS board and about the FY03 and FY04 budgets. It was pointed out that higher education is not the cause of the budget problems in Illinois; indeed, a vibrant and strong higher education system is part of the solution.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Beverly Espe – written report

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report
The President and all the Trustees have been working very hard supporting NIU in Springfield. Chair Sanchez made a very strong statement in favor of NIU keeping the income fund local. Trustee Siegel wrote a letter to the Star urging everyone to write letters to their representatives and to the governor.

The President, at the direction of the Board, is looking into a technology surcharge. The Board passed both constitutional amendments – one updating titles and one changing University Council members’ start dates of July 1 – on the consent agenda.

F. Council of Illinois University Senates – Sue Willis

The purpose of the CIUS is to promote the interests of Illinois public universities; the membership consists of the chair of each university’s Faculty Senate (or equivalent). Several resolutions were passed: supporting the inclusion of a faculty member on the IBHE; opposing the creation of a super-board which would combine the IBHE with the ISBE and the ICCB; supporting the reinstatement of the 5th year of MAP funding; supporting the retention of the income funds at the universities; and opposing the uncompensated move of health insurance funding from the state to the universities.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair

J. Newman-Ryan asked for any feedback on adding +/- to grades, either pro or con. It can be sent to her or to the Faculty Senate office.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair – no report

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C.T. Lin, Chair – no report

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Mark Cordes, Chair

1. Proposed Statement on Honoring the Academic Calendar

M. Cordes moved the following statement, from his committee:

The faculty of Northern Illinois University are committed to honoring the entirety of the academic calendar. The regular meeting of classes throughout the academic year is integral to the University’s core mission of excellence in teaching and instruction. Faculty should only cancel classes for appropriate reasons and only when it will not interfere with a course’s educational integrity and objectives. In particular, faculty are not to regard class days immediately before or after breaks, vacations, or holidays as less important than other days, and should not cancel classes simply to extend the break period. At the same time, it is recognized that important reasons occasionally exist for canceling a class, and it is within a faculty member’s academic freedom to make such decisions.
The motion was seconded.

M. Cordes explained that the motivation for the statement was to address the “vacation creep” problem that some had worried about when the University Council extended the Thanksgiving break to include all of the Wednesday before Thanksgiving (rather than starting at noon).

There was extensive discussion about whether or not it really was within a faculty member’s academic freedom to decide to cancel class. It was suggested that the final sentence could be deleted but the maker of the motion declined to accept that as a friendly amendment. A motion to that effect was defeated. The question was raised as to what would happen with the statement; it could simply be posted and publicized, or could be forwarded to the University Council for inclusion in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual or elsewhere. The maker of the motion then agreed to replace the words “academic freedom” with “discretion”. The question arose as to whether there was already a university policy covering this issue, and if so, what it is. [There is not]. Then it was asked what the purpose of the motion was; it has two (possible) purposes. One is internal, to discourage faculty from canceling classes when not necessary; the other is external, to assert that we do in fact put learning first when making these decisions. Some faculty are required to fill out forms before they travel, explaining the purpose of the trip and how instructional responsibilities will be taken care of; however this is not a universal practice and is not required [even for workers’ compensation coverage in the case of injury, according to S. Cunningham].

It was moved and seconded that voting be postponed until the present policy (if any) can be clarified. The motion passed.

2. **Statement** on the Need for a Grievance Process for Faculty Misconduct Against Students (Page 11)

M. Cordes moved that the Senate approve the following statement:

The Faculty Senate recommends creation of a grievance process for allegations of faculty misconduct against students.

The motion was seconded.

The motivation for this motion was the existence of incidents that were not settled at the department or college level; the committee thought that a process should be established to handle these. S. Willis said that she was aware of the problem and had intended to work on it after the new grievance procedures for faculty and staff were out of committee.

Questions were asked about the definition of misconduct, how the policy would be created, and how it would be implemented. The policy itself would define misconduct; in order to become policy it would need to go to the University Council. Statistics on the number of such incidents do not exist, although the seriousness of some of them makes this an important issue even if the numbers are small. The policy would not cover incidents that are already covered under existing
policies such as sexual harassment or discrimination against someone in a protected class, nor would it cover issues that are within a faculty member’s academic freedom to decide.

D. Wagner suggested that, rather than just making a statement, the Senate should draft something. The motion was amended (as a friendly amendment) to include referral to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

The motion passed.

E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

1. Ethics Statement ACTION ITEM

G. Bisplinghoff moved that the following statement be included in the Faculty Senate Bylaws as Article 9; the present Article 9 would then become Article 10.

Article 9. STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS FOR FACULTY AT NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

9.1. Faculty, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject as researchers and scholars is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although faculty may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

9.2. As teachers, faculty encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Faculty demonstrate respect for student as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Faculty make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They do not discriminate against, exploit or harass students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

9.3. As colleagues, faculty have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Faculty do not discriminate against, exploit or harass other faculty member or staff. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas faculty show due respect for the opinions of others. Faculty acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Faculty accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

9.4. As members of an academic institution, faculty seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although faculty observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek
revisi

on. Faculty give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, faculty recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

9.5. As members of their community, faculty have the right and obligations of other citizens. Faculty measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, faculty have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

The motion was seconded; there was no discussion, and the motion passed.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – John Novak, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

R. Miller asked about the results of the outside consultant’s study of the image of the university; S. Willis said she would find out what they were.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Acceptance of Nomination letter from Sue Willis (Page 13)
B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
C. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
E. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
F. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
G. Minutes, Graduate Council
H. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
I. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
J. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

XIII. ADJOURNMENT