
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

President Willis called the meeting to order.

II.  ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis:  I would like to add one thing to the Agenda. Under Reports from Advisory Committees, I would like to add an item F, which would be a report from the College of Illinois Senates which I attended a couple of weeks ago. With that amendment, do I have a motion to approve the Agenda?  Second?  All those in favor say aye.  Opposed?

The Agenda was approved as amended.

III.  APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2003 FS MEETING  
(Pages 3-6)

President Willis:  Moving to the approval of the minutes of our last meeting which was on the 5th of March, could I have a motion to approve the minutes?  Is there a second?  Any discussion or changes or amendments to the minutes?  All those in favor of approving the minutes as written?

The minutes were approved.

IV.  PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
**President Willis:** I have very little myself under President’s Announcements. The only thing I wanted to mention is that I phoned up President Peters this morning and caught him just as he was leaving to go to the airport and said “what is going on” and he said “we still don’t know”. We were supposed to hear about the FY03 rescission on Monday and then we were supposed to hear about it on Tuesday and we still haven’t heard about it. He says we have the phone tree all set; in fact, someone in Public Affairs called me up last week and wanted my home phone so that whenever this news comes out, I can hear about it. So far, nothing. So, what can I say?

A. Anne Kaplan and Frederick Kitterle will be attending to discuss the **P-20** Initiatives (Page 7) and hand-out – walk-in

**President Willis:** We do have Anne Kaplan and Fred Kitterle here who are going to be discussing the P-20 Initiatives. You have a handout about that in your packet on page 7. So, Fred and Anne? Do you want to come up here or what do you want to do? Whatever you do, do it at a mike, okay?

**F. Kitterle:** What we’re here to do is to give you an update. Let me remind you about the following. At a University Council meeting, the President came forward and indicated that as a result of the efforts of Stan Ikenberry of the U of I, the presidents of the twelve public institutions of higher education in the State of Illinois got together to talk about an issue which is central and pressing in this state and in this nation. It has to do with elementary and secondary education as well as pre-education and there is, and always has been, pressure – and certainly with the new governor there’s even more pressure – on accountability for institutions of higher education and the way in which they are responding to helping schools. As a result of what is referred to – and this is not a sports team – the “Ikenberry 8” – are eight recommendations that came out of the presidents’ meeting. A number of us who are deans were rather concerned about what the “Ikenberry 8” means for us. The President was obviously concerned about what all of this meant for NIU and its position as a leader in the preparation of teachers and in the professional development of teachers. As a result, he put together a committee, consisting of Vice President Anne Kaplan, who is Vice President for Administration and Outreach, which makes sense; Marilyn McConachie, who is the assistant, Administrative Assistant to Anne, as well as Chris Sorenson who is the Dean of Education; Harold Kafer, the Dean of Visual and Performing Arts; Shirley Richmond; and myself. All of these four colleges are directly involved in preparation of teachers and in professional development. In addition, the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, with representation by Promod Vohra, was part of that; the reason for that is that significant numbers of grants, and many of you know Jule Scarborough, have been generated out of that college. In collaboration with us and the College of Education, we have been doing a number of things on professional development in the area of mathematics and science in the Rockford schools and in rural school districts, all handsomely funded by the National Science Foundation. At any rate, what we did was we came together to think about these challenges and to think about them in the context of several important things, not the least of which are high expectations but dwindling budgets and competing, compelling demands that we have as deans and administrators of colleges. As a consequence, what we did was we sought out a strategy for how NIU could approach the so called “Ikenberry 8” and also as
a way in which NIU could serve as a catalyst for conversations on what is an extremely important issue for us and for the state.

Let me talk about the first part. It is fairly clear that the strength of the faculty at Northern is diverse. It is significantly interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary. It has generated, I think, some important outcomes as a result and there are five partnerships; science, math and technology, approaches to special need students, the fine arts, and applied research. We feel that that is a way in which Northern can make a contribution and, when we go back to dwindling resources, we get significant amounts of grant money in that area. The areas that we have just identified fit well with the national agenda of where funding is going to go. So the point is that we’re not looking at resources like peanut butter on a sandwich spread, thinner and thinner, until pretty soon we say “where is the peanut butter?” So we feel that this is strategic, it is an important decision, plus these are important issues politically to be addressing.

The second point, and an important point, is to begin to galvanize deans of other colleges, and so we called together what is called a “P-20 Summit”. We brought together the Deans of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education, Engineering, VP&A, Health and anyplace that had something to do with teacher preparation/professional development. We hosted that at NIU-Naperville on the 30th and the 31st of March. We had thirty-five representatives across the state so we had every university represented. The idea, and those of you in mathematics who know about Coombsian measurement technique, we called this “unfolding P-20”. The real central issue was how do we collaborate; what we have is the five issues that we raised. How can we effectively serve our educational partners; make certain that educators in the initial stage of preparation gain appropriate content knowledge – these are central issues by the way in teacher preparation; provide professional development to ensure highly qualified educators in the field; more effectively address issues of assessment and accountability in the development of educators; and last, but not least - and significantly of incredible importance - is influence the public agenda of educational policies. These then were the issues that were before that group. The outcome of it all was - we will feed you, but you got to produce at the end of this- that we have a white paper, which we are putting together, and that white paper will deal with these issues. They are attempts to work in a consortia manner. This is really critically important. What we mean by that is that the issues, these issues that are identified, are complex. They are multi-dimensional. They require interdisciplinary approaches and interuniversity approaches. If we can, and many of you know in the sciences that inter-institutional agreements really can lead to significant grants and contracts that allow a whole group of people with limited resources, if you will, to come together on important issues. We looked at that as important because in partnerships, what happens is if we all hang together, we can make a difference. If we lose partners then no institution can have it hung on them that they failed to deliver. So we think this is strategically an important way to go and economically a very, very smart way to go because as a consortia arrangement, it really is the case that the strength of our argument is the combined wisdom and intellect of faculty across major institutions in this state. So that gives you an idea of what we were about and what we are putting together.

The other part of it – and all of you have lamented and this came out at University Council – so many times, too often, do we write Illinois Commitment and what we’re doing each year in the Results Report to the IBHE; somewhere, somehow, this information gets lost in the shuffle and it
doesn’t make its way to any legislator or, as Pat Henry or as Sue may report now is “well, why
don’t you tell us about these things?” and the answer is “well, I thought that’s what we do every
year”. So, one of the things we are going to do is look at creating a consortia clearinghouse of
information. We are going to be working with some of the advisory people on boards of colleges
that have prepared messages. In advertising we’re going to look for more effective messaging.
The other thing we are planning to do is work with state legislators, people who have been
friends to this university like Judy Erwin, in ways in which we can more effectively
communicate to legislators that make their job of communicating to their colleagues more
effective, easier. So, those are part of the strategies that have come out of this. Already I will
tell you that we are planning for virtual meetings in math, science and technology and in the fine
arts. Some of the reasons for meeting in the fine arts have not just to do with supporting fine
arts, but to reinforce the notion that accountability and assessment are not simply a quantitative
test score but must have a qualitative dimension. So the fine arts role is not just the fine arts, but
to really talk about practices that are qualitative in nature and we feel that that is an important use
of our colleagues in that area and we have a working group on that issue as well. So, I wanted to
just give you a summary on what we have been about and some of the context for that and some
of the strategies and to also indicate to you that we are well aware of the fact that we’re doing
this in an environment with diminished resources and we are trying to find a way to position the
institution well that we can respond by bringing resources external to the GR money that we have
already coming into this institution. Anne?
Are there any questions? David?

D. Wagner: Yeah, I’m not quite sure – this has been talked about before, the P-20, I object to
because it makes 17, 18, 19, and 20 identical in nature to the first 16, but when you talk about
meetings of fine arts, is that including just the people from the colleges or are you including
those meetings – people from high schools, second and third grade, etc.?

F. Kitterle: Let me indicate David, a couple of things. First of all, the first summit was a
Dean’s Summit. We plan on having another summit coming up in April that engages other
stakeholders as well so that’s one thing. The other point though, and I think that you raised this
and I’m glad you did raise it - the check will be outside - the P-20 Initiative is really, and the way
it needs to be looked at, David, is that what we are talking about is student learning. I think it’s
important to keep that in mind. That what we are interested in, it’s not just the preparation of
teachers but the reason for it is to enhance student learning. By looking at that, we are talking
about a seamless, we hope, process that involves people. Certainly we all know that to the extent
we are working well with colleagues in elementary, in secondary – it means that it’s easier for us
when they come to Northern in terms of what we have to do, whether it’s remedial or
remediation or non-remediation. The other part of it, though, is by stressing, and this was part of
our two-day meeting, the importance of the critical nature of student learning. What we are
talking about is the following, that this is an integrated approach. Remember, all of you in this
room, when the IBHE came after our PhD programs and argued there are scholars and teachers
and if we get rid of all those researchers, we can get more people in the classroom and the
strength of our argument was teaching and scholarship are inter-related and if you take away
from one, you hurt the other and it is not transparent to undergraduates either if you do that. The
point is if we’re looking at a tax on higher education, let’s be very, very clear. That affects
student learning and it affects this whole seamless nature and it affects the state. It goes right to
the heart of the Illinois Commitment about workforce training and the way in which workforce training starts is in our schools. So this was actually deliberate to talk about P-20 as a seamless thing. The other thing is normally what you hear is we talk about P-12, but remember what’s happening or with P-16, is more and more people are coming back to get master’s degrees. People are coming back in alternative degree programs so we’re thinking of a much, much broader spectrum in that. So that just explains why we’ve chosen that term.

D. Wagner: I understand the reasoning but for one thing, you talk about the relation of teaching and scholarship. The relation of teaching and scholarship is far, far different in 17 through 20 than it is in P-12 and I just don’t think that distinction is recognized by talking about P-20, so I would propose it be called P-16 + 4. No, I’m sort of serious. That would accomplish what you want but distinguishes the last four years.

F. Kitterle: I just feel if you have a plus in front of something in this day and age, you can put a minus in front of it. But your point is well taken. I think what you illustrate is that there are qualitative and perhaps quantitative differences up and down that continuum. Nevertheless, there is also an issue of common purpose here.

President Willis: I was just wondering, is there anything you would like or would accept from the faculty at this time or are you just letting us know what’s going on.

F. Kitterle: What this is right now, Sue, is an information item, the realization of this and the way it’s going to unfold and take reality. A lot of this is going to engage a number of people on campus and we are – I mean, certainly in math and science – we’re going to be doing it. I will simply tell you right now where this approach is going to start to unfold. Many of you who serve on CITC are aware – or maybe you aren’t aware and you still serve on CITC – that what is coming forward is an approach, an integrated approach, to the way in which we are going to be preparing students. We hope to prepare students in a standards-based environment in the sciences and so here is just one example of a way in which we are going to be moving ahead. So faculty are going to be involved but what we hope to do is, as these things unfold, as opposed to seeing them as separate, what we want to do is to be able to tell a coherent story and we want to be able to tell that within the context of a coherent state-wide story.

President Willis: Okay, any other questions for Fred or Anne? Okay, thank you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

President Willis: Let’s see, moving on, I have no items for Faculty Senate Consideration nor is there anything under Consent Agenda, so let me move to Reports from Advisory Committees, which I guess is mostly me this time.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sue Willis – report
President Willis: Pat Henry was not able to go to the FAC meeting last Friday and so I went. I will give you a short report on what happened there. Keith Saunders, who many of you may remember was the Chair of the IBHE through last year, is ill. He has primary pulmonary hypertension that he’s being treated for, but he’s resigning from ISU, so we sent him a get-well card. A bill called HB2805, which would put a faculty member on the IBHE, which is one thing that the FAC has been interested in for a long time, passed the House. I don’t know what its status is in the Senate at the moment. There’s a concern about the STRS Board; what the Governor wants to do is sack all the Board members. Right now they have staggered terms, and he wants to appoint new people, plus he wants to appoint the Chair and the Executive Director of STRS. So the FAC is obviously not happy about this. One thing that having an independent, well relatively independent, board and certainly an independent executive director does is it insulates STRS from politics at some level. There had been pressures during previous administrations for STRS to invest money in things that the Governor particularly liked and they were able to say no, we’re not going to do that. So, I’m not saying that would happen necessarily but obviously it raises that concern.

Then we had some general discussion and a short business meeting. The IBHE, as you probably know, did its budget in December but at this point, it’s more or less irrelevant. We’re just going to have to wait and see what the Governor’s budget looks like in order to fasten it to some kind of reality. As I mentioned earlier, the decision on the FY03 rescission is supposed to be made this week and as soon as I know – or as soon as the President knows, I’m sure he’ll want everybody else to know. He’s been very good about that.

Let’s see, the cuts next year, which we will almost most certainly get, may very well be targeted in the sense that they may tell us what to cut rather than saying, we’re cutting your budget by x%, now figure it out. Nobody is thrilled about this but that’s how it is.

The IBHE did an administrative cost study for the Bureau of the Budget but it is not public at the moment because it’s a draft, at least that’s what the Bureau of the Budget says. So one thing that we discussed, and it’s unclear that it isn’t going to be a draft forever which would be unfortunate, so one thing that we discussed at the FAC was somehow engineering a freedom of information act request to see it. So that may happen at some point.

It was pointed out that there is a lot of public misunderstanding of higher education, what we do and how hard we work and things like that. This tends to lead to a lack of sympathy and so that’s something that we would all like to address.

Finally, there’s the Illinois Articulation Initiative, which has to do with transferring credits, particularly from junior colleges to four-year universities. There were some concerns that this was voluntary and so it’s often ignored. Furthermore, in order to keep everybody happy, majors tend to keep adding requirements but never remove any so that if you look at the number of courses that you actually need to graduate, it’s very hard to do it in four years. So that was a concern. There was also a concern about the Gen Ed Science Panel, which was micro-managing how people could do their Gen Ed science classes.
We did have a short business meeting at which the various committees met and reported. Someone asked what the private universities could do, and it was said they could certainly speak to the legislators about SURS and budget cuts and that kind of thing because that doesn’t really do them any good either. The Personnel Committee drafted a statement of concern about SURS and what I was telling you about the Board. The Budget Committee also drafted a statement of concern about SURS and about the FY03 rescission and about the FY04 budget. Someone made what I thought was a very good point about the position of higher education in the state which is that higher education is not the cause of the budget shortfall in Illinois or anywhere else but we can very well be part of the solution. So, cutting higher education – particularly disproportionately – is really not a very good idea.

Okay, so that is all I have to say about the FAC. Does anybody have any questions about that? Okay. Yes? Oh, I’m sorry, yes?

**D. Rusin:** You said we could be part of the solution. What do they propose that we do? I ask that to offer services where we can. I don’t feel like I can dig in my pocket and find 5 billion dollars.

**President Willis:** I understand that, and I think the remark was focused more towards the state than to the individual universities. If we have a strong higher education system, it may not fill a 5 billion dollar budget hole between now and September, but it’s part of a long-term plan for a healthy economic environment in the state. Do what we do is we just keep on doing what we’re doing and make sure everybody knows about it and we point out how much the dollars that they put into higher education come back. President Peters had a study about that - and I think it was reported on in either the Star or the Mid-Week - that said how many dollars you get back for every dollar you put into higher education, and it’s considerably more than one, so that was the main point. Not that we should do anything different but that really, just by virtue of what we do anyway, we’re not just a drain on the budget. Okay, any other questions?

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

**President Willis:** The Academic Affairs Committee did not meet nor did the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee.

**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 – report (Pages 8-9)**

**President Willis:** The Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee did meet. Bev Espe wrote a very nice report, which is on pages 8 and 9. Unfortunately, Bev is out of town and Sara Clayton is sick. I was also at that meeting so if anybody has any questions about it,
I would be happy to answer them. I don’t think there are any big surprises in there other than things that you know about, bills that could adversely affect the university and this sort of thing and the budget and what have you. Okay, any questions about that?

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report.

President Willis: Let me go on then and give a very brief report on the Board of Trustees’ meeting which was on the 19th of March. As is usual as in all these meetings, the budget was dominating any other subject of discussion. Manny Sanchez, the Chair of the Board of Trustees, made a very strong statement supporting NIU and higher education in general and the faculty and retaining the income fund here which means we get to keep the tuition dollars that students pay instead of sending it to Springfield and then maybe later they send us some of it back. He and all the trustees have been working very hard at lobbying with the legislature. Every time the President has been down there, there has been at least one and usually more trustees with him so they have been very, very active and are very, very supportive of us.

Let’s see, Myron Segal wrote a letter in today’s Star. I don’t know if you’ve seen it but he made those same points at the Board of Trustees’ meeting – write letters, get your neighbors to write letters, get your students to write letters, get your students’ parents to write letters. Anything we can do will help I think and higher education really needs help at this point.

Okay, so moving away from the budget, let’s see – well, not quite – but sort of, the administration, namely President Peters and whomever he designates, at the request of the Board, is looking into a technology surcharge. The idea is that it could be used to pay for a new student information system, smart classrooms, improved websites and all that kind of thing. That is, as I say, under consideration. There is not a specific request yet.

There were two constitutional amendments that were passed by the University Council and then went to a faculty referendum, one of them making basically cosmetic changes to bring the titles of people up to what the current titles are because there are old titles in there. The other one was changing the start dates for University Council members to July 1 as we have already done here. Both of them were passed by the Board on their Consent Agenda so there was no discussion.

Okay, so that was the Board of Trustees. Does anybody have any questions about that?

F. Council of Illinois University Senates – Sue Willis

President Willis: All right. I’ll move on and you’ll get to hear somebody else. The Council of Illinois University Senates. This is a group consisting of the Faculty Senate Presidents of all the public universities in Illinois, so there’s about a dozen of us. It’s a fairly new group. It’s been around for maybe three years and we’re trying to meet twice a year. We did meet twice this year. The idea is that there really is no advocacy group which represents public universities in the state. The Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE has representatives not only from the public universities but also from community colleges and from the private institutions. There’s no faculty member on the IBHE. So there is no voice that represents just public higher education. So the idea was that we could be that voice. We passed a number of resolutions and
will be refining them and then they will come out. One was supporting the inclusion of a faculty representative on the IBHE, which, as I mentioned before, has been passed by the House. There has been discussion of the creation of a super-board, which would regulate all levels of education, and we did not like that because we think higher ed would get lost. This would be, I believe, instead of the IBHE or over the IBHE or something like that. Obviously, if you mix us in with K-12 and have one board that’s in charge of everything, it would not be in the best interest of higher education, is what we said.

Let’s see, we supported the reinstatement of the Fifth Year of the MAP funding for student assistance. We supported the retaining of the income funds at the universities, which is what we have right now. We didn’t use to. This is where – right now, when students pay their tuition, their checks go to NIU and then we use that money to provide them the services for which they have paid. You would think that would make sense. The state would like to have control over that, and what they would like to do is what they used to do up until about six or seven years ago which is when the students write the checks, we send them all to Springfield and then they come back to us sometime later or some part of them comes back as part of our budget. So the state would like to do that again and the CIUS did not think that was a good idea. This is one of the things the President and the Board of Trustees have been fighting about also.

The other thing is that we had expressed concern about the thing which happened last year, which you may have already forgotten about, where we had to take on part of the health insurance costs, remember that, instead of the state paying them, all of a sudden the university had to pay them and so effectively, that was a budget cut because it was costs that we had to pay that we didn’t use to have to pay. So we made a resolution about that too. So the idea is that we will write these things up and then distribute them and we can have the various senates endorse them. We can send them to newspapers as letters to the editor and that sort of thing.

Okay, any question about the CIUS, which, by the way, is pronounced “see us”?

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair

President Willis: Okay, let’s move on to committee reports. Academic Affairs, Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: We have no report; I just have a call for information. At the last Senate meeting we had a request that we consider +/- grading. Some of you who have seen my office realize that I have trouble throwing things away so I have a whole set of surveys from the last time this issue came up, but I think we need a new set of information so I will ask Sue and the office to send out a general e-mail to everybody who can send things back or post it on tompaine or mail things to, I guess, the Faculty Senate office and we’ll get them. I think we need a broad representation on this issue. Four years ago when it last came up, people were fairly split on advantages and disadvantages, so if you have an opinion one way or the other or facts from other places where you’ve been that have used that system, I’d appreciate some information.

President Willis: Okay, we can get that organized.

President Willis: Okay. That’s it, right? Okay.

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

President Willis: Economic Status, Jim?

J. Lockard: No report.

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C.T. Lin, Chair

President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget, C.T.?

C.T. Lin: No report.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Mark Cordes, Chair

President Willis: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Mark?

1. Proposed Statement on Honoring the Academic Calendar. (Page 10)

M. Cordes: We have a report that is in the packet sent to you, two items found on pages 10 and 11. I will begin with the first one, the Proposed Statement on Honoring the Academic Calendar. If you recall, this was referred to us at the last meeting to address the problem that Sue termed “vacation creep”. It’s the notion that the day immediately before breaks and vacations, there’s the habit of some faculty, I suppose, to cancel classes and there’s perhaps a snowball effect that takes place. I believe the University Council recently changed the calendar so that beginning year after next the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, the entire day will be off and I think that’s the genesis of this concern here, the fear that in that case, pretty soon people will be canceling classes on Tuesday and then we’ll end up having the whole week off. So we were asked to come up with a statement. We did come up with a statement on page 10 which we are bringing before the Faculty Senate and would ask that you endorse this statement.

President Willis: Are you making that a motion?

M. Cordes: I’m making this a motion.

President Willis: Okay, is there a second? Okay, any discussion or questions or comments? Yes, John?

J. Wolfskill: I’d like to say that I certainly agree with the principle of this motion, excuse me, of this proposed policy. I believe that the policy as written would be a vast improvement over nothing. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it is too weak and I believe specifically to say that it’s “within a faculty member’s academic freedom to make non-emergency cancellation of classes”
in my opinion, just is not right. I believe that academic freedom extends to the content of what does or does not go on in the class, but actually having the class, in my opinion, de facto is really a contractual arrangement and I don’t think it is within a faculty member’s right to make non-emergency cancellations. At the very least, I would want to see such a thing approved by a supervisor, a department chair or analogous figure. For that reason, I would speak against the motion.

President Willis: Yes, Bill?

W. Tolhurst: I want to agree with John. It seems to me we already have the kind of policy we need with regard to the use of the final exam period, when apparently there was a comparable problem with giving final exams on the last day of the class and blowing off the final exam time so they could get their vacation for the summer done earlier. Essentially that that kind of policy would be just the sort of thing we need to deal with this problem.

President Willis: Let me point out that we’re making a statement of principle; we’re not really making a policy here. One thing I suppose that could be done, Mark, I don’t know if you’d consider just leaving off the last sentence and just not mention it. Did your Committee discuss that?

M. Cordes: No, we didn’t really discuss that matter. My own feeling, and I can only speak for myself at this point, I feel that last sentence is pretty important. We can maybe finesse it a little bit but I think what probably goes into the last sentence, for instance, canceling a class to speak at a conference, which is a common practice at the Law School. I think that faculty have to be concerned about not doing that too often but I think that to present papers, attend conferences, so forth is not an emergency, and yet is a valid reason. A second example would be the day after September 11, for instance. I would guess about half our faculty cancelled their classes; the other half did not. I believe it’s within a faculty member’s own discretion to make that sort of decision. I think there are other examples. I’m sensitive to the potential of abuse and, you know, maybe we can modify the language but at the same time I believe that there are non-emergency situations in which a faculty member should be able to cancel a class.

President Willis: Okay, Bill?

W. Tolhurst: I agree that there are such reasons and, nonetheless, do not think that the last sentence is necessary in the policy because people have been and do do this and there’s nothing in the policy that would object to that so I move that we amend the motion by deleting the last sentence.

President Willis: Okay, are you willing to accept that as a friendly amendment or should we vote on it?

M. Cordes: I’m not willing to accept it myself.

President Willis: Okay, yes?
**L. Kamenitsa:** You pointed out that this is not actually a policy, simply a statement of principle. Where else will this go?

**President Willis:** I had thought we could post them on our web page, for example. If we wanted to have it be more like a policy, we could put it in our Bylaws if we wanted to. That would take a little more process to do. We could suggest it to the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee to put in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manuel. That would not be an inappropriate place to have it. I think first it would appear in our own records that we are on record as making the statement and then if we want to make it more formal, then we could figure out what venue that should take. Yes, Bob?

**B. Miller:** I’d like to have the Committee clarify how canceling classes is tied to academic freedom?

**M. Cordes:** I’d sure be willing to put in the word “discretion” instead of “academic freedom”. That’s a somewhat vague concept I would agree and I’m not tied to that particular language. I personally like the idea behind the last sentence. I have no problem changing the wording including deleting “academic freedom”.

**President Willis:** All right, we have a motion on the floor to delete that last sentence entirely. Are we ready to vote on that particular motion? Okay, all those in favor of deleting the last sentence raise your hand. Okay, those opposed. I’d like to count again, sorry. All those in favor of deleting that last sentence please raise your hands, nice and high. All those opposed to deleting the last sentence. Okay, the no’s have it so the sentence stays in (19 to 21). Yes, David?

**D. Wagner:** I’m not sure. I used to have a friend that would instruct me on how to use “only” but I’m pretty sure the third sentence should read, “faculty should cancel classes only for appropriate reasons”.

**M. Cordes:** If it’s okay with the rest of my Committee, I’m willing to do that.

**President Willis:** All right, are there other changes that people want to suggest to that last sentence to make it more acceptable? Bob, first?

**B. Miller:** Will they accept as a friendly amendment to drop “academic freedom” and change it to “discretion”?

**M. Cordes:** If it’s okay with the rest of my Committee, I’m willing to do that.

**P. Smith:** I’m not sure if I understand the difference between the third sentence and the last sentence “faculty should cancel classes only for the appropriate reasons”. To me, that’s saying faculty recognizes that there’s important reasons to occasionally cancel classes.

**M. Cordes:** Yeah, I mean, the last sentence is a little repetitious and I – the reason the last sentence is there I believe, is because the tone of most of this is strongly suggesting that we not
cancel classes which I think is an important statement to make but the last sentence there is just to kind of put it in perspective and to clarify that we’re indicating that there are appropriate reasons which is already mentioned and that faculty members can make those. So, I agree that it’s a little repetitive but I think it’s simply kind of an offset to the tone of the rest of the statement.

President Willis: Okay, so are we accepting “discretion” instead of “academic freedom” in the last sentence as a friendly amendment?

M. Cordes: Yes, well does anyone on my Committee object to that? No? Okay, that’s fine.

President Willis: All right. Yes, Mylan?

M. Engel: I have a question; I’m still a little confused about what this is that we’re voting on. It’s not a policy. I would assume there’s already a policy that probably prohibits classes for inappropriate reasons?

President Willis: I wouldn’t be surprised. I don’t know off the top of my head. What would we do with this statement? I think that’s a good question. I mean, why bother? I think it serves a couple of useful purposes. One is it puts us on record as understanding that the holding of classes is obviously important and if, for example, legislators come and say “how come you’re canceling classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, your people aren’t very dedicated are they?” and then we pull this out and say “no, look, here’s what they said”. So it serves a political purpose and then as I said in response to the earlier question, we could explore doing something more formal with it. That would take more time. We could put it into our Bylaws somehow. That’s something where we’d have a first reading and then an action item. The Academic Policies and Procedures Manual - that would go through the University Council, so those are all possible avenues. It would be more formally on record than if we just do it here. My own feeling is even just for political reasons, that it would be wise to be on record with this statement or something like this.

M. Engel: Just to follow up, so if we approve this the people who routinely cancel classes before the Wednesday before Thanksgiving can just continue to do so?

President Willis: Well, people will do that anyway. I’m not expecting this to change anything anybody does. Okay? This is a statement of our intentions and our values as faculty. It’s not a statement that we have the power to actually hold any particular individual faculty member to them, because we don’t. Yes, Bill?

W. Tolhurst: Two points, one is if we’re doing this for political purposes, I wonder about the political wisdom of implementing a policy that clearly implies that faculty members have been irresponsible in canceling classes before vacations. That sends a message too. Second, since we don’t know whether there are any relevant procedures in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, we don’t know whether this statement is consistent with those policies if any there be.
President Willis: Okay, well as I say, this is within the context of the canceling of classes on the Wednesday morning before Thanksgiving. As a general statement, I’m not sure it makes sense to put that in there, but perhaps that could be the framework of some kind to put it in context for the moment. I take your point, I mean, I’m not sure if we come out and say that, you know, under the Academic Calendar that that implies that we haven’t been. I’m just not sure. Sheri?

S. Spear: I agree with Bill. We certainly have some procedures such as if I’m going to a conference, I fill out travel requests, I say how things are being covered. The Chair, whomever is the signing authority, does so and we go to our conferences. I think we’re already misunderstood as higher education and I would be leery as to the interpretation that someone would read into this who doesn’t come from academe, it seems to feel like – I know we’re not saying this – but, it would appear to those who are already questioning us “well, you know if you want to have class, fine, otherwise it’s at your discretion”. I would be very careful making this – it might be perceived as - this type of statement that might be misread in today’s political climate.

President Willis: That sounds like a nice procedure. I don’t think it’s a university-wide one. It certainly was not the case in my department. We were pretty much on our own. If we needed to cancel a class, we really don’t need to inform anybody, we just did it. Well, it wasn’t always for travel, I mean, sometimes you had a meeting at FermiLab and, you know, you didn’t get travel reimbursement for that. There was a time when I had to be in Switzerland and I arranged for somebody else to take my class and he cancelled it. It irritated me. Yes, David.

D. Wagner: I was the one who made the motion at the University Council that did this and in part I did it because people haven’t been honoring the academic calendar and missing classes Wednesday morning. I’m going to support this because people have accused me of trying to secretly get rid of Monday and Tuesday also and that was not my intent. There is an implication in this that it’s likely to happen so what if you switched it around and put the focus on the possibility of not dismissing classes when it was necessary on the assumption that we are all honorable faculty members that will always live up to our obligations to keep the proper calendar and then recognize on some very limited occasions we may deviate from that accepted policy?

President Willis: I would suggest that if the group wants some full-scale revisions, it would probably be better to send it back to the Committee rather than trying to do them here. We still have the motion to approve on the floor. Was there another comment? Yes, Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: This is a bad week for me to say this but it seems to me if we’re going to make some comment – I realize this is Faculty Senate and that it’s a faculty driven motion at this point – but, I had a student the other day who insists she cannot come for the entire week of finals. She wants her final at a different time because she’s doing a Budweiser promotion. So, you know, depending on where this goes out of here, I mean, if we’re going to talk about the attention given to who attends class and who holds class, then maybe we need to think about both sides of that obligation. Just a comment.
President Willis: Yes, I think if you held up the faculty and held up the students and said you know, who’s more devoted to education in general, I don’t think we’d have much of a contest. Not that I don’t have many dedicated students, but – I even noticed that myself when I started teaching and it came as a bit of a shock when I realized that if I didn’t go to class, it wasn’t going to happen. I couldn’t just skip class like I used to when I was a student. It’s a different kind of position and it’s a different kind of responsibility. Anyway, yes Mylan?

M. Engle: I just want to follow-up on Bill’s point. It would be nice if we knew what, if any, policy already exists before we vote on this. This might be totally redundant. It might be inconsistent with current policies. Is there a way to find out what the existing policy is, if any, before we decide to pass another non-policy statement?

President Willis: Sure. I can’t find that out this instant but I can find it out and we could look at it next time. Somebody has to make a motion to that effect. Yes?

A. Windelborn: Augden Windelborn, Physics. This may be a dumb question but would excessive canceling of class or canceling for inappropriate reasons be considered faculty misconduct? I only mention that because I’m reading the next page while we’re talking and I mention this because a number of students who have complained about the number of times that certain faculty have cancelled class. I know of one case where it was cancelled three times out of eight sessions in a four-week period and no reason given to the students. So, I’m just wondering. Would that apply?

President Willis: It’s certainly possible. I mean, I don’t think that’s a question that has a yes or no answer.

M. Cordes: I don’t think it has but to be honest with you, that is not the type of misconduct we’re concerned about on page 11. In fact actually, I would not want the Grievance Policy that would address that. I think that’s a problem and I think it needs to be addressed. I’m not sure that’s the type of thing that a student should be able to have a formal grievance against. That’s my own opinion. So I would want that to be a part of it although I would hope that the department chair or someone else would address that in an informal manner.

President Willis: If you look at the reasons of how you can get rid of tenured faculty, you can do it if they are engaging in egregious misconduct or really not doing their job at all. So, if it gets bad enough, you know, you could start looking at that kind of procedure but I would think it would have to be pretty extreme.

S. Mini: Then I’d like to make a motion that we hold off on voting on this until we find out what the current policy is.

President Willis: Okay, it’s been moved and seconded that we postpone until next time, right, and I will look it up in the meantime. All right, so we have a motion and a second to postpone this until the next time and I will come back with more information about existing policies. Is there any discussion about that? Yes, David?
D. Wagner: In the meantime, shouldn’t the Committee at least think over what we said? They might also want to change.

President Willis: That’s certainly up to them. I mean, I’m not going to tell them not to think.

M. Cordes: I’m not sure how to change it in light of what’s been said except, I mean, there seems to be a very substantial minority position to eliminate the last sentence, but other than that I’m not sure what direction we have and unless I hear members of my Committee wanting to meet to talk about this and revise it, I don’t plan to convene the Committee for that purpose. If people here give us some direction I’d be willing to do it but I haven’t heard enough direction at this point.

President Willis: Okay, David?

D. Rusin: In that case, I guess I’d like to offer some direction. I mean, I saw this statement and I thought it looked perfectly reasonable in the context of the discussion from this arose. But now that we’re starting to have this broader discussion, I have to say I’m just astounded that it’s understood that there isn’t an expectation that the faculty are going to be there every single day. If I’m going to be sick, if I’m going to be out of town on a conference, I will not cancel my class. I will have someone else cover my class for me. If I’m sick, I’ll call in and probably what will happen is that the Chair will probably find somebody to cover my class at the last minute. I mean, if I sent my kids to the public schools and I found out that the teachers were from time to time just not showing up or not doing anything, that would annoy me. I used to get very annoyed when they would have filmstrips for several days because the teacher wanted to do something. I have kids who are at this university and, speaking now as a parent, I was very upset to discover that my kids had no class for a week or I think two weeks because their instructor was off on some field work or something which may have had valid professional reasons behind it, but doesn’t really mean that the class should be cancelled. There really has to have been some kind of substitution policy. Every time we go do travel and I think it’s not just because you’re requesting travel reimbursement, but every time we were going to leave our campus responsibilities, we had to fill out that authorization to travel in part because if we got run over by a car or something there’s this medical insurance thing that’s supposed to cover us and in that some form – this is the one Sheri was speaking about before, we had to say how were our teaching and other responsibilities going to be handled. So ----

B. Goldenberg: If you don’t fill out that form you’re not covered by insurance.

President Willis: Okay.

B. Goldenberg: That’s policy.

D. Rusin: I’m looking very quickly to see which of our committees would have to draft a policy if there isn’t one already and Mark, I think it’s you and Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. If there is not a statement that says faculty is expected to be there, I don’t know how to say you have to be there every day because I know the faculty when they are not supposed to be at a
meeting or in front of a classroom, they will take the day to do their work at home or in the library or something. That’s fine but, gee, you talk about the reputation that we have as academics in the public sphere, this is one of the things that makes us really look bad. I want to be in the office every single day until the janitor tells me to go home.

**M. Cordes:** I think this policy to a certain extent does that, maybe not in the terms that you’re suggesting or to the extent that you’re suggesting, but this policy says that faculty are to take their teaching obligations and having classes meet very, very seriously and it’s not a light commitment, it’s not something to be cancelled for the slimmest of reasons. Now, my own experience and my guess is that it varies from department to department. I assume in the math department from hearing you and John talk that you have a set of requirements that are probably at one end of the university, but surely the practice in my department is that faculty are there pretty much every day, we occasionally get people to sub for us if we’re gone, but we usually don’t. I personally rarely cancel a class. I think I’ve taken one sick day in the last five years or something and canceled a class and I have a few times cancelled classes to speak at conferences but usually I will decline a speaking engagement if it will interfere with my schedule. But other people will cancel on occasion and it’s pretty rare for us to bring somebody in to teach for us. If possible, we will make up the class. For some classes I can do that and if I can do it, I will always make it up, where other classes because of scheduling I can’t. I guess my point is that I think this statement more or less says what you’re saying. I don’t think this is suggesting that showing up to teach your classes is not a major commitment and a major expectation on the part of faculty.

**President Willis:** We do have a motion on the floor to postpone this until next time and in the meantime I will find out if and what existing policy is. I’m hearing things in both directions like we don’t want to imply that everybody isn’t in the classroom all the time that they’re supposed to be but on the other hand, everybody isn’t in the classroom all the time they’re supposed to be because there are all these stories of people complaining about, or students complaining about, classes being cancelled. I’m sure these are isolated incidents, but they’re not nonexistent. I would like to vote on the motion to postpone unless somebody else has something to say about that motion and then we can come back. I assume it’s going to pass and we can come back next time and I’ll tell you what I’ve found out. All right? Okay, is there any further discussion on the motion to postpone? Okay, if not, all those in favor raise their hands. Opposed? Okay. I will find out what information I can. If information is there, I’ll find it. If anybody has any further thoughts or feedback or suggestions, you can certainly feel free to send them to me. I assume Mark will like to hear them too.

**M. Cordes:** If for some reason there’s an outpouring of people suggesting that we take a new approach or something like that, I’m certainly open to having the Committee meet again and talk about it.

**President Willis:** Okay.

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

**M. Cordes:** We have – now that we’re done with the hard issue, we can move on to the easier one. Turn to page 11. This is a statement on an issue that was not referred to us by the Faculty Senate but rather it came up within the Committee itself. What we’re asking for is that the Faculty Senate endorse the material in bold at the very end, that one sentence, essentially recommending the creation of a grievance process for allegations of faculty misconduct against students. We’re not saying what form that grievance process should take. We’re not necessarily saying what sort of incidents should be within or without that process. We think that there needs to be a commitment that should be put together to explore that issue a lot more. I think it needs to be a committee that would have a lot of people of different parts of the university community involved in it. I think just as a general matter we would recommend that the Faculty Senate endorse the creation of some grievance process for allegations of faculty misconduct. Just a little bit of background, it was brought up within our Committee that several members have heard stories, allegations of what would be very egregious misconduct on the part of faculty against students, not missing three out of eight classes, as serious as that might be, but of a different nature. Tim Griffin gave us information, a very sanitized set of case histories that involved issues of misconduct. We looked at those, discussed them and a member of the Committee researched what some other universities have done and had found some universities that had set up a grievance process or had at least directed sub-units of the university – various colleges, departments – to address it and set up their own grievance process by which students could have some sort of formal process for faculty misconduct. We realize that there is an informal method that occurs, but students should have the right and do have the right to approach department chairs, deans and so forth and my own personal feeling is that probably in the majority of cases, that works fairly well. In fact, any grievance process that might be created, I think, should emphasize the need to resolve informally if possible. But the fact of the matter is it doesn’t always work. Department chairs aren’t always as responsive as they might be, or at least there’s allegations to that effect and after discussing this issue at several different meetings, considering the case histories that we saw, looking at what some other universities had done and the recommendations they had made, the Committee felt that it would be appropriate to make a recommendation that a formal grievance process for students be available. It’s our understanding at this point that there is no process by which students can bring a grievance against faculty for misconduct, a formal process does not exist. Again, there’s informal means and so with that bit of background we would bring this proposal to the Faculty Senate and again would ask for their endorsement for the bold material at the end of the page.

**President Willis:** Okay, so you’re moving ---

**M. Cordes:** Yes, again this is a motion that the Faculty Senate adopt this. Again, all this is intended to do is set up a process by which some committee somewhere, and I assume this would go to the University Council with a recommendation that a committee be formed to explore this. I might add it’s our understanding at this point that there is a committee that has been looking at various points about a more unified process that would cover staff and faculty grievances and that kind of highlighted the absence here that there’s a process underway that would help – a process by which faculty and staff would be protected by a grievance process and what students
themselves would have no process against faculty – and that might have made it even a little bit more compelling to us to make this recommendation.

President Willis: Okay, so you’ve made a motion. Is there a second? Okay, it’s been seconded. I would like to speak to it just for a moment and then whoever else wants to speak can do that. I certainly agree with the necessity for this. It’s my experience that – although there’s nothing that says that students can’t bring complaints against faculty, there is, in fact – there’s no instructions, there’s no process and we do have processes for other types of complaints and so this is actually on my list but it’s not on the top of my list at the moment. The Committee of the University Council – well, that’s on my list at the moment also – is almost done with a unified procedure for faculty and staff. It was decided not to include students in there I think partly because they’re not – well, this was written with the idea that it was discussing people who were actually employees of the university and so the considerations are a little different. My intention was that once I get that out, to then turn to the one for students. So, I’m well aware of this lack. By the way, there was a student who had come to me a number of times with complaints and I was very limited in what I could tell him to do. He finally wound up coming to the Board of Trustees and then raising a complaint. I think if we had a process in place, I can’t say that wouldn’t have happened, but it would certainly be much less likely. Okay, comments, discussion? Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: I think this is fine. It seems to be important. I would just raise the issue as somebody has said today, we don’t have a definition of misconduct so that seems to be a related issue.

President Willis: That was a part of the ---

J. Newman-Ryan: So wherever we forward this to, I would want somebody to look at some definition for what is and is not misconduct.

President Willis: That would be part of the grievance process. It would list what it covered. The one we’re working on now does that also. Okay, John?

J. Wolfskill: Mark, you hinted at this but I’m still not clear. What group or body would create the policy or the process and what group would approve it and what group would enforce it?

M. Cordes: It’s unclear to a certain extent on purpose because I’m not sure we have all the answers to that. I would think that the University Council would be the appropriate body to make a decision on whether a grievance process for students should be created. I would think it would be most appropriate for that body to form some sort of working committee that would look into the issue that would involve faculty, administrators and students on that committee and, again, that committee would be looking at a process but part of that would also identify the types of misconduct that would be included and would not be included in this process. In terms of enforcement, I think the grievance process itself – the policy that is created – should somewhere state the enforcement process; how it’s enforced, who oversees it and so forth. So, you know, that’s kind of a preliminary response but I think probably the University Council would be the appropriate body to make some of those decisions.
President Willis: The grievance policy that is being worked on now is being done by an ad hoc committee of the University Council. It was formed about three years ago and indeed you’re correct there, we do have stipulations for – it says if you have a complaint you do this, and so and so shall respond within x number of days and if they don’t then, it tells you what to do next. So, in that sense it has enforcement for if people are not responding or whatever, then it tells you what your options are. Yes, Mylan?

M. Engle: Do we have any information about what percentage of students that have encountered faculty misconduct have not been able to deal with the problem through the channels that already exist?

President Willis: Tim, do you know anything about that?

T. Griffin: Since there is no official, or for that matter unofficial record kept of most of those interactions, there is no data.

M. Engle: Well, could you then – since I assume sometimes the students come to you, do you have some sense of how significant of a problem it is?

T. Griffin: I certainly have a subjective sense of how significant a problem it is. I believe we’re not talking about large numbers of people to my knowledge and if that is how you’re assessing significance, it is of low significance. However, when one feels that one’s educational and perhaps professional career is perhaps in jeopardy or has, indeed been ruined, one might argue that a very small number is significant.

President Willis: Bill?

W. Tolhurst: I would find it helpful if we had some idea of what kind of thing we’re talking about. As a recovering chair, I know I had on occasion to deal with issues that appeared to be issues of creating a hostile climate for women in the classroom and other things that looked like they might involve sexual harassment and it was made clear to me when I was being trained up that that was my job to deal with that stuff in an appropriate way. Are we talking about sexual harassment, things like that that are clearly illegal?

President Willis: Well, we already have a sexual harassment policy in effect.

W. Tolhurst: That was my assumption and so I was unclear what kinds of misconduct would fall under this.

President Willis: We also have a Grade Appeal Policy so this would cover types of misconduct that are not due to somebody being in a protected class, for example. I expect there would be, and maybe Tim can speak to some of the things that he’s seen, in general terms. Some of examples I’ve heard with the – because the same question came up with faculty and staff, why do we have to grieve against anybody, we have all these policies anyhow for anti-discrimination and all this sort of thing but it doesn’t list everything. There was an allegation of someone who
was prejudiced against people with southern accents, he treated them very badly – he or she, I don’t know which.

**W. Tolhurst:** And students wouldn’t be able to grieve a faculty member’s choice of how to deliver class material using group projects for example and things like that.

**President Willis:** I would think that things that fell under the rubric of academic freedom would not be covered. You would, I think, be able to grieve different kinds of mistreatment, faculty refusing to talk to them and then giving them bad grades or whatever.

**W. Tolhurst:** Well, it would be very helpful to know what kinds of things, having some sanitized actual examples would be helpful.

**President Willis:** Tim, can you speak to that or would you rather not?

**T. Griffin:** I would feel more comfortable providing you copies of what I gave to the committee and allow you to use your discretion as to the number of those and the degree to which that might be most appropriately distributed. I did release it to the committee, however, I will add with the caveat it not be forwarded. It is sanitized. Unless someone is actually involved in one of the cases, they wouldn’t have a clue as to even what department or college it was in but I nonetheless always tend to err on the side of cautiousness when it comes to dealing with matters that are otherwise confidential.

**President Willis:** Well, one example would be if you look in the catalogue, in some departments there are a number of courses which are required for the major which say “one of the pre-requisites is permission of the department” and so there could be an instance where a student felt that permission had been denied for unfair reasons, reasons having nothing to do with the student’s academic qualifications. So that would be a possible example. Yes, Mark?

**M. Cordes:** Just in reference to those sanitized materials, and I won’t go into particulars, my own impression is that although in all the cases the incidents were completely inappropriate, I would probably have only said at most half of them would be the types of things that would fall under this process. First of all, there were three or four sexual harassment incidents, which are already covered. There were several things which I felt probably would come under academic freedom even though I personally would not want to teach a class in the way the professor was, I would not be willing to have a student have a grievance process against it. But there were some extreme allegations and, again, from my perspective they’re allegations. I don’t know if this occurred or not, but these are allegations of threats that faculty members were making to students. Some extremely demeaning comments in the context of a class that had absolutely nothing to do with the course material and at the same time, would not fall under a protected classification. Threats to students to fail them in classes, to fail them on comp exams, things like that, if they went to the faculty chair and talked about something which happened in the class, those sort of incidents and some others. I think that in the process of putting together a grievance process one needs to spend a long time thinking about and identifying those things that would be appropriate and are not covered elsewhere and those things that really would come under
academic freedom. But I'm sensitive to your question and I think it might be a good idea to be able to give some very general examples to people in some manner.

**President Willis:** Yes, I think the – I mean, you just have one little sentence here, that there ought to be a grievance process, which I personally agree with. There are a lot of details in actually making one, which are not in this sentence, and I think if we approve this, it should be understood that those details will be dealt with. That seems obvious to me but clearly once the process gets started, there would be a lot of opportunities for input and discussion of all these various things. Yes, David?

**D. Wagner:** Yes, I said this before and never convinced anyone, but if the Senate’s going to have any power beyond moral suasion, it seems to me it lies in the power of initiation. To merely say let’s send it up to the University Council is useful, but I would prefer that these issues be debated at the Senate. I think the debate on what would count and how it should adjudicated would be held more appropriately at this level rather than the University Council. Then send up something to the University Council that is far more concrete than just sort of begging them to take up the problem.

**President Willis:** Okay, well this could be the beginning of that process. I don’t imagine we would want to do that as a body; we would want some small committee to work on it so this could be the impetus for that.

**D. Wagner:** I would agree to that but at least then it would come to the Senate and be debated and a fairly concrete proposal be forwarded to the University Council.

**President Willis:** Right, as I say, this simple statement here doesn’t specify any of that so all of that is certainly possible.

**J. Engstrom:** I think I disagree with that. I think it would be important for any discussions like that to involve students and other people that might be involved so if we wanted to make this just amongst ourselves and then send them the package, I don’t think that’s an appropriate thing. I’d recommend this go to the Council and have a group that would include faculty and others but also include students.

**President Willis:** Well, I think this body cannot make policy anyway in that sense. So as I take David’s suggestion, that instead of just saying please do this, we would come up with some kind of draft and then the Council would presumably send it to a committee that would have, as you said, faculty and obviously yes, students need to be involved. But we would have staked out some ground and said here’s what we as faculty think about we want in this and so forth. Yes?

**W. Tolhurst:** Well, it seems to me if we’re willing to recommend this be developed it would be more helpful if we recommended that somebody look into developing it, perhaps a committee of the Faculty Senate and, in fact, charge that committee to come up with some language that we could talk about and then forward to University Council. To simply pass the recommendation doesn’t identify the folk who are being urged to do something about it and so everyone can then say, not my problem.
President Willis: I think it would be, let’s see.

W. Tolhurst: If I knew which committee was the relevant committee I would make the appropriate motion to amend. Rules and Governance maybe?

President Willis: Rules and Governance would be appropriate. There are a number of possibilities.

W. Tolhurst: Or just sent it back to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

President Willis: We could do that.

W. Tolhurst: I move that we amend this, that the Faculty Senate recommends ---

President Willis: Or even Academic Affairs, but ---

W. Tolhurst: What’s that?

President Willis: I think that the committees that would be relevant would be Academic Affairs, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities or Rules and Governance. I think any one of those could work.

W. Tolhurst: O.k., I have a motion to amend. The Faculty Senate recommends that the committee for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities develop a draft of a grievance process for allegations of faculty misconduct against students.

President Willis: Was that a second? Okay. Do we want to – so that’s a proposal to amend it. Do you want to accept it as a friendly amendment or should we vote on the amendment?

M. Cordes: I would be more than willing to accept it as a friendly amendment with the understand that it’s next year’s Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee that will be doing this.

President Willis: Yes, I think everybody understands that.

M. Cordes: Okay, then I accept that.

President Willis: All right, so we will refer it to next year’s – we’ll probably refer it to you to begin with but it will take longer than between now and three weeks from now which is our last meeting anyway. This will be an ongoing process for next year. All right, so we have a motion to request the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to come up with a draft of a grievance process for use of students who are alleging faculty misconduct. Right? Is there any further discussion? Okay, all those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The motion passed.
M. Cordes: I just have one more comment, I take it that the passage of that motion indicates that the Faculty Senate is supportive of this concept and at least at this early stage, realizing that there’s not a lot of information that’s been given yet, but at least at this early stage the Faculty Senate supports the idea of a grievance process or is at least considering the idea of one.

President Willis: I would certainly think so. Otherwise, you wouldn’t have much to draft. Does that end your report?

E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

President Willis: Rules and Governance, Gretchen?

1. Ethics Statement ACTION ITEM (Page 12)

G. Bisplinghoff: Yes, we need to take action today on the placement of the Ethics Statement, which is on page 12. We need to put that into the Faculty Senate Bylaws as Article 9 and the present Article 9 would then become Article 10. As I understand it is what we need to do is take formal action on this today so, is there any discussion?

President Willis: You’re making that motion?

G. Bisplinghoff: I’m making that motion.

President Willis: Okay, let’s have a second.

G. Bisplinghoff: Now we can go forward. Is there any discussion?

President Willis: Are we ready to vote on that? Okay, all those in favor say aye. Opposed? That was easy.

The motion passed.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – John Novak, Chair

President Willis: Okay, John, Elections?

J. Novak: I’ll be contacting members of the Committee before the next meeting.

President Willis: Okay.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Willis: I do not have anything under either Unfinished or New Business.
X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Yes, Bob?

B. Miller: Either last year or two years ago the university hired an outside consultant firm to study the image of the university and I know several of us took part in that – it was last summer or the summer before – time goes fast when you’re enjoying yourself. Sue, could you tell us what the outcome of that study was?

President Willis: At the moment I cannot. I have not heard, but I will ask. Any other comment or questions?

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

President Willis: I would entertain a motion to adjourn and you can all go outside and enjoy this lovely weather.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.