I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Order, order. We have a lot to do today so let’s get started, the sooner the better.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda? Thank you Dr. Giles. Can I have a second? Thank you. Any comments or questions? I’ve got one. I would like to be awarded the flexibility to move the elections up a little bit if it looks like we’re running late because a lot of you have to take off. We need to have people here to actually have elections so if it looks like it’s getting late and we haven’t gotten to them, I’d like to be able to move them up earlier. All right. All in favor of the agenda giving me dictatorial powers over it, please say yes. All right, thank you. All opposed? Thank you.

The agenda was adopted as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 28, 2007 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 4-7)

P. Stoddard: Up next is approval of the minutes from the meeting of March 28. Thank you Dr. Giles for so moving. Thank you Dr. Kimball, Dr. Thu. Any corrections, comments, etc.? All right. All in favor of approving the minutes please say aye. All opposed? Okay, we’ve got minutes.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

P. Stoddard: Next up we’ve got to go into Executive Session. We’re going to evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Personnel Advisor. So in order to do this, we need to have all non-voting members and the President of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Personnel Advisor leave the room and Dr. Thu, our Vice-President, will take over for the meeting. So if you don’t have a vote, if you’re a member of the press, if you’re just an interested onlooker, please vacate and we’ll get called back in as they finish up. Yes, yes we do need a motion. Thank you. Any discussion? Okay, don’t eat all the cookies. No promises. Okay, so all in favor of going into Executive Session say aye. Opposed? Okay. Okay, yeah we can discuss – you’re referring specifically to recommendations? Yeah, I think that would be legitimate to do.
**B. Miller:** I think that Jody’s ??? discussed before at Faculty Senate related to the awareness of the campus about the fact that the Faculty Personnel Advisor, or perhaps I should say lack of awareness, on campus about the Faculty Personnel Advisor and I wonder if we might make it more of a formal motion that we refer this concern to a committee to explore more carefully as opposed to having it just hanging every April?

**P. Stoddard:** Right. I know last April we referred to specifics on the procedure by which the advisor is evaluated and some of the specifics and that’s actually working its way now – I think that we’re going to vote on that next week at Council to formalize those recommendations but yeah, if you’d like to make a specific recommendation of referring certain aspects of the recommendations made by that committee, that would be appropriate.

**B. Miller:** Okay, well I would like to refer that to Faculty Senate; I’m not sure which committee is the most appropriate.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, well why don’t --- next year’s Senate.

**B. Miller:** I’d like to move that we address the lack of awareness of faculty and staff to the services of the Faculty Personnel Advisor as part “A” of my motion and part “B” is that the Faculty Senate once again push for a line of support, financial support, for the Faculty Personnel Advisor now that we have a new provost.

**P. Stoddard:** Is there a second to the motion? Thank you Cason. Any discussion? All right. I’m debating whether or not to add a friendly amendment that we also consider the electronic version of the faculty handbook.

**B. Miller:** Okay, that would be fine with me. I accept that one.

**P. Stoddard:** Cason would that be all right with you as seconder? All right, so we will also consider ---

**B. Miller:** Some people here don’t know what that is so ---

**P. Stoddard:** We used to get a publication of information useful to the faculty. That has not happened in a long, long time probably due to printing costs more than anything else and various resources and expected behaviors, etc., rights and responsibilities essentially, were delineated in that handbook. So that would certainly be a resource people would know to go to where we could point everybody and say go there and find out what you need to find out about, whatever. I just caution that this is going to be a major undertaking and that next year’s senators willing to consider it without promising to produce it, but it is going to be a non-trivial exercise.

**B. Miller:** Some of that is also linked to the Faculty Development website, some of those resources and I think they share that with new faculty but I think as a part of a publicity campaign, we might be able to link it. I mean, just linking things through the Faculty Senate website I think would be very useful.
P. Stoddard: Yeah.

B. Miller: In terms of some of these resources.

P. Stoddard: It’s not clear how many people would think to do that, to go to the Senate website to find – but, you’re right – it would ---

B. Miller: Linking it from A-Z.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, it would be a very useful thing I think. Okay, all in favor of the motion? Opposed? All right. Thank you. Any other discussion on recommendations or comments made during Executive Session that are not specific to personnel. All right.

The motion passed.

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council

B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty Personnel Advisor

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: All right, moving on then. I just have a couple of, well, first off, we need to take a moment to recognize people who have completed their terms, who are going to sign on for a second term or who are signing on for the first term. In the first category, people who have completed their terms are Pam MacFarlane, Janet Holt, Brianno Coller, Judith Hertz, Elvia Arriola, Daniel Kempton and Greg Barrett. So let’s give them a big hand and thank them for their efforts. Returning are Jack Marchewka and Alan Rosenbaum. Thank you both for agreeing to come back. Newly elected are Clerisida Garcia, Lars Luetkehans, Milivoje Kostic, Jeffrey Brown, and Michael Peddle. So thank you all. Yes?

???: --- in Nursing.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, go ahead.

M. Valle: I’m Mayi Valle from the newly created department of Nursing and Health Studies and I was the senator for School of Allied Health Professions but now I will be the senator for Nursing and Health Studies.

P. Stoddard: So we had a departmental merger and as a result, we have a new – well, one – you have become one. I don’t know if you’re being considered that or not. Also, I’d like to comment, she’s not here today, but Bobbie Cesarek from SPS has been re-elected president of that body and therefore will be joining us again for the next three years on this body so congratulations to Bobbie and we look forward to working with her and the full SPS in the upcoming years. So once again, let’s give everybody a big hand. Very good.
A. Recognition of Faculty Senators whose terms are:

**Completed**

Pamela MacFarlane, Kinesiology & Physical Education  
Janet Holt, Educational Technology, Research & Assessment  
Brianno Coller, Mechanical Engineering  
Judith Hertz, Nursing  
Elvia Arriola, Law  
Daniel Kempton, Political Science

**Re-Elected**

Jack Marchewka, Operations Management & Information Systems  
Alan Rosenbaum, Psychology

**Newly Elected**

Clersida Garcia, Kinesiology & Physical Education  
Lara Luetkehans, Educational Technology, Research & Assessment  
Milivoje Kostic, Mechanical Engineering  
Jeffrey Brown, Law  
Michael Peddle, Political Science  
Gregory Barrett, School of Music

B. Institutional Privacy Policy

**P. Stoddard:** I just want to point out a couple of things that are coming down the road some of which may or may not impact you directly. First off the President has been very concerned recently with institutional privacy procedures and there’s a task force that has just started meeting to examine this. This is in the wake of inadvertent information disclosures, peoples’ social security numbers getting out and so forth and state law is very specific on the university’s rights and responsibilities in terms of protecting private material, private information. So this task force is being charged with looking at what the university does, how we do it and how to minimize the changes that the information gets out that shouldn’t be getting out. This may, since so much of this is electronic nowadays and so much of the privacy software for example is new and doesn’t operate on old machines, departmental offices that have machines that are more than five years old might be forced to upgrade those. Now there is a recognition of course that that’s going to cost money and that this is probably an ongoing thing as new software is developed, new machines have to be bought. This is one of the concerns that we’ll have to be talking about is can we mandate that a department upgrade its machines. If so, is there funding available so that the department doesn’t have to bare that and so forth. How we deal with paper. I’m sure that those of us who’ve been around for awhile have reams of paper, some of it old stuff, that does have social security numbers on it. How is that secured? If it’s just thrown in the bottom of a drawer someplace where anybody could get to it, that’s not such a good thing. So there will be
some things coming down the line that we’re going to have to keep an eye out for. There are three people from the academic side, as far as I can tell, myself, Dr. Bose and Dr. Seaver and the rest of the folks are — well, there’s university police involved, several people from the university judicial office, several people from ITS and so on. Those are the main people looking at this so I’m thinking it’s up to the three of us to make sure they understand we’re an academic institution and not an institution in charge of protecting people’s privacy as a first priority. Obviously we want to protect people’s privacy but we need to also remember we’re here to teach. So anyway, if you’ve got concerns about this — this is something that they’re trying to finish up in like the next two to three months and so before we meet again, there may already be a policy that’s been drafted. So if you’ve got specific concerns, please pass those along to me or if anyone in your department has specific concerns, please pass those along.

C. Parking Committee

Next up the parking committee, a couple of things to keep an eye out for. The visitor lot — I think you can get in for free or a reduced admission after 4:00 — that’s going to change and they’re going to charge full price to park in the lot from whenever it opens to 7:00 p.m. so if you’re trying to get back on campus and want to park there at 6:55, they might charge you $5.00.

Also, they’re finally going to be redoing the bridge on College Avenue, that’s leading off campus to the east and, as a result, the parking — well, obviously you’re not going to get into campus over the summer on College Avenue unless you bring your swimming trunks and that parking lot that’s right to the left as you come across the bridge onto campus, that’s going to be closed for the duration of construction. So if you or anybody you know parks there, they’ll have to make alternative plans for the summer. I think access to Gilbert Drive is going to be restricted, again because of construction related activities. Long term, they’re thinking of turning Gilbert back into a residence hall and so that’s going to have a little bit of parking implications as well but not so much for faculty; they’re going to rearrange the student parking out in the lots by the fields there. Those are the main things parking is talking about but also they’re looking at a strategic plan themselves, that’s a key phrase these days, so if you’ve got grandiose ideas about how parking on campus could be made more idealic, feel free to pass those along.

Finally ITS, the Computer Facilities Advisory Committee, really the only thing I think that’s going to be of major interest is they’re upgrading Blackboard to 7.1. They’re going to do that at the end of May. They’re trying to get it in between semesters. My understanding is all the old features are very similar to what you’re used to already. There will be new features which presumably you wouldn’t be used to already and may require some training of some sort or at least some playing around with them but I think if you don’t try anything new, you should be all right. Go ahead, yeah?

J. Pierce: I have a question about intersession courses that may be using Blackboard. How are they going to be effected?

P. Stoddard: I don’t know. That did not come up in our meeting I’m afraid but let me check into that and get back to you. Okay? Write me an e-mail to remind me and so I’ll know how to respond and everything. That’s a good point. I know they always try to do it to minimize the
problem. Of course, there’s always the situation where somebody is going to get caught. So I’ll ask about that.

Finally, somebody asked during the year about lab usage. I think this came up at the end of last semester. There are students who apparently were having trouble getting on to computers in the labs while other students seemed to be playing games or checking out ?? or whatever. The thought is that it would be easy to make a sensible policy on computer usage in the labs but it would be virtually impossible to enforce and so what they’re doing – they’ve got software now that the lab supervisor sitting in the lab can tell students that there’s a free lab down the hall or downstairs or whatever building with ten open terminals or whatever so – terminals, ten open computers so at least that should help eliminate some of the crunch that students are feeling. So if you get complains from your students about being able to access labs, tell them to contact, to talk to the supervisor. Yes?

N. Churek: I’m Natalie Churek, Accountacy. How would that work when we’re operating a class in there if there’s a lab terminal with 42 terminals and we have 38 students. If some student lab person going to send them down to our lab telling them we have 4 extra terminals.

P. Stoddard: Are you operating that as a specific class?

N. Churek: Yes, we operate classes in our labs and is somebody going to be sending over students saying “oh, there’s 4 terminals and not 32”?

P. Stoddard: I suspect you should be able to say we’ve reserved this lab for this class period and then people would not send anybody.

N. Churek: I mean we do that but I mean it sounds like the software is going to say there’s 4 terminals there and they’re going to get their hopes up and then to find them ----

P. Stoddard: Right. I understand what you’re saying. I don’t know for certain but I strongly suspect there is a reservation system built in in terms of classrooms.

N. Churek: In that software? Okay.

P. Stoddard: And if not we’ll make sure that something is done anyway because that’s a good point. Okay, other questions about what the friendly folks at ITS are up to? Okay. They are friendly but not always as helpful as you’d like but they’re always very friendly about it, at least to me.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Moving on, we have two items, perhaps one, for Faculty Senate Consideration. You should have in front of you a report from Tom Sims who is also a member of the Graduate Council, just giving us an update on what types of issues they’ve been talking about and whether or not they’re issues that faculty as a whole as embodied by this body, feel the need to express
concern. So I’ll take a look at that. If there are issues, probably the best is to keep them in mind for the beginning of next year.

Ideally we would have had a similar report from the representative to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council who appears not to be here today. Is there anybody else on the UCC who’s here? Would you – I know this is putting you on the spot but can you very briefly address any major issues that have come up that you think might be of interest?

L. Darscheid: Hi, I’m Linda Darscheid. We’ve always been updated by the PeopleSoft course numbering kinds of issues but otherwise we really haven’t gotten into much else at UCC for issues, just sort of ongoing issues.

P. Stoddard: Okay, so no new ??? advising centers or such. All right. That was quick and easy. Questions? Yes?

J. Pierce: I’m concerned about the PeopleSoft renumbering. The College of Ed decided what to do for each of their courses. Is this supposed to cover all courses in the university? We did not follow this particular scheme.

T. Sims: Tom Sims, Graduate Council. Yes, it’s supposed to cover all courses in the university. This was the general scheme that the PeopleSoft people or the university people dealing with PeopleSoft recommended to Graduate Council be followed and generally departments were asked to submit basically just a spread sheet showing the course renumberings and obviously a process like this immediately gets into all sorts of complications with screwed up course numbers and duplicated course numbers and whatever. So individual departments had to do a little bit of tap dancing around, you know, the specifics of the policy so I think the general idea is as long as it ended up working in terms of however an individual department wanted to renumber it, that was fine.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions? Okay.

A. Update from Undergraduate Coordinating Council

B. Update from Graduate Council

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Daniel Kempton, Chair – Chair – report (Pages 8-9)

1. Report for Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment

P. Stoddard: Moving on, report from Academic Affairs?

D. Kempton: Thank you. Daniel Kempton, Political Science. This report is not actually of the
Academic Affairs Committee but if you recollect, at last Senate meeting, we heard from Associate Provost Gip Seaver about the ad hoc committee on enrollment and what it does and it was recommended very kindly by Professor Thu that the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee attend that meeting which I have now found out meets monthly. I did find it kind of interesting. I put together – I don’t have to read all of this, I’ll highlight a few points, pages 8 and 9 of your packet. It is a large committee meeting with just about everyone related to enrollment attending. We were given some of the facts that I’ll highlight for you. The enrollments are running slightly slower than they were – admissions are running slower I should say than last year. They have opened a hundred seats on the waiting list. They do that with a combined what they call index score of 125 or higher. I’ve learned that an index score is 3X your ACT score plus your class rank is how you get your index. So these are sort of interesting issues that faculty may not be aware of, how those decisions are made. The target for new freshmen is 3,050-3,100. We got a breakdown from various offices. Traditional honor students are down, the target there is 255 – it should read to 260. The transfer students are slightly up but they think that may be because of easing the procedures and that much of it can now be done electronically. CHANCE admissions are also up, 648 versus 633 last year. Again they talk about show rates and not all of those who have accepted will actually show. There wasn’t much discussion of actually what this means or policy decisions. It was largely a reporting of where we’re at in terms of enrollment. I don’t know who’s created the targets or how they got created but they didn’t get discussed, not at that month’s meeting anyway. The one policy issue they mentioned is currently in APAS and the consideration that we would be eliminating the Pass/Fail system. We would still have S/U grading. If you’re not familiar with the different, Pass/Fail is a student’s option so an individual student says I want to take this class Pass/Fail. S/U is a grading system that is tied to all students in a course so the department decides whether they’re going to use S/U grading. Apparently the number of Pass/Fails every semester is quite small, minuscule. So we went through quite a number of these issues. I guess they will continue to do that monthly. I was a little disappointed to find out that it seems like overall that the number of admissions was down but the number of lower quality students was up. The number of honor students was down so putting that altogether there’s a little bit, again this is only one meeting, but a little bit that worried me in terms of the trend. I guess in terms of you all need to know about this, again if you want the detailed information I’ll put probably a longer report and most of you want to be here. I think what we ought to do is continue this process for a year and then next May have the Senate come back and reconsider whether they want to have a faculty representative on that committee. Sort of demo this for a year and see whether it’s a waste of time or whether actually useful. So that would be my suggestion after attending one.

P. Stoddard: Okay, in the back begin.

J. Pierce: If there’s a concern about the lowered quality of students, it might be because you’re combining 3X’s the ACT plus the class rank so if you’re first in your class, that’s not going to make much of a difference.

D. Kempton: I don’t know if that’s a percentage, I was madly taking notes because most of this is unfamiliar to me. I’ve never even heard of that; is that how that gets combined?

P. Stoddard: It seems to me – yeah.
D. Kempton: That would hurt you to be first in the class.

P. Stoddard: I suspect it’s got to be percentile.

D. Kempton: I was thinking that if you were in the 90 percentile, you were in the top 10% and that was good and they add a dot ---

P. Stoddard: ???

D. Kempton: It still seemed like rather you could get a 20 ACT take that times 3 and be in the 65th percentile which means you’re probably a low C student and still get in with this new alternate list.

P. Stoddard: Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: I realize you might not know the answer to this. Do I read this right or do I recall from when Vice-Provost Seaver was here talking about this admission fee is relatively new. We were the last big school in Illinois to do this or something. Okay. If I’m reading this right, 500 students have not been admitted since they didn’t pay this fee? This seems like a lot to me. I don’t 500 out of how many but that just seems like a lot. I don’t know how many total – what the total number of students who were not admitted is. We never know that but 500 seems like a lot that they simply didn’t pay the fee. I mean are they made aware of that in a way that – that seems like a problem, I don’t know.

D. Kempton: I don’t know the answer to that question. That is correct; you’re understanding it right. Five hundred students, again, we’re talking about an excess or 4,000-5,000 applications here but 500 of them did not opt to include the fee either by accident or by intent waiting to find out whether they got admitted first. I’m suspecting they get a letter that says you did not include the fee. We will announce your decision when we get the fee but I will ask questions specifically.

J. Newman-Ryan: It just seems like a lot to me but maybe it’s just me.

K. Thu: I think Dan already addressed this issue but I think I would like to know where these target numbers come from. Who makes the decision about the target for incoming freshmen? Does that come from the Director of Admissions and are there mechanisms for soliciting faculty input on that aside from Daniel being anointed to go to the committee?

D. Kempton: Again, being this was the first meeting I attended, I don’t know the answer to that. I will certainly ask. I’m suspecting the targets got put together sometime last August to October somewhere in that period when they started the enrollment process. My guess is that this committee does have some input on that which is why faculty may want to be involved in the process because it seemed to me that discussions about how many we can handle were being brought up there. Now keep in mind there’s the second committee that Gip mentioned that
consisted of advising deans that he talked about last time. They may also have a role in setting those numbers.

**P. Stoddard:** I think – now I may be talking off the top of my head here – but there are certain broad guidelines or criteria that they follow and those are set either by bodies like APAS or by advising deans who, you know, are facultyish so there is faculty input into it but how those criteria are actually implemented sounds more like what this body is doing and then again we may or may not want a faculty presence there.

???:

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, and as long as it’s Dan, you’re happy. Jeff?

**J. Kowalski:** Yes, Jeff Kowalski, School of Art. I just have a question regarding the past/fail issue and you may or may not know the answer to this either but if there aren’t that many students who are taking courses pass/fail and not putting a new presence on excluding students who are taking courses for regular grades option, what’s the rationale or the reason for eliminating this option for students who might want to explore a little bit without feeling they are risking a GPA?

**D. Kempton:** I was told this a policy issue which is being considered in APAS on which I do not sit and the suggestion was that it was coming from the faculty. That was at least what was reported to us at that meeting, that it was the faculty who would like to eliminate it. So is anyone on APAS?

**J. Kowalski:** No but speaking as a faculty member, I’ve had students ask me or tell me they’re taking a course pass/fail because they wanted to see what I’m teaching but they didn’t feel absolute confident not knowing the material as well so I have a different opinion as a faculty member.

**P. Stoddard:** John?

**J. Wolfskill:** I’m not on APAS but if I can give a speculative answer to the question, may pass/fail enrollments are made in error. What I mean if you look at the catalogue restrictions on this, students can take any course pass/fail except and then there’s a long list and what it means essentially is except any course they really need. Okay? Well many students, whether by accident or design, will enroll in a required course on a pass/fail basis. Once that is done and the pass is recorded on a transcript, later on trying to undo the damage is a great deal of hassle and I speculate that that may be part of the motivation behind this policy proposal but it is just that now, a proposal, in APAS.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other comments for Dan? Yes, Linda.

**L. Darscheid:** Are we still talking about an enrollment cap was it 25,000 or 26,000 students?
D. Kempton: They didn’t give the specific number for next year for the whole enrollment but I believe it is because they were comparing both transfer rates and new freshmen rates to last years’ so I believe there’s no change in the target population, in the target student population.

P. Stoddard: Okay? I’m going to make use of the temporary dictatorial powers you granted me so generously and move on to Elections and Legislative Oversight and so Professor Hansen would you like to ---

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Moving on to our original schedule, it looks like we have no report from Economic Status.

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: I think we do have a walk-in from Resource, Space and Budget.

C. T. Lin: The Resource, Space and Budget Committee the walk-in ??? this report here so let me just read. On March 21 we met with Anne Kaplan, Vice President of Division of Administration and University Outreach and she explained that, you know, in her Division there is actually a combine ??? supervise ITT network, NIU TV, radio, Outreach and Government Studies. She said the combination of those services because they try to help ??? the P-20 Initiative and she also mentioned about she was very excited about this ??? Project that is planning to be operational in 2011. She said that, you know, in her unit there heavily is entrepreneur type of thing. Approximately 70% of budget come from local funding and also from the service provided by NIU. She continued to talk about the Outreach Program one of which the units facilitates the off-campus class and she said that the off-campus class tuition is generally higher than on-campus and she said that the higher tuition really tries to provide a higher faculty stipend. She said that, you know, there is also a certain contract with the school district so therefore the university has provided some sort of tuition waivers for the ??? of NIU students from those school districts. On the other hand, she compared that the off-campus division of NIU relative to the other competitor, you know, NIU’s off-campus division actually is lower than the competitor. She continued to talk about the outreach. She said that, you know, the participation of different departments on the outreach program, you know, vary from department to department. But in term of good market, you know, they always had a good market for education, business, health care and, you know, all those areas. For example in computer science, chemistry, physics, you know, the market is pretty low. She talked about this so-called high speed internet two. Her unit is working toward that to enter large data base through the Fermi Lab as well as Northwestern University and currently the internet two is a link to the physics department. She also mentioned that due to the fact of the large volume of cell phones recently, the income of whatever, the fee, that NIU obtains from the regular phone use is actually down. She said those fees, revenue, actually is very important to support the computer system, ITS, infrastructure and she mentioned that reason we have a some sort of so called download of music ??? by the students. She always works together with the ??? to find students who have down illegal downloading of the music see. Finally, she talk about on-line courses at NIU. She said that, you know, that NIU spend, you know, a little less, you know, the
development of on-line courses is slow compared to the other institutions because NIU spent $15 to $20 thousand on developing on-line courses as compared to other universities who spend about double of that see. So those are the things that she talked about. Any questions?

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you C. T. Next up is Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Jan?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Janet Holt, Chair – report (Pages 10-11)

J. Holt: In January, we were given the charge to look into clarification of policies of academic dismissal of tenured faculty members as well as non-tenured faculty members whose terms haven’t expired yet for cause. There is a due process clause in Article VII of the Constitutional By-laws and that’s where we focused most of our efforts. We gathered information from Paul Stoddard regarding past history of these kinds of cases at NIU. Tim Griffin was able to give us references to resources that we used as well as post some of our questions on the International Ombudsman Association Academic List Serve to get ideas and recommendations of other universities that had clear policies regarding due process with cause. The universities that we looked at for comparison that were recommended to us for comparison was Elburn University, Princeton University, University of Colorado, University of Idaho, University of South Carolina, and Virginia Commonwealth. Based on the review of our policies as well as some of some of the exemplar policies, we felt at least the three areas that were probably were most important for us to put our time and attention to were possible clarification of the definition of the cause for dismissal, the statement of who at the university initiates such procedures and the time table for the procedures to occur. Of those three areas, we discussed all of them and decided not to recommend changes to the definition for academic cause for dismissal and unfortunately I didn’t bring the Article VII with me but just my recollection is it’s a very general definition here and is very consistent with what we’ve seen at other universities and it is something like the dismissal for cause has to be related to the academic fitness of the university faculty member related to their teaching, fellowship, or collegiality. So we did not recommend changes to that. We did recommend some definition of policies, very vague as to who can initiate such procedures against a faculty member and it just talks about university administration and we thought given that the dismissal with cause would have to be for some related to the academic faculty member’s teaching, research or collegiality. That would make sense then that the head of the academic unit at the university, the provost, would be the person that would initiate such causes – initiate the procedures – and that also is consistent with what we’ve seen in other policies. We also noted that in our policy the timetable is much vaguer than what we saw in other policies so on page 11 of your report you can seen numerated 1 through 5 of changes that we recommended in terms of having cleared ??? of these things to occur. So #1, when the hearing committee is convened there should be at least 30 business days after the Provost initiates the dismissal for cause in order to allow everyone the time necessary to prepare for the hearing. Then we did not set and we kind of limit for the hearing itself but after the hearing the hearing committee should make its recommendation to the President within 10 business days. The President shall accept a report and transmit his or her decision to the hearing committee within 10 business days and if the faculty member decides to appeal, the appeal would go to the Board of Trustees and that should occur within 20 business days and then the Board of Trustees would have 30 business days to decide whether or not they want to agree to consider the case.
So those were the two areas of change that we really recommend. First that the Provost be the person to initiate academic dismissal with cause and secondly, some more specific guidelines as to the time frame for this. We also noted that there were some other areas that were less clear in our policies than in other policies that we read. We did not have time – we ranked these lower than the first three – and so we didn’t have time to consider those three and so we would like to pass those on for next year’s committee and those three areas are remedial efforts of conciliation prior to convening a hearing panel, further reviewing whether more details are needed in the hearing process than the timetable, and salary considerations for the faculty member during the hearing process. We’d be happy to pass on the materials that we gathered to review all this for the committee next year.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. I think at this point I think your recommendation then is just to have next year’s committee again and flush out some more of the details. Would that be ---

**J. Holt:** Well, we thought that we did flush out the details in these three areas so we would like to recommend these changes for these areas and then if the committee wanted to further investigate it, these are some areas they could further look into.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. What this body then would do would recommend then these changes to the University Council which is the body that ultimately would make the changes or not. Now in my monthly meeting with the President and Provost Monday, I did show them a copy of this and they expressed a little bit of concern about the timeline in that in the worst case scenario, if you had a faculty member who did something really, really bad, our imaginations have already been activated for us by recent events, and, you know, you address it later in your second – or last paragraph of things you have yet to consider, but they would not want to have to keep someone on the payroll for conceivably half a semester or more while the timeline that you’ve laid out is met. Because that’s – I mean, you know, in certain instances a justifiably long time and you want to make sure everybody has a chance to say what they need to say, but typically in these cases the person being considered for dismissal is still being paid during the process. If you had a faculty member who committed a horrible crime the university and the Board of Trustees would not want to be in the position of still paying that person while the 10-12 weeks of this process went on.

**J. Holt:** Can I clarify?

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, please.

**J. Holt:** There’s only a minimum timeline for #1, so for all the other bullet points 2-5, 10 would be the maximum amount of time. So the minimum would be to give them 30 days to get their materials together for the hearing panel. There’s no timeline recommended for the hearing panel and then the President could make his recommendation within 1 day. The hearing panel could do it in 1 day, so that 2-5 are maximum time points and they were very consistent with what we saw in other policies.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, several comments. I guess, Jody and then Alan.
**J. Newman-Newman:** I have two but I have one first related to this. I don’t know, I don’t know enough about this issue but to me, it seems like it’s not whether they get paid, it’s that you want them removed from the classroom if there’s an accusation but you have to let people – you have to give people a chance to prove that these allegations are real and so they need to be paid until whatever process takes place that shows that those allegations are actually true. I don’t think that pay is really the issue, I mean; you have to allow them to get paid in order to defend themselves until that’s settled. But the big stick seems to me that needs to come in is to remove them when there is some allegation of, you know, a serious crime and they need to be removed from classrooms or whatever so they’re not potentially harming somebody else but I think they need to be paid until we actually know whether these things occurred.

**P. Stoddard:** Well, I’m not expressing my own – what I’m suggesting is that when we recommend this particular set to the University Council, I’m not sure which body that will be that takes it up, but they are going to want to meet with the Provost and hash some of this stuff out. Alan?

**Alan ???:** I have the same comment that Jody had. When the committee is discussing this, we were recognizing that we are sort of charged with protecting the faculty’s interests and no necessarily the President’s or the Provost’s interests. So, keeping that in mind, I think we need to advocate for what we think is a fair process and if the administration wants to argue against that, well they can and I don’t know how that will turn out. But I really feel very strongly that we can’t just say someone’s committed a crime, I mean, they’ve been accused of a crime, but today trials take a very long time to get over with so unless someone pleads guilty and says yes I did it, they’re not going to know that somebody committed a crime for, you know, months or even a year or so.

**P. Stoddard:** There’s actually the point I made also that the President and the Provost – they have heard it. Kendall?

**K. Thu:** I concur with the previous two comments that there’s a due process here and we can’t let recent events hopefully completely eschew our understanding of the myriad of grey areas where this could fall into. I have a question that maybe there’s a ready answer to which is who – how is the hearing committee appointed and who does the appointment?

**J. Holt:** It’s elected by the Faculty Senate so the Faculty Senate elects the hearing, let’s see if I remember the hearing panel and then from the panel five members are chosen for the committee.

**P. Stoddard:** That’s already in the bylaws.

**J. Holt:** Yeah, that’s not something we’re changing.

**D. Mathesius:** We get a list of all the faculty from campus from Human Resources. From there we have a program that randomly picks, I think it’s 20, no it’s 34 numbers. Whosever numbers match up, those names go on the ballet then we send them out to all Faculty Senate members and you get to pick like 14 or 15 names and those are the lucky winners. So again, it’s more or less like picking out of the hat but, you know, they get named to this without saying they’ll do it.
P. Stoddard: Okay, Beth?

B. Miller: We’re talking about cause for dismissal from the university but I believe one of the issues that is emerging here is dismissal from or removal from class which is separate, sort of an immediate removal from class, which is separate from dismissal from the university.

P. Stoddard: This is true, yeah.

B. Miller: I’m a little grey about that distinction and I think maybe that’s also an issue that in light of recent events, is maybe a little – and also recent events on our own campus about, you know, how people move in and out of classrooms, students anyway, how these things are managed, you know, I think they’re two separate issues.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Dan?

D. Kempton: I agree and I think this is not at all about reassignment of duties which could be done instantaneously by the department chair or higher at any point in the process, this is just about completely losing your job and while I agree with the questions about therefore, thirty days preparation being important, in fact, I would go further and ask the committee was the norm thirty days or is this a relatively short period because in a legal proceeding, thirty days is a very short period of time to prepare your case. Was that the standard you found at other universities or why was the thirty days chosen?

J. Holt: What we found was generally twenty to thirty days and they were either days or business days.

D. Kempton: Okay, so you’ve gone on the long side with thirty business days. All right.

Thank you.

P. Stoddard: I’ll certainly express what appears to be the overwhelming consensus of the faculty that, you know, people are innocent until proving guilty and should not be unduly punished before their guilt has been ascertained although, as Jody points out, we do have to sometimes take immediate actions to protect students and colleagues.

J. Newman-Ryan: I just have another question. I’m sorry this is obtuse but I’m really tired so – academic dismissal for cause, is that the wording? Because it seems to me it’s dismissal for academic case because we have other causes too don’t we? I mean academic dismissal seems to me to imply that you could still do your research or something so, is that the right wording?

J. Holt: Yeah, that’s just the wording that we thought – actually, in the Board of Trustee regulations, there are a couple of different reasons why faculty can be dismissed. One of them is this, academic dismissal for cause. Another is financial ???. Another is elimination of a program.

P. Stoddard: Any other comments or questions for Jan? Thank you. A difficult assignment to be sure. Yes, I guess we do don’t we? Yes, sorry. Yeah we need a motion to formally recommend this to the University Council. All right. Any further discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, we’ll bring it up with Council next year.

The motion passed.

J. Holt: I’d like to thank the committee that worked with me on this because we did spend quite a bit of hours on it.

P. Stoddard: No doubt, no doubt.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – report (Page 12)

P. Stoddard: That brings us to Rules and Governance. Is she still here? There she is. Nancy?

N. Castle: You all have a walk-in that actually is a little more up to date than what was sent out in the packet. The third problem we were asked to address this year had to do with the fact that with some colleges there are so few member of units that those people get penalized by getting appointed to an excruciating number of Faculty Senate sub-committees so we were asked to look at ways we might deal with that. We tossed around a whole bunch of things. If you read what was in your packet, one suggestion was don’t worry about it because nobody ever shows up for these committee meetings anyway. Another was well, let’s reduce the number of committees and one particular suggestion was the elections committee because it has to do the work like we had to do today and unfortunately Earl was the only one that showed up so probably he had all the other double appointees. But two did sort of rise to the top. One was that we have Faculty Senate members from the smaller colleges volunteer for whatever committees they want to and then the Executive Committee which has to have a representative from each college, the member of the Executive Committee would sort of by default be the representative on those issues that come up that we need to be sure we’ve got representation. The Executive Committee tends to know what’s going on with all the sub-committees. That was one consideration. Another is to assign each Faculty Senate member to one committee and then to encourage the president to make assignments based on anticipated need and that in the instance when we absolutely need somebody from a college, we could make a request from that college for somebody who’s not necessarily a Faculty Senate member. Ultimately, my committee could not come up with a recommendation and so our recommendation was to turn it over to you all to see if you have any ideas or any possible solutions to this. Also, and I’ll bring it up because I am the current secretary of the Faculty Senate and since the Faculty Senate secretary has no job description, it was suggested that if you eliminated the Elections Committee and just made elections the responsibility of the Faculty Senate secretary, then that would reduce one whole committee and that seems to be a relatively feasible thing because our elections, as long as Donna still works here, they’re pretty routine. So we’re open, I realize it’s late, we’re also open to carry this on next year but I’m sure Paul wants to make appointments over the summer for the fall committees.
P. Stoddard: Yeah, well I mean officially, since this would be a bylaw change, we would have to go through the normal double reading unless we waived it which we could do. Dan you had a comment?

D. Kempton: I’m a little bit leery of #2, although I don’t belong to a small college, it’s not that you can’t trust the president to know when there’s a big issue up there, you don’t always know when there’s going to be a big issue that’s going to effect a college so I think – I like the proposal of eliminating one committee but I’d prefer the first one greatly of having a representative on every committee but making some of those representatives not people who also serve in the Faculty Senate because that reduces the burden. That person’s job could be to find the other representatives to other committees from within their college. I just think that’s a neater solution than the second one which strikes me to leave something of a gap sometimes.

P. Stoddard: Thank you for saying that. No, honestly I share that concern that it’s not easy to see what’s coming down the road and what college needs to be represented where. Beth?

B. Miller: On a related issue, I was going to ask if the strategic plan might affect the Faculty Senate in the way that we restructure or consider restructuring ourselves and our committees at some point and, if so, might that be the work of the Faculty Senate in the next year?

P. Stoddard: The plan itself as far as I’ve seen and I haven’t seen everything yet, does not specifically call for the Senate ---

B. Miller: I know that it doesn’t call for it I’m just asking ---

P. Stoddard: The Senate may wish to align itself more with the goals of the strategic plan. I’m not entirely sure. That’s something obviously once the plan has been formalized, we might want to take under consideration and that might change the whole committee structure of itself. But I think, at least for the time being, I’d like to operate under the assumption that we’re not going to radically change the way things are done. Go ahead Dan.

D. Kempton: I’m sorry I’m speaking too much but let me just try to move this forward by suggesting we don’t waive the second reading because unless you really have a reason to waive the second reading, I don’t like that in principle but I think the heart of the suggestion is one, get rid of one committee; two, allow the representatives from the smaller colleges to pick representatives from other committees, I move that we approve that for a first reading and then carry the second reading over to next year and that way they can take it back to their colleges and see if there’s any problems with it and if it’s still okay next fall, then they could finally approve it but that would at least move this forward.

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have a second. Comments?

J. Wolfskill: We’re talking about a bylaw proposal are we not? I’m extremely uncomfortable considering that even on a first reading, if no official proposal is written down in black and white and these ideas sound promising but with respect, I would like to suggest that this be deferred for
next year’s Senate so that the matter could be presented in a more appropriate manner.

???:

**P. Stoddard:** Jim, do you withdraw? Okay. You realize your last official act may be to withdraw. All right, Nancy.

**N. Castle:** What I can do then and I appreciate the feedback, is to prepare for you for the first meeting in the fall something that would specifically reference what bylaw this would have to do with and what – I guess what I’m asking is for like a head nod consensus but what that would look like would be to consider eliminating a committee and the first option.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, it sounds like something along those lines is what people are thinking. I see heads nodding so consider that your consensus.

**N. Castle:** Okay, then that’s what I’ll do for you for the fall.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay.

**N. Castle:** Thanks.

**E. Hansen:** Paul, question – as a representative from a small college, I find it interesting that it’s difficult to get bodies to serve and not only to serve when they are elected or put there to just show up. It aggravates me to no end because then that service falls upon other people, normally junior faculty, who get ripped to shreds because they haven’t done an adequate amount of research and grant writing because they spend all their time running from committee to committee. Somewhere along the line, that has to be brought forth. The history of the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology is pathetic in that and I happen to have written a document that brought the college here and it has been ??? that it’s better now than it ever was but in the past it was just brutal to get someone to serve on a committee. That’s just a point of information; you can do with it whatever you want but I’ll tell you what, we circle these small colleges to try to get bodies, good luck.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, I appreciate your comments. Any other comments?

**F. Elections and Legislative Oversight** – Earl Hansen, Chair – report

1. Election of President of Faculty Senate for 2007 – 2008

**E. Hansen:** Can you hear me or do I need a microphone?

**P. Stoddard:** You always have to have a mike so that we ---

**E. Hansen:** All right, item F1, ???. First we need to address the election of Faculty Senate President/Executive Secretary of the University Council. At this time I’d like to move that we accept the nomination of Paul Stoddard, close the nominations and
unanimously approve his appointment to this position. We have a motion made and seconded. Call the question please.

**P. Stoddard:** All right call the question. I accept the position with gratitude.

**E. Hansen:** Okay, call the question then.

**P. Stoddard:** All in favor? Opposed? Thank you very much.

**E. Hansen:** Thank you.

2. Election of UCPC representatives for 2007-2009 – ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting – voting will be by college – votes will be counted the following week and new UCPC members will be notified.

**E. Hansen:** Item F2 is the election of UCPC representatives for 2007-2009. We have ballots here that will be distributed at the meeting. Voting will be by the college and votes will be counted the following week and the new UCPC members will be notified. So we have any committee members here or is it just going to be me?

**P. Stoddard:** Is anybody on the elections committee here to help pass out pieces of paper? Well, I’ll help.

**E. Hansen:** Don’t worry about it.

**P. Stoddard:** Health and Human Sciences? Jeff you’re not Health and Human Sciences. Once you get your ballot you can put your hand down. Donna. When people are nominated do they agree to serve or is it that they just come up on the list?

**D. Mathesius:** Any University Council member goes on the list. ???

**P. Stoddard:** They do agree to be on the University Council however, so this is a duty that could befall you. Education?

**D. Mathesius:** We only have the three colleges because these nominations are for two years so Visual and Performing Arts your person has another year.

**P. Stoddard:** Has everybody had a chance to vote for those colleges that are actually doing votes? Is there anybody not having a ballot or – okay.

3. Committees of the University 2007-2008 vacancies for Faculty Senate to approve or select – packet will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting.

**E. Hansen:** And last but not least is item 3 under F which is Committees of the University 2007-2008 vacancies for Faculty Senate to approve or select, packets will be distributed at the Faculty Senate meeting. You have a handout in front of you that has a group of committees and
people that have been nominated or decided to run for these positions. At this time I would ask – if we look at the – okay, the ??? Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee, a 3 year term and we have a position at large to replace Elizabeth ??? and there are four names. Would anybody like to speak to any of those four? So much for that.

D. Mathesius: There are paragraphs there saying why they want on the committee.

E. Hansen: Going on to Campus Security and Environmental ---

D. Mathesius: We’re going to have to have a vote on that.

E. Hansen: Each time? As a group here.

D. Mathesius: Right. They’re allowed to vote one time for each committee.

E. Hansen: You’re allowed one vote per committee. You’ve got to pick one person there to vote for. So we have four candidates here. I’ll give you a minute to read the comments that they’ve written. I apologize ahead of time for any mispronunciation of words here, names what have you. The first candidate from the Department of Physics – all in favor of that person, raise your hand. Are you writing these down? Could we have those hands again? All right thank you. All in favor of the person from Literacy Education raise their hand. All in favor of the party from Communication Disorders? All in favor of the person from University Libraries? All right, thank you.

D. Mathesius: There’s a tie between Anna and Kelly so we’re going to have everyone vote again to break the tie. So if you want to look at their information again, you’ve got to pick one of those two.

???: It says that three are to be selected so is there a problem?

D. Mathesius: There are three faculty members that serve on this committee but only one of their terms is up. The other two they still have years to go on theirs so we have to only pick one person to replace Elizabeth.

E. Hansen: Call the question again. All in favor of Anna please raise your hand. All in favor of Kelly please raise your hand. All right, Kelly is the winner of that seat. Moving on to page 3, the at large position on the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee. We have four candidates there if you’d like to take a moment and read their bios.

D. Mathesius: And just to let you know, I never received a paragraph on Rosita Lopez, that’s why she is not on there. So if anyone knows her and wants to say anything they can.

P. Stoddard: Or for anybody else.

E. Hansen: We’re ready to call a vote here. There are four candidates. All in favor of the candidate from University Libraries, that’s Byron Anderson, raise your hand. All in favor of
David from the Department of Geography. All in favor of Don. All in favor of Rosita. The winner is David Golden to take that position. This appointment for that last position on the University Benefits Committee. There are four candidates. You’ll vote for one. You might want to take a moment to read their material. Anyone want to speak for any of these candidates? We’re going to call for a vote now. All in favor of William. All in favor of Chris. All in favor of Joe. All in favor of Lynn. The winner is Joseph. On the back page, the University Class II Judicial Board, three are term. The departments have put forward the names of their or the colleges rather, of the individuals to represent them and ask that we just take them and accept them as they have come this way. All in favor of accepting them as they appear raise your hand please. All those opposed? Okay. That takes care of the Class II Judicial Board. It’s the same thing with the University Press Board. The colleges have sent the names forward and asking that we take them as they came in here. All in favor please raise your hand. All opposed the same sign?

P. Stoddard: Thank you Earl. Question in the back?

???: When it says a constituency and a person to replace and there’s nobody selected is that a mistake or ---

D. Mathesius: No, the college offices are still in search of someone willing to serve.

???: You mean they’re looking – in search of someone who will serve?

D. Mathesius: Yes they have not received anyone who is willing to serve on that committee so they are still in search.

P. Stoddard: John did you have a question? Okay. All right. Thank you again everybody.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Jody Newman-Ryan – report (Pages 13-7) and walk-in

P. Stoddard: I think we have a report from the Faculty Advisory Committee.

J. Newman-Ryan: I’m not going to read another report but I’ll point out a couple of things for you. If you look on page – it starts on 13 – we meet once a year apparently. This is my first year on this so at least this year we met once with the actual Board of Higher Ed so last month was our one time to do that. At that particular meeting of the Board of Higher Ed they also invited legislators to attend since it was in Springfield so we heard from a variety of key individuals on Higher Ed appropriation committees and the like. I’m sorry I learned some of their names but there were two that I didn’t learn and the official minutes are not yet posted on the website, the IBHE website, so on page 14 I refer to him as Legislator [Y] because I don’t know who he is.
There was [X] above that but if you look about two-thirds down the page, whoever he was, we were all quite concerned that he made the comment publicly that higher ed has been able to absorb and thrive under the budget cuts from the last three years so most of, at least the Faculty Advisory Council, did not think that was true but again, in this age of needing accountability and things we need to find a way to show that we’re not thriving so something for all of us to think about and particularly for students if they have examples of how they feel that budget cuts have negatively influenced their educational experience, please refer that to the Student Advisory Committee and your representative because that’s something that we think these legislators would need to know. As faculty, I’ll just point out a couple of textbook pending laws, page 15 towards the bottom, we have – I just summarized the information we were given which was many, many pages of pending legislation so I tried to find ones that you might be interested in. Again, I don’t know what’s happened in the last month to these. I don’t know but if you look at the bottom of page 15, we have Senate Bill 325 which would create the Textbook Advisory Committee Act and again as we’ve heard from various committees, there’s concern over textbooks and textbook pricing, etc., etc. This one and the one on top of page 16, there’s Senate Bill 326. So if you note those it would require one or the other, I forget which actually, would require faculty to write justification for why they’re choosing certain materials so you may or may not think that’s a good idea so I just point that out to you for your information. That’s all. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, any questions for Jody? Okay. The walk-in we have?

**J. Newman-Ryan:** There’s nothing important there.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, if there are no questions I just want to say thank you for all your efforts this year – Kendall, yes.

**K. Thu:** An important question for me. Is my term as Vice President, does continue on into next year? Donna?

**P. Stoddard:** I think we vote on it next year so the answer would be no unless you run again.

**K. Thu:** Okay so you elect a new Vice President next fall. Okay.

**D. Mathesius:** ???

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, so show up for the first Executive meeting. Any comments or questions from the floor? Again, I think it’s been a good year. Enjoy finals and the summer and I’ll see some of you next fall. Jim moves to adjourn. See you next time.

**B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report**

**C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report**
D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.