PRESENT: Bisplinghoff, Burch, Burrell, Cappell, Castle, Cesarek, Chown, Churyk, Derscheid, Garcia, Goldblum, Kamenitsa, Kowalski, Lusk, Martin, Millhorm, Mirman, Mohabbat, Monteiro, Morris, Newman, Novak, Onyuksel, Rosenbaum, Schneider, Snow, Sons, Swanson, Thompson, Thu, Tolhurst, Valle, Wade, Zahay

T. Fisher attended for S. Wickman.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Welcome back. I trust everybody had a rejuvenating break and they’re settling into the new semester with glee and anticipation and joy in your hearts.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA


The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 28, 2007 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 3-5)

P. Stoddard: Next up, approval of the minutes. If you haven’t already, please take a quick glance at them and when ready, if somebody would like to move their approval. Thank you Cason. It looks like Lynn is seconding. Any additions or corrections? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the minutes please say aye. Okay, thank you.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
**P. Stoddard:** Under announcements, I have one thing I guess that I’d like to announce. I spent this morning in an *ad hoc* group. We are conducting a survey of the campus climate. This is not to be confused with global climate change right now or anything like that which is actually what I did at first. Maybe that’s a professional hazard. Anyway, we will be issuing a survey to the students getting their perceptions on life at NIU, academic, social and otherwise. You will, as faculty, be encouraged to remind students to take the survey. It will be available online. It should take about twenty minutes. You may also if you’re teaching a larger class, be asked to donate some class time to this endeavor but that would be merely asking, by no means mandating, that. We spent some time; Bobbi and Jay were with me this morning. There’s a standard survey that this group puts together and we were allowed to add ten questions to it and we did addressing specific questions that we have at Northern, some academic, some student life, some diversity issues and so forth that we added. All of these are covered in some length by the regular instrument. There will be a companion survey of the faculty asking our perceptions of student life and so forth and they’re looking for a connect or disconnect between what we think the students are experiencing and what the students think they are experiencing. So that might prove interesting. Then at some point down the road the Provost says that we will be asked what we think of our experiences here at NIU. So some things to look for and I guess this campus climate survey, it says here, will be deployed on the 11th of February. There should be a couple of weeks I believe to have people submit their responses. If you have any questions about that you can ask me, Bobbie, Jay, the Provost, Virginia Cassidy; we’re all involved in that along with some others. If not, moving on, I think this is going to be a fairly brief meeting today.

V. **ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

VI. **CONSENT AGENDA**

VII. **REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

**P. Stoddard:** We don’t have a report from the FAC. We don’t have any reports from the subcommittees of the Board of Trustees. I believe we do have, however, from either Bobbie or Jay, a report on the full Board meeting.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hanson – no report

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 Nancy Castle – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – [report](#)
**B. Cesarek:** Thanks Paul. As it turned out, the meeting was taken up quite a bit by an Executive Committee Meeting so Paul missed actually the meeting meeting so he asked if Jay and I would get together to do the Board of Trustees’ meeting notes and I was very pleased that I had actually done these for the SPS Council so the SPS Council has what you’re getting because I went back to look at my notes and, as you can imagine, it’s really hard to decipher things six weeks later or so relative to exactly what took place. It was very brief because again of the fact that I think they did not reconvene until after 11:00 and they wanted to be done very quickly. They did move also very quickly on a number of issues. Obviously the proton therapy, the resolutions were pretty strong, the proton therapy and all of the accompanying resolutions that were there relative to actually making that a go. They were kind enough to thank Joe Novak for his service to the institution. They had a number of action items which also had been addressed previously at either of the subcommittees and had gone through those be it Finance, Facilities or Legislation and Audit so those were noted on the action items that were there. I think you will all be pleased that they were delighted with the BOT professorships that will be put in place for the faculty as part of the Strategic Planning Initiative. They’re going to release some of the Execution Session minutes from long ago that are no longer subject to confidentiality and then there were a number of informational items which you can read there if you would from each of the Board, the Legislative, Audit and External and then it was noted that the Board of Higher Education did approve NIU’s PhD and Art Education. There were some announcements on the Civil Service Merit Board, that they met but I don’t know that there was anything concrete that was passed and that NIU Foundation is on its way to 150 with 115 million. There was some concern by one group and they had the opportunity to ask for public comment and Nancy – is it Bisel? – Besel? – on behalf of the service workers wanted to ensure that the Board of Trustees knew that because they were entering into a union negotiation contract, they did not receive the 4% increase as the average salary increment that many had received and obviously were not real happy about it but because of the timing of when they entered into these negotiations, they were not part of that pool so it was duly noted by the Board of Trustees that it would be followed up on. Any questions/concerns? Thank you. Go ahead.

**F. Bryan:** Bobbie do you know in what form they’re going to make these Executive Session meetings available? I mean, is it going to be online or ---?

**B. Cesarek:** You know what, they did not say. I’m certain we could find out very quickly for you and let you know.

**F. Bryan:** Well, because I mean, those of us who have been to these meetings and have served on ??? as a representative to one of the committees and we know that these take forever and many of us are just curious as to what the heck they’re doing and I think this would be a good opportunity to at least see a summary of what they do in these sometimes two hours which I would like to believe is a lot of mannose but I don’t know. I would like to see.

**B. Cesarek:** Well, and it’s interesting that they are releasing almost, you know, eleven years worth of stuff and how deep and how involved it is and how much paper it takes. We certainly can find out for you.

**F. Bryan:** I appreciate that. Thank you.
**B. Cesarek:** Absolutely, happy to follow up. Yes?

**B. Lusk:** Bobbie I’m curious, was any mention made regarding the Proton Therapy Treatment Center at Central DuPage Hospital? This seems really strange that we’re now in direct competition with another huge proton therapy center twenty miles away. I wondered if they discussed that at all?

**B. Cesarek:** Actually they did not and I had no idea that one – how long is the one at DuPage – is that new as well or ---?

**B. Lusk:** Neither of them have yet got approval from the Health Care Facilities Planning Board so I think both of them are trying to go up quickly. I think NIU came out with its proposal slightly before Central DuPage but they’re both seriously going for it. It’s interesting.

**B. Cesarek:** Certainly the Chair of the Board of Trustees, her background is health, and I know she’s a big, big push for this on behalf of the institution but knowledge of DuPage Hospital – I would like to think that they have that knowledge but ---

**B. Lusk:** They know about it. I wondered if it came up in the discussions.

**B. Cesarek:** Never.

**B. Lusk:** Okay, thanks.

**B. Cesarek:** NIU has been central. Okay? Thank you so much.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other questions for Bobbie? All right, thank you very much.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, this being the first meeting of the semester, I’m not sure we have any reports from the committees. I’ll run through them so they can report that they have no report. Academic Affairs? No, report. Academic Status? No report. Resource, Space and Budget – not here; there’s no report. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities? No report. Rules and Governance is not here and doesn’t – well, the chair is not here and there’s no report.

A. Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report

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

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

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Alan Rosenbaum, Chair – no report

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report
P. Stoddard: Elections and Legislative Oversight, we do have something we have to do but the chair is not here today. So we are going to call upon Cason as a member of the Elections Committee who has the onerous task of pulling names from a hat or a box or something along those lines. This is to select the members of a committee to evaluate the Executive Secretary of the University Council and President of the Faculty Senate and also to select a committee for the evaluation of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. This is a little earlier than we usually do it but the thinking is we would actually like these committees to get their work done in the next month or two so that when the time comes, I know the FPA has expressed an interest in continuing on in that position. I’ll probably express an interest in continuing on in this position, it would be nice to have an evaluation done before the Senate decides whether or not either of those continuations are good ideas. So we’d like to get that done a little quicker than usual; usually we don’t get to this evaluation until the last meeting of the year and that’s a bit too late so that’s why we’re doing it now. If you’re selected for that committee, please try to keep that in mind.

1. Selection of a committee for the Evaluation of the Executive Secretary of University Council and President of Faculty Senate – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 (Page 6)

D. Mathesius: We’re going to chose for the Executive Secretary first. Cason is going to pull 2 names and an alternate – well actually 3 names I guess – of University Council members and then the same for Faculty Senate members and then 2 student names and then we’ll combine the University Council names and Faculty Senate members to pull the names for the Faculty Personnel Advisor committee. I need 3. Carol Thompson. Jeffrey Chown and the alternate is Amy Newman. Those are the University Council members. These are Faculty Senate members. Lara Luetkehans? I’m sure I didn’t pronounce that right. Jack Martuka and the alternate is Kerry Burch. Then I need 2 student names. The students are Erin Hunson and the alternate Merjana Pulaveni.

2. Selection of a committee for the Evaluation of the Faculty Personnel Advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 (Page 6)

Okay, now we’re drawing for the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Maribel Valle. Jim Millhorn. Linda Derscheid and the alternate is Jay Stravers. Okay. That’s it.

P. Stoddard: All right, thank you everybody in advance for your hard work and Donna will be in contact to set up meetings and get you rooms and so forth – meeting rooms.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Increments (Page 7)

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on under Unfinished Business sort of, is the question of salary increments. Those of you who were here last year remember that as a body, we agreed to
forward a recommendation on how increments, any potential increments that might be forthcoming, should be divided in terms of what we euphemistically call across-the-board and merit. Across-the-board is a little misleading but basically the idea is that everybody who does an adequate job should get something to offset cost of living increases and then merit is self-explanatory. For your information, on page 7 of your packet is the actual motion that we passed last time and forwarded on to UC/PC. The question I have, or that has come up, is whether as a body, the Senate is happy standing behind that recommendation or if we want to revisit that recommendation and come up with a different formulation to forward on to the UC/PC. So take a look. Last time we basically said we would like the across-the-board to be 50% of any proposed increment and the other 50% should be devoted to merit. That was not a unanimous decision last time; there was some dissent mostly people thinking more merit was called for but it passed by a reasonably large majority. Any thoughts that anybody has? Yes, Professor Sons?

L. Sons: Is not someone who has done a reasonable job evaluated as if they have some merit?

P. Stoddard: Well, sort of. Generally, as you well know, the deans will force a 1-5 scale where 5 is the lowest and even if everybody in the department comes from Lake Woebegone and is above average, the person least above average will get a minimal merit rating. I mean the deans are concerned about across-the-board increases/increments in terms of people who really, really are not doing satisfactory work. I mean I don’t know that we have any of those folks. I like to think that we don’t but I suppose it’s always possible that somebody somewhere is not teaching the requisite number of classes, is not active in research or is not taking part in shared governance procedures and other such things. The deans really would not like to be in a position of awarding anybody with a pay increase who is not performing up to what most of us would consider minimal standards. But I mean, once you get past that, what usually happens on these things is the Provost will set a floor saying everybody who has merit should get at least 1% or 2% or whatever and then he’ll set a maximum as well and typically if the average is 4% we might see a bracket (is what they typically refer to of 1-7%) so that you would have to show reason why someone was getting less than 1% increment or more than a 7% increment. Last year we said we wanted to make sure that the bottom of that bracket essentially was at half of whatever the increment was. Last year it was 4%; we said essentially we would like to see a 2-6% bracket. Everybody who has merit, everybody who is doing their job should get at least 2% to offset in some small way inflation. Lynn?

L. Kamenitsa: I’m a little confused, not about the substance of the recommendation, but why we’re discussing this. It looks to me like we passed it by a pretty substantial majority last time, we asked it to be forwarded and I’m wondering why we’re opening it. Is it that the people who voted against it wanted to reopen it?

P. Stoddard: No, not at all.

L. Kamenitsa: Is there pressure from the deans or why are we spending time on this?

P. Stoddard: I think really the Provost was looking for clarification whether we meant for that last year to continue on and be our standard recommendation or if this was something the faculty wanted to revisit. Last year we didn’t talk about some time frame like we’d like to see this for
the next five years and then rethink about it. We just said for the upcoming year we would like this. So I mean if people are happen with this, we can say that we’re happy with this and move on. If not, you know, we can start considering alternative schemes. They just – since we didn’t specifically say they want a clear a statement from us as possible. But I don’t get the sense though that there was any pressure that that was not a good system and we should change it. I think they just want to be sure that that is where we still stand. Kendall?

**K. Thu:** I don’t have any problem with what we agreed to last time. My concern is what is going to be done with our recommendation this time because, as you remember, the Provost who came and talked to us last fall was unaware of what our voice was in the matter and I’m wondering if we agreed that this is an appropriate stance by this body, in addition to forwarding it to UC/PC, are there other ways that we can communicate our will?

**P. Stoddard:** Well, the UCPC is actually the body that formally makes this recommendation so we are just saying as a faculty body, we would like them, as a more representative faculty body, we would like them to consider this. So I think forwarding it to the UCPC is appropriate. We can also, now the Provost is the chair of the UCPC, we can forward it specifically to the UCPC and to the Provost.

**K. Thu:** Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** And we will do that. All right, would anybody like to move one way or the other on this, either we accept and just continue the recommendation or change it? Dianna?

**D. Swanson:** I move that we continue this recommendation.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, is there a second for the motion? Okay, thank you. Any discussion? All those in favor or maintaining the recommendation say aye. Any opposed?

The motion was approved.

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

A. University Closure on December 10, 2007

**P. Stoddard:** Under New Business it was suggested that a topic the faculty might be interested in talking about was the event of last finals week, the university closure, whether or not it was appropriate to do so, the procedures under which that decision was made, any other issues, the university’s handling of the incident, whereby there is graffiti in one of the restrooms of the residents halls of a very threatening and specific nature and therefore, the university had to close. So I said well, we can certainly bring this up in Senate and see if there is any concern about the way things were done. Yes Lynn?

**L. Kamenitsa:** I’ll start off. I have talked to several faculty who were very concerned with the administration posting faculty options in a place where students had access to those. We felt like
we should have had – or several people I’ve talked to felt like we should have had first crack at hearing the options, figure out what your options are going to be and then let your students know and it might have been sufficient to tell students faculty have options, ask them which ones they’re going to give. So we had students come in and say well, I want this option where I’m going to do x, y, or z. I want to take the exam next week because it said there that’s one of the options I have and it just sort of felt like well we’re still getting information. Maybe there were some things that should have come only to faculty, giving us some time to figure out what we wanted to do before we had students sending us hundreds of e-mails asking for options that we weren’t intending to utilize.

**P. Stoddard:** Seems reasonable to me. Yes, Brigid?

**B. Lusk:** I just wanted to second that. We also had hundreds of students wanting incompletes. It was chaos and they said well, we’re told we’re allowed to do this – no, read the fine print, but it was misunderstanding.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other questions? Yes, Diana?

**D. Swanson:** I was quite pleased by the first, I don’t know, twelve to twenty-four hours of the handling of it. I thought closing the university the way it was done was appropriate. However, we then heard nothing basically and we still have basically heard nothing. So that disturbed me, you know, that a day or two later we aren’t hearing anything more from the President or anybody else. There was no, I mean – yes, both in terms of the security issues, but then also I think another thing that really has not been adequately addressed by the administration is the racist nature of these threats. Yes, the President met with the Black Student Union and the NAACP on campus and that was good, but there’s been no statement from him since and I think those students – and faculty members for that matter – who are concerned about this issue on campus and were saying well yeah, this particular incident didn’t actually happen – the threats weren’t actually carried through with but the whole issue or racism on campus is real and I really think that the President and others should have done more about it. Another thing, you know, there was a meeting what, the first week of classes on a Wednesday evening that the Division of Student Affairs organized that wasn’t actually publicized to everyone. I heard about it the day before. I wasn’t able to attend but it seems to me that some kind of – something, you know, convocation – I don’t know. I mean – that’s what I have to say at the moment I guess.

**P. Stoddard:** Some sort of more campus-wide acknowledgement and discussion about the issue. In the back?

**M. ???:** I’m ??? and I completely concur with Diana. I really would have appreciated knowing more details of the incident and the follow-up that was happening. I teach very large classes where I had to make decisions about whether the university would stay closed or not and I always felt kind of under the gun. Then coming back this semester and not having heard, you know, what was the follow-up? Was anybody caught? I have students coming to me and I don’t have any answers for them.
**P. Stoddard:** I happen to serve on – we have a taskforce that’s looking at the report of the events at Virginia Tech. This is a report for the Virginia governor. We’re looking at that. They make a lot of recommendations. We’re looking at that in terms of how many of those recommendations are applicable to NIU, what’s our status in meeting those recommendations and so forth. As part of this, I sit on a subcommittee with Chief Grady and have had the opportunity – this whole incident obviously came up in both discussions – and I don’t know if he wants any of this available for the press so maybe this is off the record – can I do that? Basically, he says in these types of situations they are following up with an investigation but it’s very unlikely that – they have not apprehended anybody – I don’t think they have any suspects. It’s very, very difficult in circumstances like this to actually pin down who did this. So are following up on it; they don’t have any news to report because frankly, it’s kind of cold but it certainly – anyway. One of the things we are talking about is communication which is sounds like both you and Diana are very concerned about and the need for maintaining a flow of communication even if it’s to say well, nothing new has happened. So, I mean, that is all coming through this Virginia Tech group and this was, I hate to say it, almost like a dress rehearsal for a serious – I mean, serious as this was, nobody was every hurt or, as far as we know, actually threatened. The Chief had some interesting perspectives on all of this. You know, we pointed out that in all likelihood this was merely a student who didn’t want to take finals on Monday and that when I first here, if a student didn’t want to take a final, he called in a bomb threat and the Chief said – pointed out – that what they’ve done, they’ve gone through and somebody says there’s a bomb in Cole 101. They go through, they investigate it very carefully, very quickly though, and continue on the days activities so that calling in the threat really has no – and their model for these kinds of things are going to be similar. To evaluate, make sure there’s no threat and not disrupt the schedule. All that said, however, it also came out that, you know, if anybody feels for a threat like this, if they hadn’t named the student center but had named one of the major classrooms, and the university did not close and you felt very unsafe about this, you always have the option of calling Public Safety of the NIU police and saying look, there’s a threat been made against this particular building, please – and the Chief assures me they will provide extra security, they will have a visible presence in and around – now maybe you don’t want that for your exam, I don’t know, but they would have, if you requested it, provide a visible security presence, they would check the rooms, you know, keep people from bringing backpacks in or whatever if it’s really a concern. So there are avenues, I mean, it never occurred to me that you could call up and say please, but there are avenues if you feel safety is a concern, call Public Safety and they will work with you to diminish that as much as possible.

**C. Garcia:** What I have to say is that I think the decision of closing the university in my view, was a good decision even though it created a nightmare to our students and the department exam schedule and all the arrangements we had to do for individual students and all of that because I think that’s better than having the possibility of losing life in the university. So that is – I think we all support that in a way, but what we really feel is that after that was over, there was no official statement by the university just like there was when we had to close. That was okay so now what? We were in limbo, okay, and everybody is talking one way or another, you know, and I don’t care if it was one student who wanted to miss the class, even if that’s the case and there’s a possibility of losing life, I think the closing of the university was the right decision; we are not questioning that. With all the different ramifications that creates, however, I think that
what we are losing here is the communication after the fact. That neither the students nor the faculty has had any source of credible information on what’s going on.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. In the very back?

**T. ???:** ?? from ???. Just to echo what was stated, I think it was handled well but also for the administration to know it was the lack of communication now it becomes kind of like a PR issue because I’ve been contacted by parents, you know, and just community people wanting to know, you know, how is it going, what was found out and so – what about my vagueness of a response. I did not let them know that the campus is safe for any student; the campus is safe for particular minority groups so I would loved to have said, you know, they investigated. It was in fact this and for all purposes campus is safe. You think should consider Northern as a school of option for your son or daughter.

**P. Stoddard:** So we’ll follow up to be sure. Yes, Professor Thompson.

**C. Thompson:** I agree of course with the – I sort of wondered what in the heck was going on with the more police-type part but the other hand, although I don’t have large classes so I don’t really know how it played out, but I was very impressed by the options that were given and the detail of the implications of what you might have to go through with each option. I was also impressed in our college, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, that when the new semester started again, someone in the dean’s office had sort through again some implications about if you had chosen particular options and reminding faculty about what to do. Again, they didn’t apply to me particularly – I don’t have large classes so it was a little bit easier to handle but I was like oh wow, if they had – because I had not thought of the timelines or some of the particular issues. I was pleased with that.

**P. Stoddard:** Was there somebody else? Yes, Professor Tolhurst?

**W. Tolhurst:** It strikes me that one thing that might help is that if in fact there’s now a higher state of alertness to this sort of thing and that we are more ready to meet a challenge like this again, that would be a good thing to communicate to the university community. I’m assuming that the university police are going to take things very seriously and it will not take as much to get their attention as it might have in the past and I think the more that the campus community knows this, the less likely it will be that there will be incidents like this and the higher the comfort level of the rest of us.

**P. Stoddard:** I never meant to imply that they didn’t take this very seriously. They did.

**W. Tolhurst:** I think they did take it very seriously but it’s one thing to take it seriously and it’s another thing to let people know that they’re taking it seriously and the likelihood of apprehension has gone up a half a notch.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. I think somebody on the – yes?
L. Kamenitsa: I just wanted to follow up on what I said before and what somebody else said, I actually while I’m glad I wasn’t the one who had to make the decision Sunday night about what to do and I respect what they did, in terms of security and political decisions, those are tough enough. It seems to me that some of the mechanics that somebody just commented on could have already been written in advance. We’ve had closures. We’ve had two other times we closed because of weather at the end of fall semester, I should not be – you know, when – there should be information in the initial memo which should be a standard memo that they append to their thing telling me what’s going to happen to graduating seniors. The information I got from my college, Liberal Arts and Science, about incompetents at the beginning of the semester contradicted what they’d said at the end of last semester. That part should be routine, you know? That, seems to me, should have been done when they did the little things that hang in all our classrooms now. So it’s just a matter of cutting and pasting that part of the memo and those parts of the procedure in so they can focus on these other issues and I didn’t think that was – I thought there was too much done on the fly in that respect.

P. Stoddard: In fairness to them, I mean, I appreciate what you’re saying and I think 90% of that should have been some place already but, I mean, this is slightly different than a snowstorm in that there’s the anxiety with being on campus under these issues that I think is what prompted some of the extra options that they wanted the faculty to consider but I think the original point that it should have been a faculty consideration not a student consideration – we should be considerate of the students but it’s up to the faculty to decide how they want to accommodate student needs and not put all that out there for everybody to see. It was a good point. Ferald?

F. Bryan: You know I rarely ask questions but this affected me in ways that – one of the hats I wear besides being parliamentarian is that I’m the director of the Coms 100 program. In the fall we had some 1800 students and we have a required final exam. I’m still recovering from that because even though I understood the option that we had to cancel the exam and allow students to take the grade they had, I was told then later in the week by my dean directly that no, students had to be required to take that final so we’re making arrangements to do that and of course my question to the college was well are you prepared to handle the paperwork that’s going to come from all that assuming only a small percentage choose to take that. Anyway, that’s my own gripe. But two questions – 1) there are academics who study crisis response and there must be national standards by which things like this, especially in light of Virginia Tech. Has the university considered those and are we following the national standard? And secondly, and most importantly, since we hopefully learned something from this, are we sure it’s not going to happen again?

P. Stoddard: Well no I don’t think we can be sure it’s not going to happen again. I think the opposite is probably more true. In terms of the first, there is an emergency operations plan I believe. It’s in the OP of which the little red and black flip chart is a small piece. The actual plan I’m told is 400 pages of information so maybe the real problem was finding the right page – no, I should make light. But there is – I know they do have a plan. A lot of this was worked up in the last summer since Virginia Tech but I think a lot of the pieces were in place anyway. The comprehensiveness of it is what they’re really working on these days. The plans is, you know, it’s going to be a continuing evolving thing as situations come up and we do things and as we find out well, there were some glitches here and there, you know, we should have been a little
more careful about options. We should have done a better job following up on communications and so forth. I think the idea is to incorporate what we’ve learned into the plan as we go so hopefully this will continue to improve. Even more hopefully, we won’t get too many opportunities to find out how well it has worked. Professor Garcia?

C. Garcia: One again I think that’s why it is important to acknowledge what didn’t work, what was good and what wasn’t because I think we do these fire practice even. You know, what made this complicated this time was it was the last week of the semester when we have exams and ??? schedule anyway and so then we have to ??? one day and so that threw everything off so maybe we need to practice this when we calculate final exams week, we need to have a, you know, like a secondary plan. If something happens we’ll have ??? we gotta kind of have like a when you plan for rainy days or stuff like that or have ??? for that. ??? then we should have another kind of procedure for that and I think that committee should look at those options and also to consider practicing this, not just like we have a dress rehearsal that we thought it was real, you know, it ended up being a practice but why, you know, I think maybe we can be much better off if we actually practice this with the ??? procedures. That’s my suggestion for the committee that is working on that.

P. Stoddard: Okay. In the back and then Diana.

M. Valle: The other thing that I would have appreciated would have been guidance for family. Again, I teach a very large class with lots of African American students and I had several parents calling me telling me I’m going to pull my kid out of school. He’s not going to take your exam and it would have been helpful to have a place where I could have referred them or at least some guidance as to what to tell very worried, very irate parents. It wasn’t only the students that were upset; the parents were very much a problem.

P. Stoddard: Right, okay. Diana?

D. Swanson: I just thought of one other thing that I learned about only since school started up again which is that there’s a regulation apparently in the residence halls that students are supposed to leave within 48 hours of their last exam time. This is very much – this is very difficult for them, I mean especially when their exams are getting changed around but I am just shocked that that rule is there at all and one of the other faculty members that I was talking to about it well, it must be kind of hard to study for exams and pack at the same time. It seems to me that that’s a very sort of simple, basic rule that would be changed to say students have until “x” day after finals week to leave the dorms, you know? Unbelievable.

P. Stoddard: Right.

M. Morris: I would be willing to bet ---

P. Stoddard: Please use a microphone so we can record your words for posterity.

M. Morris: Michael Morris, Foreign Languages. I would be willing to bet that the reason for the existence of that policy is to discourage students who, once they have finished their finals, to
hang around the dorms and party thus interfering with studying on the part of students who still have finals until Friday. So I would be reluctant to see that policy eliminated for that very reason since I’ve talked to a number of students who have, you know, told me personally that the partying in the dorms is already problematic for, you know, people who would like to have a study environment so I’m sure that that’s the reason for that policy.

P. Stoddard: You say it is 48 hours after their last ---

D. Swanson: I believe it’s 48 hours. I guess I wasn’t thinking about that.

P. Stoddard: It might actually be only 24 hours.

D. Swanson: That is a problem isn’t it?

P. Stoddard: 24 hours to pack and leave the dorm rooms, not houses. So I would think you’d be able to pack up in a day but ---. Okay, any other comments about this? I have a meeting with the Provost and President tomorrow afternoon so I’ll be sure to forward your concerns and suggestions to them and your thoughts on what they did right. They’d like to hear that too I’m sure. Okay, any other new business anyone would like to bring forward? Yes?

D. Zahay: Debra Zahay from Marketing. I apologize for doing this out of order but I just noticed in the minutes that we just approved that I was listed as not attending the meeting in November and I was here

P. Stoddard: Okay, that’s easy to fix.

D. Zahay: Okay, thank you.

P. Stoddard: Easy questions I like. Any other new business? Any questions or comments from the floor?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: Seeing none, I’ll offer my own. Let’s go Giants and then I’ll entertain any motion for adjournment anybody might have. Thank you. Thank you. All in favor of adjourning, get up and leave.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 P.M.