FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 2008, 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Hello everybody. Welcome back. Let’s get into it.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Can I get a motion to adopt the agenda? Thank you Cason. Thank you. I’ll have one more announcement under President’s Announcements about NIU Connect and under New Business there’s a resolution that should have been in front of you when you arrived and we’ll deal with that one I guess it’s letter C under New Business. Any other corrections, additions or concerns about the agenda? If not, all in favor of voting as amended please say aye. Opposed? Thank you.

The agenda was adopted as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 23, 2008 FS MEETING
(Pages 3-5)

P. Stoddard: Next up is approval of the minutes. You know the drill. Thank you. Thank you. Any corrections, additions or deletions, etc.? Yes? I’m sorry? Please tell us and we’ll correct that. Teresa Fisher? Right, thank you. Any others? Yes?

N. Castle: Nancy Castle and I don’t see me as present or absent and to be honest I really can’t remember if I was here or not but I should be on – I believe I was – I was in the front row. I was here.
P. Stoddard: All right. Anybody else? Anybody who was present but wishes they weren’t? Don’t raise your hands. Okay, if there are no other corrections or additions – well actually Professor, you’re there as attending for S. Wickman. Okay. All in favor of the minutes with the appropriate additions say aye. Opposed? Nobody opposed, good.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. University Response to February 14

P. Stoddard: Moving on, a few words about what I saw happening from my vantage point after the events of February 14. I just wanted to take a little bit of time and recognize the administration who were here all Thursday evening, all of Friday evening, all weekend, all week that classes were closed, all the following weekend. These folks had a tough job starting from just trying to figure out what to say at the next press conference and what we knew and what we didn’t know. Trying to put together the most accurate story we could out of sometimes conflicting and often incomplete information and from what I’ve seen and what I’ve heard from people outside the university, they did a very good job in getting information out and in their response to those tragic events. From what I saw personally, I mean people like Kathy Buettner and Brian Hemphill and the president of course and the Provost, were really on top of things as much as was possible. They pulled together that memorial service obviously with no warning that such a thing was every going to be necessary. They did so in a very short time and a lot of people from around campus, a lot of staff people from all different areas of campus, really came together and put in a lot of hours in order to make sure everything went the way we thought it should. So I just wanted to take a moment and recognize those people and say, you know, from my standpoint I thought they did really an excellent job under very, very difficult circumstances.

B. Response from other Faculty Senates and schools

Continuing with that thought, we did get – the Faculty Senate – a bunch of letters and e-mails – I didn’t bring the e-mails but we got maybe half a dozen or more, eight or ten letters, and probably two or three times that in terms of e-mails from other senates around the country. I’ll just take a moment to read two of them. One is from California State, Dominquez Hills – “Dear Dr. Stoddard. Words cannot begin to describe the shock and grief that I felt when I heard the news of the terrible tragedy on the NIU campus. As an alumnus (she got her BA in ’90 and her Masters in ’92) of Northern Illinois, I remember vividly sitting through Math class twice in Cole Hall. While I completed my degree (it doesn’t say what it was in), I lived in the Neptune East dorm. Today these places which once held fond memories only serve to remind me of my deep and profound sadness. As the chair of our Academic Senate, I know all too well the demands that descend upon you to provide leadership and guidance to a grieving university on the one hand while you sustain support and assist in the healing with the other. Please know that our students, faculty and staff join you in mourning the deaths of your students”. Then I got another one which particularly well due to its origin point – “Dear Paul. I am writing on behalf of your 1400+ faculty colleagues at Virginia Tech. We were
deeply saddened by the tragic events of February 14. We understand unfortunately all too well the extent of your loss and grief and we extend our deepest condolences and sympathy to the entire Northern Illinois University community. Please know that you are all in our hearts, thoughts and prayers. If there is anything we can do individually or collectively, please don’t hesitate to contact us.” That’s from Kerry J. Redican, President of the Faculty Senate at Virginia Tech. I should’ve mentioned the first one is from Kate Fawver. She’s an Assistant Professor of History and Chair of the Academic Senate in Dominquez Hills. The letters echo very similar sentiments. If anybody wants to take a look at those I have them up here and I’ll have them in my office and, with your approval, I’ll go ahead and start responding to these, letting them know how much their words and thoughts have meant to us during these times. Personally, I was really struck by the amount of support that we got. I’m sure all of you got notes and memos and e-mails from people you know, used to know, never knew you knew and so on and, you know, some of the other things I’ve seen around here, around Chicago and so forth – Blackhawk skating with NIU logos on the back of their helmets and the White Sox wearing our caps during spring training. I mean, it’s just phenomenal and it has really fostered in me a sense of belonging to this institution, a sense of community that we share amongst ourselves, with our students, with the staff, and with the people of the local region. So hopefully, that is something we can build on. That can be the one sliver of good that we can take from this situation. I think later on we’ll probably talk a bit about how we as faculty might be responding to students. I know we all got this, to some degree, in what I call group hug sessions or sessions with the counselors back at the beginning of the week of healing as the President likes to refer to it.

C. Nominations for the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Faculty Spokesperson Award (Page 6)

P. Stoddard: So having said that, I’d like to shift gears a little bit if I can; always difficult to do but --- C. under President’s Announcements is nominations for the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Faculty Spokesperson Award which used to be known as the Bob Lane Dealing From the Bottom of the Deck Award and for those of you new to the Senate, this is an award which goes to the faculty member, it doesn’t have to be a member of the Senate or Council or any other organized or disorganized body, but to the person on campus basically who has done the most to keep the administration in line as much as that is possible – who has made sure that the rules of the university and that the intent of shared governance has been followed by the administration. On page 6 you have a list of past winners of this award. As you glance through this, that might give you an idea of some people who you might want to nominate for this. Notice we haven’t had a nominee in the last couple of years. I like to think it’s because people have been doing a good job without our bugging them about it but if there is anybody who you think of in those terms, please forward that name along to us. It would be nice to give an award out again. We don’t like the people upstairs being too comfortable with themselves.

Finally, I’ve been sitting in on the progress meetings for the NIU Connect project. That’s the PeopleSoft for the students project and that is actually has gone online now as of February 20 and so all students entering for the Fall of 2008 are now part of the new system. The Legacy system, the system we’ve been using still applies for this semester. It will apply for the
summer semester or summer term and then after that it’s history. The people who are most involved are people who have to schedule classes, people who are advising. They’ve been trying to schedule training sessions for those folks to get them used to the new system. Faculty who don’t do any advising or who don’t do much advising generally would only need to interface with that system to check their rosters and then ultimately for entering grades. We’re getting away from the bubble shoots for grade reporting. So that means at some point, between now and the beginning of September, they’re start running training sessions for faculty. They don’t anticipate a lot of training being required to click a few buttons. However, when I went out to look at the system and I have not been to a training session yet. I found I couldn’t even get in to look at it because I hadn’t been to a training session. So, you do need to get involved with that so keep an eye out I guess for when these sessions might start. I would suggest give your departmental secretaries a little bit of room because they’re learning a new system and they might be grumpy as a result. Jean knows what I mean. Anyway, any questions about any of those items?

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Okay, if not we don’t have anything to consider this time.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Nothing to consent to.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hanson – no report

P. Stoddard: None of the standing committees or advising committees – although I should mention I guess that the FAC did meet on February 15. We did not actually have a representative at that meeting. However, they did send us a letter and I’ll read that one to you in place of the report. It says “Dear Paul, the members of the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Ed extend their deepest condolences to the students, faculty and staff of Northern Illinois University for the terrible events of February 14. We would like you and your community to know that the Council observed a moment of silence and reflection in opening the day’s meeting” and I quote “who’s the chair who’s from ISU. Other than that, the Board of Trustee committees will start meeting tomorrow, I think they all meet tomorrow so we’ll have a report on that at the next Senate meeting which will be in April. We may have reports on that at the University Council meeting next week; probably should. Well, not spring break right, the week after spring break. I know we’ve done a lot of messing with schedules but spring break was sacrosanct; never mess with spring break.

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 – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Standing committees – I don’t think we have many reports but I’ll read them off just to be sure. Academic Affairs?

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

K. Thu: We meet next month.

P. Stoddard: Next month. Okay, excellent.

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

P. Stoddard: Economic Status?

C. Snow: Nothing.

P. Stoddard: Nothing, okay.

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

P. Stoddard: Resource, Space and Budget? No C. T.; no report.

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

P. Stoddard: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities?

A. Rosenbaum: Nothing.

P. Stoddard: Nothing, all right.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – report (Pages 7-8)

P. Stoddard: Rules and Governance, you got anything for us? I suspect you do. Make sure you have a microphone.

N. Castle: A couple of times we have talked in this group about the fact that we have a number of colleges that have few units with senators who are able to come to Faculty Senate by virtue of how few their units are. So we, last year and this year, the committee looked at rewording or providing some flexibility in the composition sections of the Bylaws for all of the standing
committees of the Faculty Senate so you should have in your packet on page 6. The section
reads the same for each of the subcommittees ---

**P. Stoddard:** It’s actually page 7.

**N. Castle:** Oh, I’m sorry, page 7? On page 7 it reads the same for each so I just picked the one
on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and at the top you’ll see that I have indicated exactly
where in the Bylaws we’d be making these changes. The change that we recommend is in italics
only for this meeting just so you know where it would fit in. Currently, the way it stands we
have one faculty senator appointed to each of the standing committees of each of the colleges
except the last sentence as it currently stands says “a faculty senator representing University
Libraries and a faculty senator representing the College of Law may be appointed upon their
expression of interest”. So those two are already sort of off the table although if you would like
to include them in this other language we could but the language that we came up with for the
rest of the colleges says that “In the event that a college has too few representatives to assure a
different faculty senator to each committee, appointments will be made on the basis of
anticipated activity of the committee for the year and, as possible, per expressed interest of the
senators. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee member from those colleges will serve, upon
request, as the voting member of any committee needing representation from the college in
question” which is really wordy but basically what it says is that the President of the Faculty
Senate when making the assignments over the summer, has a sense of things that are coming up
in the fall. At the end of the spring semester we identify issues that are percolating or whatever
so h generally have some idea of committees that will see a lot of action in the upcoming year
and could exercise judgment at that point in terms of assigning people to those committees. The
*de facto* representative would be the person from the Executive Committee which has to have a
representative from each college on it and so as the information comes to the Executive
Committee, somebody from that college would be clued in that this might be something of
interest. That person could get a substitute for the subcommittee, somebody who’s not
necessarily on the Faculty Senate. We were trying to come up with a way to deal with the fact
that the College of Business has five units; Education has six, Engineering has 4; Health and
Human Sciences only three; Visual Performing Arts, three; Liberal Arts and Sciences has
seventeen departments and so they’re fairly well represented on the committees and the
subcommittees. The rest of us tend to be on multiple committees. You may recall that in the
Senate last year, one of the things that was discussed was to reduce the number of committees.
Eliminate the elections committee because they don’t do anything anyway and we only do it at
the meetings so maybe if we were just pretty organized with the secretary and to the assistant to
the secretary that we could do that but then this group last year decided well, that’s not really
such a big pressure committee. It’s the other committees that really occasionally see some heavy
duty. So this is what we came up with and I would move that we make this change in language
to the Bylaws on the Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate.

**P. Stoddard:** Being a Bylaw change, we actually are required to have two readings of this so
you might move that this would be the first reading of it.

**N. Castle:** Okay. I move this is the first reading and I would move that somebody needs to
second it or we ain’t gonna read it again! Thank you.
**P. Stoddard:** Are there any comments or thoughts? I know they worked fairly long on this and reasonably hard I assume but if you do, now would be a good time to mention it. If not, you could also let Nancy know about it between now and the next meeting. Otherwise, we’ll vote on this officially in April. Okay. All in favor of accepting this for a first reading say aye. All right, thank you. Thank you Nancy. Anything else? Nope, okay.

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

1. Nominations for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of Faculty Senate – see list of University Council members eligible to be elected. (Page 9)

**P. Stoddard:** The next order of business is Elections and Oversights and I think Cason is going to fill in for Earl today.

**C. Snow:** As stand-in for Earl, I would like to open the floor for nominations for the President of Faculty Senate and the Executive Secretary of the University Council. Right. So moved then! Nancy?

**N. Castle:** If you are interested Paul, I would like to nominate you.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you. I would be interested so I accept your nomination. Thank you. Okay. Are there any other nominations? Yes, Nancy?

**N. Castle:** I don’t have a nomination but on page 9 is the list of people who are eligible.

**P. Stoddard:** Good point.

**N. Castle:** And I am wildly absent.

**P. Stoddard:** You’ll notice on that list Brigid Lusk has an asterisk which means if she’s re-elected she’s eligible. She was re-elected so she is eligible if anybody wants to nominate her or if she’s here and wants to nominate herself. Yes, Linda.

**L. Derscheid:**

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Any discussion? All in favor of closing the nominations say aye. All right. Thank you. All right.

IX. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

X. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. Faculty response to student issues stemming from February 14.

**P. Stoddard:** Under new business a couple of items to consider. One, well and this is prompted from a couple of different places, but one was one of our guests today. This has to do with our
response to student issues stemming from February 14. We all know of course that the schedule has been postponed a week. We know that students and others on campus are going to respond to those events in different ways. We obviously have students who were in the classroom who may have been traumatized by what they had to see. We may very well – I’m sure we had a lot of students who had close friends who are no longer with us. We have students who are hurt. We have students that just by virtue of being on campus, will have a lot of trouble dealing with what happened. We have students who missed the class who will have trouble dealing with the fact that they weren’t there. Then, of course, we all as faculty know that we have our own issues that we have to deal with in this. The Provost has asked that we try to be flexible in how we deal with student issues. You know, some of us may still be dealing with incompletes from last semester as a result of the graffiti incident and that’s just snowballing now. We also have the issue of having postponed exams and graduation a week. Students who may have troubles because they have family vacations or jobs or other time commitments – excuse me – one wedding we know of. Somebody is going to get married the day of graduation now – at least one. These are going to be things that come up and basically we’re being asked to be as flexible as possible, to make allowances where we can for these students who, you know, through no fault of their own suddenly find themselves in very difficult scheduling situations as well as emotional situations. So the Provost has asked specifically that we be a little more generous in the granting of incompletes, that we work with students on alternatives to, you know, the final exam if that has to be the case and so forth. I don’t know, does anybody have any thoughts on that? Anything they want to say about that? Yes, Linda.

L. Derscheid: I think one thing we need to bare in mind is the integrity of the institution and what it means relative to the courses our students take. That is, when we talk about being very, I don’t know what the word is, very concerned, you know, dealing with students – I don’t think we’re going to deal with students much differently from what we would deal with were we to have emotionally disturbed students in our classes otherwise. It’s caused by a bunch of different kinds of activity but we have always been willing to deal with these things. What I’m concerned about is hearing students say in meetings that “oh, the faculty aren’t going to hold us to the same standards”. I think that is a totally inaccurate reading of where we’re at. That is, integrity demands that we grade at the same kinds of levels that we would otherwise grade. We may be working with a lot of students in terms of all kinds of special things but we don’t do any students any favor, if you want to put it that way, by grading them differently from the standards that represent the standards of the institution and this should be made clear to students. That we’re not talking about lowering standards in our courses.

P. Stoddard: Right. That’s an excellent point. Thank you. I’d also point out that the decision to push the semester back a week was made specifically with standards of – all academic standards in mind. We had already lost a Monday to Martin Luther Day. We’d lost a Wednesday to a snow day. We lost an extra Friday to the events of February 14. If we did not push back a week, we would have lost a full week in the Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedule and obviously many faculty feel they would not have enough time to teach everything we need to teach anyway, much less try to do it in one less week. That’s something that item B under new business addresses as well. But before we get to item B, are there any other comments or thoughts about – yes?
C. Garcia: I agree with the faculty that just talked. I think the flexibility come in the schedule and recommendations for ??? according to plans, etc. I think the students themselves also want to maintain the standards. That’s what they have expressed. So we just have to ??? a way to each different student’s needs which are very understandable right now and that is a hassle for us to deal with ??? different students but I think we have to convey to them that that’s what it means when we talk to them about flexibility – flexibility in the schedule; not flexibility in the grading process.

P. Stoddard: Absolutely. Okay. Good. All right, moving on then.

B. Reading Day

P. Stoddard: Item B is reading day and this is actually something that’s going to go through University Council since they deal officially with the university calendar, the academic calendar, but I thought I’d bring it up here and sort of get a sense of the faculty on that as well. The thought on reading day was to actually not have reading day this year, have classes on that Friday instead again with an eye towards the fact that we have lost – we pushed the semester back. That gets us the week that classes were closed, but we’re still out the Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes. Having classes on that last Friday gets us back one of those days. So the thought was to go ahead and allow classes to meet as they normally would during that day. If faculty felt that the students would be better served in their class by having the time to read, then that would be an individual faculty member’s decision in each individual class. But there would be no university policy saying that that day should be reserved for reading. So this would be essentially a regular class day. Yes?

Carol ???: I just wanted to make sure I understand exactly because I think maybe my mind wandered right at the very beginning. So basically to do away officially with the reading day for this semester and then it’s at the discretion of the professor as it would be at any time whether they decide if the class would meet or not meet. The reason I wondered was I was worried because if it was the other way that it’s a reading day but then faculty if they wanted to could meet, I think that sort of negates the thing and I think there’s actually a lot of faculty who don’t realize how – that in the rules – reading day they really should not be doing anything.

P. Stoddard: Right, your first interpretation was correct. Classes will meet and if faculty decides to cancel class for whatever reason.

???: A microphone was here. I’m not sure why we have reading day one semester and not another semester anyway.

P. Stoddard: I think it’s because of the exam schedule that in one semester we have exams right up – the exam is on Saturday – I forget how it works. It has to do with the exam.

D. Mathesius: Only in the spring. Exams start on Saturday and are on Saturday and then on Monday through Friday. Graduation is on a Saturday. In the fall, exams are Monday through Saturday with graduation on a Sunday so it’s just giving them a one day break between their last day of classes and before exams start.
A senator: Is that a relevant issue here?

P. Stoddard: It did come up in discussion but it was felt that in this circumstance with the loss of so much class time during the year, that it was better to get that extra day of classes in despite the fact it would cost students a day in between. But again this will come up in University Council where the students do have the appropriate voice to register their concerns or agreement with that. Okay? Yes?

N. Churyk: That is only for classes that meet on Fridays correct? Because you were bringing up Martin Luther which I moved my once a week graduate class for Martin Luther and Labor Day each year because of the Monday holidays.

P. Stoddard: This really – yeah, it only effects Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes or Friday classes. Yeah, if you normally met on a Friday then you should meet that day. If not, then ---

N. Churyk: You were bringing up all the other – the Wednesday, the Monday.

P. Stoddard: I understand and if you have a Wednesday evening class you’re out a week and if you have Monday only class, you’re out a week.

N. Churyk: Okay, just verifying.

A senator: Since we are talking about this, are we to take any position? Are we for it or against it – what we’re talking about?

P. Stoddard: I just wanted to see, I mean, if there was any strong opposition to this I wanted to know about it now so that I could forward that on to the University Council when we meet after break. If there’s not or if the faculty wish to vote yes or no, this body can certainly do it. I just wanted to see where we stood. You know, if I hear a lot of positive or negative comments I can relay that; if there’s an official vote, I can relay that.

A senator: As far as I know, I think the schedule was changed and the reading day was announced so we are now changing schedule again one more time and the reading day is to give one day break for students to prepare for exams, then they are not going to have it. I personally believe there should be a reading day and there is no reason not to. One day doesn’t really make a whole big difference.

P. Stoddard: Okay. Anybody else have any – yes, Michael?

M. Morris: I have been debating whether or not I wanted to say anything about this or not and I decided I’d better say something. I got an e-mail yesterday from one of my TAs in Elementary Spanish who reported that she had three students in one of her classes who claimed that during the rescheduled finals week that they were going to be out of the state or out of the country or otherwise having some commitment and she had already offered them various alternative arrangements, none of which were satisfactory to the students in question. Essentially what the
students wanted was they wanted to take the final during the original finals week which would require that I, while I am preparing classes for the last week or two of the semester, would have to prepare mass exams at the same time and when I hear students, you know, claiming that the rescheduled finals week creates a burden for them, well essentially what they are doing is they are placing the burden on us at the time when, you know, there are a lot of faculty who are struggling with the events of the 14th of February as well and I think that it’s important for the students to understand that it is also up to them to make accommodations for the faculty in this case because it’s not only the students who are effected but the faculty as well. I think that the faculty position needs to be taken into consideration there.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, but I would point out, I mean, the faculty we have the final say in how those accommodations are to be made; what sort of accommodations will be made and, I mean, if you feel it’s unreasonable or you cannot adequately prepare a mass exam and do the rest of the work you need to do, then you don’t have to offer them that option of taking it during the normal finals week. You might offer them another option, you know, I don’t know whether they want to do a paper instead. I might do that in my class; it might not be appropriate in your class but there might be some other way of doing it. You might offer them an incomplete and they come back and take the final later or a make up exam at some point that’s more convenient to them. I mean it’s up to you as a faculty member to decide how best to accommodate their needs but ultimately it is up to you and it’s not the – the student can’t come in and say you have to do whatever it takes to make me happy, you know, and you have to bend over backwards, jump through twenty-two hoops in order to meet my specific set of needs. It’s up to you to determine.

**M. Morris:** I’m glad to hear you clarify that because when I hear flexibility, that is exactly what comes to mind is the idea that I am supposed to bend over backwards to accommodate these people and the issue that was occurring to me was the issue that Linda just rightly raised and that is to say, where do we, you know, when do we say, you know, it’s up to us to maintain some sort of standards here.

**P. Stoddard:** It is up to us. Absolutely. Any other discussion about these issues? All right, if not – oh, I’m sorry. Gretchen?

**Gretchen B:** To follow up on that, I also wanted to mention that I think it’s not only a question of standards but it’s also a question of fairness across the board. If you get involved in a variety of different options for folks and this happened of course at the end of last semester, that I don’t feel comfortable offering one option to one student and one option to another student. I feel that I have to be fair across the board in terms of what I am doing to give an equal, you know, attention and response to their need but also to make sure that this is fair across the board for all of the students in the classes.

**P. Stoddard:** Again, as we talked about – I guess back in January – it seems so long ago, these options – these are our options to offer the students. It’s not options that the students can demand of us. There was a bit of miscommunication I think in December but they are the options we choose to offer. All we’re being asked is to be as accommodating as we can but not to the point of sacrificing standards, not to the point necessarily of sacrificing fairness, not to the point of sacrificing, you know, what we have to do.
C. Garcia: I think that if faculty is trying to make accommodation by flexibility and it doesn’t work then the faculty have the final call. I also think that if we offer something to one student – I kind of thought of that too – so I can relate to your point and what I did was I offered it to everybody. Whatever I offered to one, I offered to everybody. But only that one wanted to do it, the majority wanted to do it with everybody else. They are kind of upset they can’t. So only those who really need it were the ones taking that option. But if I offered it to everybody, then everybody knows that’s a possibility. Even when we wish it was the choice of them, I think we will feel good about being fair that way, you know.

P. Stoddard: Yes?

A senator: I’m thinking is it possible to offer final one week before the ??? is scheduled. You offered that flexibility to all students ??? or is it up to the faculty. That’s one actually option of reading the statement, being flexible and doing whatever you want.

P. Stoddard: Well, within reason. Faculty can schedule exams obviously at any point during the semester as they see fit. If you choose to schedule an exam the week before finals week, that’s certainly your choice. A lot of people do that. The only rule is that class must meet whether it’s to take an exam or to do something else during the period allotted during finals week. So if you want to give an exam the week before and then go over it during finals week or do whatever other type of class session you want during finals week that’s your choice as a faculty member but you are – you have to sign something that says we met during that final period. Okay? Yes?

A senator: I have a question. Not about the alternate options but the consistency. I had one student come in and say that her notebook was destroyed in the classroom and we had a test the next week so I gave her an alternate test option. Now do I have to make that option available to everybody?

P. Stoddard: I think this is something you answer for yourself. Talk to colleagues. This is a choice that you as a faculty member should have to determine. Some people I think would offer it to everyone else; others might say this is a very special circumstance for this student and from what I’ve heard, everybody who had a notebook in the classroom, those notebooks are all worthless now. I don’t think anybody was able to recover them unless it was in a backpack or something but any book that was out was non-recoverable they said. So that is a real issue and it’s not something that anybody every envisioned I think so I think you deal with it as best you can in the way that makes the most sense to you.

C. Garcia: I have a question. Do we have a reading day or it’s out?

P. Stoddard: It has not been – it will be officially voted on in University Council in two weeks. My sense that I’ll report to them is that we talked about it. There was some dissent about changing reading day to a class day but it seemed like most people who spoke about it were in favor of the idea. Unless I hear otherwise, that’s what I’ll say. Yeah, most people it seems are in favor of changing it to a regular class day.
C. Garcia: Well, I would like to say that I think that particularly I think we should have the reading day.

P. Stoddard: Maybe then – how about just a quick show of hands. How many of us would like to see a reading day as traditional – in other words a reading day that last Friday? Okay. A fair number. How many would like to see classes on Friday. Okay, classes on Friday at the discretion of the instructor. Okay, so roughly half and half. All right, Diana?

D. Swanson: This is just a thought. I haven’t spend a lot of time thinking all this through at this point but I haven’t yet had students come tell me that they can’t be at the exam because of the semester being pushed forward a week but my thought was oh good, I’ve got that last Friday that maybe could be a time but if the regular class is in session, then that messes up the flexibility of the Friday – you know what I’m saying? In terms of trying to figure out ways to accommodate students’ schedules like I’ve got a wedding next week on the exam day so that’s just another thought to throw into this muddle.

P. Stoddard: Just thinking off the top of my head, a lot of people probably had that thought which might make scheduling make up exams during that day dicey. Maybe not, I don’t know if it’s a net gain or a net loss. All right, so I’m going to report the faculty was kind of split on the issue of reading day. Any other comments about these issues?

C. Cole Hall Resolution – walk-in

All right, if not then I think Professor Thu has a resolution he would like to introduce at this time?

K. Thu: Thanks Paul. The resolution that’s before you I forwarded to Paul on Monday but just to give a few words by way of background. The geneses of this resolution actually comes from my Gen Ed course that I used to teach in Cole Hall actually just a few hours before the tragedy and it’s a class where we lost one of the students to the tragedy that afternoon and so in the aftermath, after we came back, we of course had a difficult time talking about it but when the issue of Cole Hall came around, it became a tangible easier thing for my class to talk about. So the geneses of this resolution really comes from the students in my Gen Ed course who by and large felt very strongly that there needs to be more dialogue about the disposition of Cole Hall. Now this of course all took place before President Peters’ announcement or e-mail yesterday indicating that, you know, we’re going to have some time to think about things and have a dialogue and have it incorporated into our healing process. So I actually thought about withdrawing the resolution after I got the e-mail from President Peters but then I had a second thought. I thought well wait a minute, it is an expression of the – a potential expression of the faculties sentiment towards Cole Hall. We’re not really on record yet as expressing our views and in addition, for the Department of Anthropology there’s a huge issue that hasn’t gotten enough attention which is the disposition of the hundred thousand plus artifacts in the basement of Cole Hall which I’m sure neither President Peters nor Governor Blagojevich were aware of when they made the press conference. Our museum director who curates those artifacts which have been in Cole Hall since the late 60’s estimates that it will take at least a year to
appropriately inventory, package and transport those artifacts following standard museum practices. So given that set of facts and the idea that we as faculty haven’t expressed our collective views yet on Cole Hall, I decided to just leave the resolution out there for consideration. So I will make a motion to adopt the resolution.

**P. Stoddard:** All right. Thank you. Any discussion on the resolution? Has everybody had a chance to look it over? If not, take a minute. Okay, any discussion? If not – yes, Jeff?

**J. Kowalski:** My only discussion might be to, I mean there’s an estimate and actually I’ve talked with Ann Wright-Parsons about this too and it’s not that I disagree with her estimate, but if by getting more people involved with the inventory and preparation and transportation of the artifacts this could be accomplished in a more timely manner, I’m wondering if we could change the last part of the resolution to “replace delaying the razing of Cole Hall be delayed by at least one year” to something on the order of “to such time as the artifacts in the Anthropology Museum have been prepared according to the regulations of the American Association of Museums” or something of that sort.

**K. Thu:** Again, when I wrote this I did it on Monday and I think I sent it to Paul on Monday as well so the museum piece of it wasn’t essential as just simply delaying the decision in the razing of Cole Hall for a year so I could do that as a friendly amendment and would accept it.

**P. Stoddard:** All right can I propose then that the wording actually be “be delayed until such time as the Anthropology collection be properly prepared”.

**J. Kowalski:** I would suggest adding, you know, following American Association of Museums regulations.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, following American Association of Museums standards?

**J. Kowalski:** Fine.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Does the seconder accept the amendment? Jeff, yeah?

**J. Chown:** I don’t think I’m going to be offering this as an amendment. I just wanted to mention that as I think about the situation, I’m concerned about the number of credit hours that are going to be lost in not using Cole Hall in the future. I was teaching a class with 300 students in Cole and we seem to be – accommodated now in the Visual Arts Building – have been moved and I haven’t had too much a problem with it so far but I can’t imagine that in the long term, if we’re not scheduling classes in Cole that it’s not going to have an effect on students and their ability to graduate, get the credit hours that they need so I’d like to know that there’s been some discussion about if we take Cole offline and we don’t make it an option for scheduling, that students are not going to be adversely effected in their progress towards graduation.

**P. Stoddard:** I’m glad you mentioned that Jeff. I have been asked, approached by the Provost, to come up with some names – and I think I’ve just added a name to that list – specifically to address the question of the short term and long term ramifications of taking Cole Hall offline.
You’re correct; those are large classrooms that we have lost. The scheduling for fall of ’08 does not include putting any classes in Cole Hall so – I mean, so far I think everything has been arranged such that everybody has enough room. So you might have been bumped from Cole into the Art Building and the class that was in the Art Building wasn’t large enough to fill it up so that got moved someplace else and it was a domino effect that effected an awfully lot of sessions. Fall is more heavily enrolled so we’re going to have a bigger problem scheduling the appropriate sized rooms but as of yet, there’s been no talk of limiting enrollment in the large section classes because of insufficient room size. Now I don’t know what happens when they actually see what students – and this begins in the beginning of April when they start registering – I don’t know what happens when, you know, we have too many sections of 300+ students if that becomes a problem or not. But I do need to get, I have one or two names already of people. They asked me for three or four so I might be calling you and asking you if you’re wanting to take part in that - anybody else who feels very strongly about Cole, who has experienced either teaching there or in another large classroom or experienced scheduling classes. Some department chairs I know have a lot of headaches trying to find schedules and so forth. You know, feel free to let me know you’d be interested in working on that and I’ll keep that in mind.

**K. Thu:** As a related note to that, students no longer have excess to the Cole Hall Museum collection and that effects people who are in museum studies.

**P. Stoddard:** Is that true? I know that there’s also a photo-journalism lab I believe in the basement of Cole?

**K. Thu:** Well, Ann has told – we met about this this morning – she has been given five minutes of excess to the collection every week or something like that so she doesn’t even have excess to the collection and I know there was a meeting with the dean and some other folks just prior to this meeting but the point concerning student credit hours and their excess to the museum collection might be relevant for this new committee.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Okay, good. Nancy?

**N. Castle:** In the past I have, instead of teaching in Cole, taught in Carl Sandburg so I don’t know if that’s an option but that’s a ---

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, I don’t know exactly where but I know that they are planning on using rooms in this building. That, of course, gets into other problems when we try to schedule off-campus groups into the student center, which we do a lot of but obviously our classes have to take precedents but still that’s opportunities for students lost if we can’t schedule them. So the loss of those classrooms is a real issue and something has to be decided one way or another about that and, of course, what goes in the basement or what has been going on or did go on. Yes?

**A senator:** There’s nothing wrong with them at the time they were written but I think they have been overtaken by events as anyone who has read the student newspaper today would know. There’s a far more wide-ranging and nuanced system of sampling everyone’s opinion including our own than we could accomplish by a debate in a parliamentary context. I don’t see any point in urging the administration to do what they’ve already done.
P. Stoddard: I’m going to take that as an unfriendly amendment. Is there a second to ---all right. I’m afraid there’s no second. What would you think to striking the second paragraph since that may no longer apply? Or if you like the second paragraph I would suggest inserting the word “whereas the initial decision”.

A senator: I think that’s appropriate, yeah.

P. Stoddard: And is the seconder okay with that?

Carole ???: Yeah.

P. Stoddard: Okay.

A senator: My concern with that is that the modifier of delayed by at least six months. When you had the second paragraph in there, then it was six months after that two weeks.

P. Stoddard: Well, we’re not striking it. We’re inserting the word initial I believe was what we had agreed on. Am I right Kendall?

K. Thu: Yeah.

A senator: Oh, we’re not striking. Okay.

P. Stoddard: And there was – yeah?

A senator: I just had a question. What was it – I didn’t see the paper today, what was referred to in the paper that has baring on this?

P. Stoddard: Okay, the President yesterday sent an e-mail out saying that essentially the Governor’s plan of razing Cole Hall and giving us 40 million dollars to build this really fancy classroom, etc. is pretty much off the table and that we’re going to approach this is three ways. We’re going to look at what an appropriate memorial would be and Mike Malone is going to look at that. We’re going to address the question of loss of classroom space and that was what I was just talking about in terms of trying to get some faculty representation and we’re going to address the question of what happens to the building itself. That is all open to a campus-wide and beyond conversation.

A senator: I have a question. The issue about what’s going to happen to Cole Hall, all the messages that we were getting during the incident and everything were very clear but then once that issue came up, for me it became very unclear in who was saying what. So, is this directed to the Governor or the President? I was unsure whether it was the President’s decision to immediately get rid of Cole Hall – and I know we were trying to be very supportive to the President. We were very proud of all the reactions and systems that had been put in place. So my only hesitancy in reading this document was that it doesn’t sound supportive and then only because I was unclear as to whose decision it really was for such a hasty announcement.
P. Stoddard: You know I – on the evening of the memorial I had the opportunity to be sitting with a lot of people who made that decision or were in a position to make or influence that decision and my impression was that no decision had been made as of Sunday evening; that it was too early to even think about this and then this came out like immediately afterwards. In fact, I had heard third or fourth hand so it may not be worth anything, that the Governor had said there would be no money available to address Cole Hall. This is how things can change in these situations. My impression was that the President’s gut reaction and he and some of the others of the administration actually toured the building the Friday after the event and everybody came out of that tour effected very deeply and the President said “we’ll never teach in that building again” and I suspect he felt there was no way that he’d ever go in that building again after what he had seen in there. This is just my sense; this is nothing he specifically said to me. That said, my understanding is that he was not part of the decision that the Governor then announced. I mean, he was not consulted, Dr. Williams was not consulted. They were told that this announcement would be made but they were not part of the decision making process. Since that time, the President has obviously heard that a lot of this was handled overly rashly and has decided to back off the Governor’s offer. Senator Burzynski has said he would not support the offer because of the hastiness, because of the – I mean, frankly what they are proposing to put in it is more than we had in Cole Hall and so by many people this was seen as an attempt by the university to exploit a tragic situation. I think the President is very sensitive to political issues like that and so I suspect if he wasn’t thinking about it at the time, he was certainly thinking about it soon after and decided to slow down and the Governor, from what I have seen, has said whatever they want, I’ll support. You know, if the decision comes from the university, if they want to do B or C, I’ll support that. My feeling is that as long as A or B or C is reasonable, replace what was lost or whatever, we’ll have much more support around the state than if we try to get something more. So if you’re seeing language in here, and I’m sure Kendall is open to suggestions, that you feel is over argumentative in view of what has happened since Monday, you know, we can try to soften that.

A senator: My only question was then who is this addressed to when we endorse to.

K. Thu: It’s not addressed to anybody. It’s just a position or a statement by the Senate and I was really trying to be cognizant of the fact that we don’t want to come off as being oppositional or unsupportive of the administration because I think most of us if not all of us agree that things were handled quite well and so that’s why I added that fourth section there to express our view that the administration has been handling things well and that this was not intended to be an indictment against what they did.

D. Swanson: Then I have a suggestion. Perhaps the fifth paragraph could be struck and then you still have the main intent of the resolution.

K. Thu: I think that’s appropriate given the e-mail and the President’s statement yesterday, that makes sense to me.

A senator: Yes, I have one comment to make; something that hasn’t been addressed in regards to this and that when you’re referring to the museum collection you’re talking about scientific
materials and the issue of academic integrity has already come up and that’s certainly an issue here and such and for us to just take scientific materials and have them damaged or possibly destroyed, I mean, who knows, I mean it hasn’t been specified what would happen otherwise, that seems, you know, not a good thing either. So I think there needs to be some kind of a statement made for the protection of those materials and I’m completely for that but, of course it should be worded right and so on.

**P. Stoddard:** We did add that the razing of Cole Hall should be delayed until the collection could be prepared appropriately according museum standards.

**K. Thu:** It’s also hopefully fairly explicit in the second to last paragraph as well.

**A senator:** I’m just saying that I think that’s a very good strong part of the proposal.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, we had a friendly amendment suggested to strike the fifth paragraph. Is that all right with the seconder?

**A senator:** I was just trying to read and see if it made sense with it out because of course that paragraph talks about how we’re coming back away from the initial decision.

**K. Thu:** It seems to me that the statement in paragraph two now really covers what paragraph five is saying and I think the message from the President changes the message – changes the approach.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Is there any other discussion. Yeah, I’m sorry. Go ahead.

**A senator:** Finally, I think in the sixth paragraph – one, two, three, four, five, six – sorry – yes, the big one right? You could really take out the last sentence now because we’ve added a redundant reference to the American Association of Museums policies and since we’ve added that to the final paragraph, you really don’t need to say redundantly what you’ve said in the sixth paragraph about it.

**K. Thu:** Could Donna read the revised last sentence just to make sure that is the case?

**D. Mathesius:** What I have down is “be it delayed until such time that the artifacts of the Anthropology collection can be prepared following the American Association of Museums standards”.

**A senator:** That’s the last half of the sentence?

**D. Mathesius:** And the last.

**A senator:** Which is why I’m suggesting that starting with according in the previous paragraph, you really don’t necessarily need to say that anymore.
K. Thu: I see the point. To me, it simply bolsters the sentence in the last paragraph because it’s voiced directly from the Director of the museum and she has stated to the administration that it will take at least a year for those artifacts to be inventoried, packaged and transported. I just think it strengthened it.

P. Stoddard: All right, Diana had her hand up and then --- Diana?

D. Swanson: Oh, well I was just going to suggest that — I think that — well, I’m sorry, two things. Number one, I think that what Donna read should be adjusted a little bit. I’ll just read the entire last sentence as I understand what people were saying it should be “be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the decision to raze Cole Hall be delayed be at least six months and that the razing of Cole Hall be delayed until such time that the Anthropology collection be properly prepared and transported following American Association of Museums standards” and then secondly I was just going to say that as an English major, I think we’ve done enough editing and this seems good.

C. Garcia: I just have a question and I apologize if I am going to insult sensitivity here. I don’t need to do that but I am not clear why for this particular case we need to write a resolution instead of a recommendation like we always do. In many other cases we have approved a recommendation and I think all of the things we’re saying here, we all feel like it’s kind of redundant to me. I’m sorry if I’m looking at it that way. I think with the last paragraph only, we are making the point that we want to make.

K. Thu: Just to respond to the question about a resolution versus a recommendation, this is not an actionable item that we’re forwarding to another body. It’s simply the stance, it’s a position perspective by the Senate and as such, I think a resolution is appropriate.

P. Stoddard: Jean? Oh, I’m sorry – in the back first and then Jean. He’s been waiting.

A senator: What happens to the discussion to paragraph five? I think if it stays, we could adjust a little words and we ??? – we could say has been made without full dialogue in the spirit of coming together and moving forward and then abrupt ??? should probably be corrected to initial decision because that’s how we call it. I could read that paragraph again.

P. Stoddard: We deleted that paragraph.

A senator: Somebody was talking about reading it again, whether it made some sense or something.

P. Stoddard: Oh, whether the rest of the statement would make sense without that but I think that the consensus was that it would make sense without that so there’s no need to leave it in because the President’s e-mail has really superseded the sentiments that were expressed in that paragraph.
A senator: The last sentence as it has been revised, for that matter as it was in the beginning, does that not assume – is that not attached to the assumption that Cole Hall will be demolished which doesn’t bother me; I think it might be a good idea.

K. Thu: It might be. I mean I don’t know. I don’t really have a strong feeling on whether it should be razed one way or the other.

P. Stoddard: I think the problem is the definite article before the word decision. If I can put on my non-English hat for a minute and maybe if we replaced “the decision” with “any decision”?

K. Thu: Any decision concerning Cole Hall ---

P. Stoddard: Any decision to raze Cole Hall be delayed because there is at this point no decision that’s valid.

K. Thu: Correct, yeah.

P. Stoddard: Linda and then Bob.

L. Derscheid: I think still the way it’s worded though it does assume that the razing of Cole Hall is going to occur, the way this statement reads. That is, it says “that any decision (if you want) to raze Cole Hall be delayed at least six months and that the razing of Cole Hall be blah, blah, blah” so that’s suggesting that we have already got the idea it’s going to be razed. Whether it is or is not is still – so, you know, should the decision to raze Cole Hall that – you know, that would be more appropriate in terms of the proper English. Right?

P. Stoddard: Right, Bob?

A senator: I have a question of editing. I have ??? that the Faculty Senate recommends that Cole Hall not be razed until such time as the collections can be properly taken care of”. Would that satisfy all objections? It doesn’t have the AAM standards ---

P. Stoddard: We’d add all that. I think that doesn’t address Linda’s point though that still implies that it will be so if we can work Linda’s language into that I think it does clean it up a bit. So let’s see if we can’t get this whole thing in one fell swoop.

K. Thu: We could say that “be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that any decision concerning the disposition of Cole Hall be delayed by at least six months” – no, I heard no?

A senator: During the six months, no one is doing anything with the Anthropology collection. It’s just six months lost and the exhibit could still be damaged.

P. Stoddard: Well, we’re addressing two things. What happens to Cole Hall? We need to decide that and then two, if we decide that it’s going to be leveled, that sufficient time be allowed to prepare and transport the collection according to museum standards, so if anybody has a fast
pen and is willing to put that to paper? Nancy? And I would point out that we’re losing members fast here.

**N. Castle:** I was going to say then maybe my comment will be a wrap up thing because my comment is that I’m hoping Paul that sort of, as a routine, this is the kind of thing you would pass forward. I mean, I don’t think you just leave it in the minutes of our meeting that you did this, especially given there is new information about the Anthropology collection and so on. So do you routinely pass things on to the President or ---

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you. Some point between now and the next University Council meeting, I will meet with the Provost and the President and I routinely review what the Senate has talked about. This will be part of that discussion, whether I use the exact language we agree on or just say the faculty wants to have a deliberate discussion about the fate of Cole Hall and oh, by the way, we’ve got that Anthropology collection we have to be very careful of.

**K. Thu:** Also, Nancy, they know about it. It has been run up the flag pole but it doesn’t – having one museum curator and a few faculty in Anthropology say something about it is different than the collective faculty senate voicing their concerns.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, I’m going to take, in the interest of time, a final pass – what I hope will be a final pass – at the final paragraph. “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that any decision regarding the disposition of Cole Hall” – let’s say, all right – “be delayed by at least six months and that should the decision be made to raze Cole Hall, sufficient time will be allowed for the preparation and transportation of the Anthropology collection in accordance with AAM standards”.

**K. Thu:** Now could you remember or repeat that?

**P. Stoddard:** “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that any decision regarding the disposition of Cole Hall be delayed by at least six months and that should the decision be made to raze Cole Hall, sufficient time be allowed for the preparation and transportation of the Anthropology collection in accordance with AAM standards.”

**K. Thu:** That sounds good. I accept that as a friendly amendment.

**A senator:** I think the one thing that the Senate and the Council would want most to avoid is to interfere with an expeditious deliberation and determination of what will happen or not happen to Cole. It’s a small point but I would take the word “concerning” out. It’s not any decision concerning Cole Hall; it’s any decision as you originally said, to raze Cole Hall which is the one thing – this resolution started out by saying shouldn’t happen in the next six months.

**K. Thu:** And that’s actually retained in what Paul just said. In the second part of your sentence says “should that decision ultimately be to raise Cole Hall, then there should be sufficient time allowed” ---
P. Stoddard: I suppose thought, according to Bob, if the university wanted to decide next week not to raze Cole Hall, we’re saying well, you can’t do that; you have to wait six months.

K. Thu: Oh, I see what you’re saying. Well, then at that time, we’ll change the resolution.

C. Garcia: Why six months? ?? in those six months. Is it so the campus community can discuss the options and make an agreement on what to do? So maybe ---

P. Stoddard: How about any decision regarding the final decision disposition of Cole Hall be made in a deliberate manner by the university community and that should the decision be made to raze Cole Hall, etc., etc., etc. and that addresses Bob’s concern about the timeliness of the decision. It makes sure we don’t do a rashly, it makes sure everybody gets the appropriate voice in there. I’m calling the question. If there’s anybody here to answer? All in favor of the resolution as we’ve modified it say aye. Opposed? Thank you.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 P.M.