I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Are we all here? Welcome everybody to our first Senate meeting of the year. I guess we’ll call to order to let’s just get right to it.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda? Thank you. Thank you. Any comments, additions, etc.? Seeing none, all in favor say aye. Thank you.

Hansen made the motion; Stephen seconded. The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 25, 2007 FS MEETING (Pages 3-8)

P. Stoddard: If you’ve had a chance to take a look at the minutes, make sure your name is spelled correctly, that you were there if you thought you were there and not if you thought you weren’t. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you. Any corrections, additions, deletions, etc.? All right, all in favor of approving the minutes please say aye. Any opposed? Abstentions? All right, thank you.

Snow made the motion; Hansen seconded. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
P. Stoddard: As I said, this is the first meeting of the Senate. We have Provost Alden here who will chat with us a little bit about what’s going on and what we might look forward to this year. Before we introduce him though, I’d like to just say a few words of introduction for those of us new to the Senate or those of us who forgot what we did last year.

The Senate is really basically the one place on campus where the faculty has the potential for a unified voice to express our concerns. Essentially, we get together, we talk about issues that are of particular importance to the faculty. You note we also have a reporter from the Northern Star here today. He’s usually here for our meetings. We also discuss things of importance to the university as a whole, which obviously includes the students, staff and other folks but this is really mainly for the faculty. Suggestions and concerns we have here are often forwarded to the University Council which is the authoritative body on campus responsible for making, approving, revising policies and procedures that the university follows. So we’re really more of an advocacy group than anything else. As such, we also are responsible for disseminating information about what’s going on in the university to our various departments. Every department has at least one member elected to this body. Several departments will have more because University Council faculty members are also de facto members of the Senate so we typically are a body of about – what, 70-75 people, give or take. That said, we encourage everybody to get their say in. When you do so, please use a microphone. There’s one at every table. If there’s not one directly in front of you, please ask for it and especially for the new folks on the Senate, be sure to identify who you are. All these meetings are recorded and minutes and transcripts made available so we need to know who you are and what you said and if you don’t want that save for posterity then write me an e-mail about your concerns later, but if you’re going to speak up in Senate then we need to know who you are and what you say.

With that, unless there are any questions about anything in the way we work or issues – I guess I should say if you have any issues, we have an Executive Committee that sets the agenda. They meet generally the week before the full Senate meets. There will be a list of all the members of the Executive Committee. If you’ve got concerns that you’d like raised, you can contact anybody on that list. You can contact me. You can contact Donna Mathesius who is our secretary for the Senate and the University Council. She’s the one actually makes sure everything gets done properly. Ferald Bryan is here to make sure everything gets done by the book as we say. He’s got the book right there and so we are by it – Ferald is by it – and we try to not be too terribly formal in here but occasionally we do have to make sure we dot the “i’s” and cross the “t’s”. That said, if there are no general comments, I’d like to invite Provost Alden up to talk to us about the goings on at the university.

A. Provost Alden will be attending the Faculty Senate meeting.

R. Alden: Thank you. Welcome back everybody. I hope everybody had a productive summer. It was a busy summer at least for some of us. I know that there seemed to be a lot more going on this summer, maybe I just knew more about what was going on and got involved more but I did want to give you an update on Strategic Planning since that’s going to take a lot of additional effort this year as we go from the university level down to the college and department levels. For those of you who either weren’t here or were not involved in the Strategic Planning
processes, I thought I’d go over a little bit about what the process was, what some of the conclusions were, where do we go from here, and so forth. It was a very intensive process. We had President Peters kick it off at the last State of the University address with his vision of NIU as a sustainable, engaged, global, responsive, and accountable university and asking me to convene a task force to develop a strategic plan. It was in a very aggressive timeline because of the starting of the capital campaign at the end of the academic year, we had basically eight months to do it and this is something that oftentimes for university level planning, takes a university years to go through. We did have a forty-five member Strategic Planning Task Force which had representatives from any number of different constituency groups, well represented by the faculty of course, as well as staff and we tried deliberately to have representation from a diversity of disciplines. We brought in an outside group of experts. We actually had a RFP process, The Learning Alliance, which was a non-profit affiliate of the University of Pennsylvania which has been in the business of helping universities with strategic plans for probably about twenty-two years now. They’ve done over ninety universities’ strategic plans and they came in and they interviewed everybody on the Task Force, they interviewed everybody on the Deans’ Council and the President’s Cabinet and basically came up with a consensus of what they were hearing when they asked a series of similar questions of everybody and the Task Force kind of narrowed down what they were hearing down to I think eight or nine different areas that everybody kind of agreed on as consensus values and directions they would like to see the university go in. We had 110 people show up for a roundtable before classes started this last January. Again, this was a very consensus driven process where constituency groups were represented in three breakout groups that all were looking at what the Task Force had done in terms of identifying certain areas and they helped to kind of refine that whole process down. The Task Force then took the results of that roundtable discussion and identified four, what was called at that time, strategic imperatives, sort of the big picture of university goals that represented kind of what we wanted to hold as values and directions of the university. The final document was produced – I’m sorry – I skipped a whole big part which was a weekly meeting of the work groups on these four imperative areas to talk about these areas – to talk about some examples, some criteria and so forth for going forward with these strategic imperatives. Every other week I met with the work group chairs and we met with the external consultants as well as the President for some of the period during these meetings and tried to compare notes to see how each work group was doing. The work groups had space on a website where they could share information and so it was a lot of crosstalk between the groups. At the end of the process, we had another roundtable, again 110 people with breakout groups to review the reports coming out of these committees before the consultants took the products and tried to integrate them into a single document and then during the summer we received that document. I had a deans’ retreat several weeks ago to try to determine how do we bridge from this big picture document into what would be more specific planning at the college and department level. That document, that consensus document including the bridge, will be shared with the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee of the Board tomorrow and will be posted on the web shortly thereafter. So you’ll be able to see the result of this basically nine month process and that’s really just the start of things. We discussed the key values of the university in that document. I won’t go through them all. We also discussed these four imperatives. The first one was to preserve, strengthen and extend NIU’s teaching and learning environment. It was very clear form everybody that the fact that we had a history of valuing excellence in particularly undergraduate education needed to be preserved as a primary
imperative and I think some of the potential strategic direction suggested by that work group are very useful and some of the examples may actually form the basis for future action plans. But they are only examples. That’s one thing, as people saw these work groups come out with examples, they were concerned that those would be mandates before the campus as a whole had a change to vet them. I want to assure you all, and we’ll talk about that when we get into process, there will be plenty of opportunity for interaction on these examples. The second imperative was to develop a strategy for investing in multi-disciplinary scholarship and artistic clusters. This was deliberately designed to compliment NIU’s focus on excellence in individual research but it was felt that one of our strengths was that we worked together pretty well across disciplines, across departments and across colleges. Believe it or not, many research universities do not have that ability – to work between disciplines and it was felt that to capitalize on that was a good thing for us to do. The third area was to strengthen and extend NIU’s regional impact but focusing on the region in a much more global sense. The fact that the Chicago-land region is really a global region in terms of having many multi-national perspectives in terms of headquarters of industries as well as having communities that are multi-national or multi-cultural in nature is something we want to build on and capitalize on. Then finally, make NIU an institution of first choice for faculty, students and stuff. This is something to focus on the fact that we want to make sure this is a friendly and welcoming campus community and we wanted to identify mechanisms to make sure that we continue to develop in that direction and some of the suggestions really were examples of things we can do in the future.

I won’t go through all of the areas that were discussed. As I say, there’s a lot of good examples there. There are – particularly the first work groups – spent a lot of time talking about how to enrich our learning environment, engaging students not only in classroom activities but in research and service learning and internships and so forth. I think there’s a lot to be talked about there. Looking at abilities to enrich our thinking in terms of curricular development and I would like to say that there’s some good examples in there we may want to discuss more thoroughly to enhance the diversity both of ethnic groups as well as disciplines on this campus and how do we embrace that. How do we make sure that that is part of our academic culture. Finally, creating venues for conversing about ideas. This is kind of the fourth big area that that first work group looked at, focusing on a concept of a themed year of can we start looking across a number of courses, particularly general education courses, and talk about the same topics from different perspectives and maybe bring in some experts and so forth. Again, examples but maybe more concrete examples than some of the others that were brought forward. So that’s there for discussion. I know the President is interested in exploring this perhaps more thoroughly with a work group or a task force this year.

The second area is in developing a strategy for investing in multi-disciplinary scholarship and artistic clusters. This group focused mainly on determining what is the definition of a multi disciplinary cluster both in terms of scholarship and in terms of academic programs and they basically wanted something that raised the visibility of the university in a long-term collaboration involving participants across academic units, has a clearly defined focus that is best investigated by a multi-disciplinary approach and provides unique educational opportunities for our students through these multi-disciplinary programs. They also determined what the best criteria for selecting these would be as well as some of the kind of rules of the game. What would be needed for a multi-disciplinary cluster to succeed? They were not willing or, probably
wisely, not wanting to give examples of multi-disciplinary clusters; they wanted that to be a campus decision based on some of these kind of guidelines they provided and we will be engaging in that process. But it will be an ongoing process over the next years to come.

The third area, strengthening and extending NIU’s regional impact, they focused on the fact that we have done a very good job with this through Outreach, through public/private partnerships but we have not done it necessarily in a coordinated fashion and so they thought that this was something we needed to capitalize on, the fact that we work well with external constituency groups and that that may need to be something we want to enrich and enhance in the future and they did come up with some examples of what they saw would be good multi-disciplinary clusters that would support regional development. The Proton Therapy Center, which some of you’ve heard about already, this has been a combination of an opportunity as well as a strength. We’ve had long-term strengths in not only health sciences but in the accelerator and particle sciences associated with Argonne and Fermilabs and this was a natural outgrowth. They also talked about a world education center which is combining a number of people’s ideas. The Proton Center is probably going to move forward because it has its own funding sources but the world education center is something we probably want to consider along with other things that could help regional development.

In terms of making NIU the first choice for faculty, students and staff, there were a number of planning tasks identified. I think some of them you would certainly agree with; some you may want to add to. There were some strategic initiative examples forwarded and I think these, faculty reward and regard, is something I don’t think I’ll get an objection to in this group, but trying to identify areas where we need to build to increase and enhance the sense of campus culture so people feel good about being here.

In terms of the next steps, the articulation process, we will be going down to the individual level and asking people to submit good ideas within a few days or a few weeks after the President’s State of the University speech, we will be asking colleges to solicit concept papers from either departments or individuals and then we will be seeing how many of these start showing there’s some good ideas we want to focus on. It may show the potential for multi-disciplinary programs where the same ideas are coming forward from different colleges and maybe they need to be blended together and these concept papers will also be vetted as the starting of a college level planning process where we are looking for what kinds of goals, what kinds of strategic action items, what kinds of milestones are coming from the colleges and how do we see how they fit together as a university level set of priorities we want to advance over time. So the imperatives are kind of at the university level, the goals would be at the college level and then you would start to identify much more specific action steps, timelines, benchmarks and so forth. So part of the document is trying to come up with a common lexicon of what do we mean when we talk about a milestone, what do we mean when we talk about a goal versus an imperative, so some of it is trying to get much more specific when we get down to the local level where the grass roots input is so important.

Then we have, parallel to that, going on a discussion that I’ve had ongoing with the President on looking for resource allocations that can support all of these things that will be coming forward and so I’m sure he’ll be talking about some of those in his State of the University speech. Others
will come forward as these concepts tend to gel a little bit more but I think we’re talking about significantly new resources to these academic programs. I don’t think we’re talking about tens of millions of dollars but we’re talking about significant resources to try to advance some of these areas and so that will be an evolutionary process over the next years. I would hope that during that process, we’ll have the opportunity for some strategic initiative grants where somebody whose concept paper shows they have a better idea; they just need more time to develop it or maybe they want to show a prototype or a pilot project, there’ll be some funding available to either buy out release time or maybe provide some graduate student support or operational support of some sort to get those better ideas out. So all of these things are starting to gel. I would hope within the next month or so you’ll see some much more specific things coming out both from the President’s level and from my level and definitely from the deans’ level to try and start showing how we can support this university’s various imperatives.

So that’s what’s going on with Strategic Planning and I’d be happy to answer questions on that but I do have a couple of things I want to mention. In light of Virginia Tech and all of the reports that have come out in the last few weeks, I know people have security issues on their minds. I do want to make sure everybody recognizes that we do have an emergency operational plan and that’s being reviewed by a task force to look at the Virginia Tech report, see what we could learn from that, see how we can enhance our emergency operation plan and at the same time, you’ll be seeing these campus emergency guides which are kind of designed so you can flip to different kinds of emergency situations and see the recommended procedures including on the front page, who the emergency contact people are for different units. So those will be distributed over the next few weeks to all units and you should be seeing them show up in your classrooms hopefully in the next month or two as well as in your departmental offices.

We also, in a parallel effort, have had work going on through Student Affairs where the question of what happens when a faculty or staff member encounters a student or maybe even another faculty or staff member who is seeming to have some emotional problems or maybe disruptive behavior in terms of what do you do. So Student Affairs has a presentation that they want to get out to all the faculty who have concerns in this area about how do you determine whether something is a problem of concern, who do you contact, what are the next steps and there’s a very aggressive, proactive program that’s been developed coming out of Student Judicial Affairs. If you have those kinds of situations now, please report them to Student Judicial Affairs but be aware that we’re trying to get the word out in terms of the workshops. We will be having a chair’s workshop on this very issue about how do you deal with individuals; how do you determine whether an individual is having some emotional situations or some mental health issues and then what do you do about it. So hopefully the chairs will be having that opportunity – probably later in the semester we’ll be looking for mechanisms through the Deans’ Council – how do we get out the word to the faculty that are concerned about this.

I think I’ve said enough. I’ll be happy to answer questions. There are a number of other things going on but the budget situation is still in limbo as you are probably aware. There’s still an opportunity for overrides of the Governor’s signature based on line-item veto and changes on various items in the budget so we still don’t know exactly what our budget will be. Hopefully, we’ll know in the next week or two. We’re hoping for at least a 2% increase in operations but anything political can happen, will happen, and so we’ll see what happens there. Capital hasn’t
even been on the radar screen of anybody so I’m afraid we may be in for another year of either no capital projects or anything on this side is going to be very much delayed because that hasn’t been a focus of any of the groups. So – any questions you might have.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Jeff, yeah.

J. Kowalski: Simply because several faculty asked me to bring this up, it relates to the budget but if we do get this hoped for 2%-wise in operations budget, can you remind us what that might translate into in terms of any raises for faculty and staff.

R. Alden: I really would hesitate to give a number right now simply because the Cabinet has deliberately not met on that issue. It will hopefully be more than 2% but I cannot say how much and it may come in two pieces as it did in the past. All those issues have to be discussed when we know what our basic playing field is. That base budget is so important to get us started. We have had a tuition raise but, again, it’s only on entering students and so how that translates – we have to look at the enrollment, the ten-day enrollment – we have to look at how that translate into new tuition revenues on top of whatever this comes out to be. So I wish I could tell you – I’m sure the President will make an announcement as soon as possible. The one thing the President has said whatever across the board or merit based raises are coming for the fall, will be retroactive to July 1 so we’re not losing anything. If it’s in two increments, of course, the January increment would not be retroactive July 1 so I don’t want to mislead anybody. Yes?

J. Stephen: Provost Alden can you remind us of the Faculty Senate recommendation on how the raises should be ---

R. Alden: Well, since I didn’t formally come to UCPC I’m not sure I know much more than what was in the Northern Star so I’ll have to turn to my colleague to answer that one.

P. Stoddard: We had recommended that any increments be roughly half across the board and the remaining have merit with certain caveats. If it was a really huge increment, the across the board would not be greater than inflation and such. I don’t think anybody is really anticipating that eventuality but it’s – we mentioned it just in case. I would remind you that we are just one voice in the whole process. There are other voices who have different opinions about how that should be divided up.

D. Swanson: Hi, Dianna Swanson. Could you remind us what happened to that recommendation that the Faculty Senate voted on? Did it go to the University Council from there or did it go to the UCPC or ---

P. Stoddard: It was communicated personally from me to the Provost so the Provost knows ---

D. Swanson: So such matters on which the Faculty Senate votes don’t formally go to the University Council? I thought they ---

P. Stoddard: Actually, the UCPC is the official faculty voice on this. We sort of added our own two cents because in the past we’ve been called on to make a recommendation – it’s hard to
imagine – but in the past when the budget process went in a more timely fashion, which meant it was only one or two months late, the decision would be made over the summer and since UCPC was not available, I thought it would be a good idea to have some faculty voice in the process should we be in that position. Since things have carried on so late, there is any number of possibilities of the appropriate faculty voice would be at this point. We have had – I mean our say, our vote that we took, has been communicated to both the President and the Provost.

R. Alden: And there were early discussions in UCPC long before – I think it was in the fall we talked about – but I don’t know if we came to any conclusions. But, you know, as Paul says, there’s a lot of different voices on both the merit side and the across the board side coming from all over campus so I couldn’t even begin to predict where this is going to end up.

C. Garcia: Clersida Garcia from Kinesiology and Physical Education. I have a question – what is the official way to bringing to the attention of the UCPC the different ideas that different groups have about budget? Is it a written statement ???, is it something that is kept track of or no?

R. Alden: First of all the UCPC handles personnel decisions. We don’t – unfortunately – do not get involved – fortunately or unfortunately depending on what side of the fence you’re on, we don’t get involved in budget issues. The raise issue has been considered a personnel matter that if we had a certain raise of a certain magnitude, sometimes I believe the UCPC in the past, before I got here, and it’s nothing that I would not pass along if it was recommended, that they suggested – well, if you got a raise of this size, this is what we would expect to be done with it. If it was another size – you know, different scenarios but that didn’t really come forward specifically this year to the UCPC. Yes?

J. Kawolski: Jeff Kawolski from the School of Art again. So in light of that and since you’re here with us today, perhaps it would be helpful for us to ask you if when you meet with the UCPC this year, if one of the agenda items could be to consider the proposal from the Faculty Senate and discuss their responses and see if some consensus can be arrived at regarding the UCPC’s position on this.

R. Alden: I definitely could. I think what we were waiting for was some specific recommendation and Paul has mentioned the desire to get a significant portion across the board but, you know, it wasn’t any sort of model that we could debate about. I mean, I can pass that along to the Cabinet but it was – there is a lot of debate about the balance between merit and across the board and I couldn’t tell you where that’s going to come out. One of the things that if you look back in years where merit and merit only was given, there is still a significant across the board component. I mean, I think it’s very seldom was an individual not given something and so that discussion always goes on is if your merit already has a component of everybody gets some and you put that on top of across the board, is there anything for distinguishing the truly exceptional at the top of the merit scale. I mean, we had those discussions in UCPC and I don’t think we ever came to a hard and fast conclusion on it. So I will certainly bring it forward. I will put it on the agenda but if there’s something specific we can talk about other than philosophically, you know, maybe some, maybe not some.
P. Stoddard: I can forward the minutes from the relevant Senate debate. I did try in the minutes to address the various viewpoints that were expressed, give a feel for the nature of the vote. It wasn’t unanimous; it was strongly in favor of what we ended up voting on but I did try to give ????. I probably dropped the Paul on not getting that to the Provost at the end of last year. I did communicate the general wishes of the faculty and some of the specifics but not in a really formal way.

R. Alden: Yes.

E. Miller: Hi, I’m Beth Miller from FC&S. If I can change the topic back to the security issues, I appreciate the improvement in our plan and you’re communicating that to us and all the work that Student Affairs is doing. Student Affairs is part of your office, right?

R. Alden: Yes.

E. Miller: One of my concerns in working with Student Affairs and Student Judicial Office in the spring was that the communication seemed to be somewhat one way and when I tried to contact them about a concern I had about a student, he was in my class, involved in an incident on campus, I was sort of shut out of the information because of – well, I’m not really sure why.

R. Alden: Student matters are often like personnel matters for faculty or staff; they’re confidential.

E. Miller: Exactly. We still thought we had the right to “need to know” and I believed I had a right to “need to know” and I did discuss it at length with Larry Boyles and he agreed that I had a right to “need to know” but with the Student Affairs and my first contact, I was not, you know, handled – in my opinion – as a professional and so one of my concerns is when these new guides are being constructed, when the sort of “what to do with students” are being developed – and I understand that these people do have a background in counseling and student development – that there is significant faculty input because we are in the classrooms and we have a different take on what it’s like to have 120 students and what it’s – and that’s a very different kind of perspective than what it means to be a counselor and coming from a background in both, I know sort of how to speak both lingo but I, playing both roles, I have a different perspective ---

R. Alden: Right.

E. Miller: --- and I want to at least urge you to ask them to consider making sure that faculty are involved in the development of these guides because I think it does make a big difference in how we approach our students, what we do, you know, and simple things like, you know, is there a phone on every floor where we can call campus police. There are, you know, where do we go in case there’s a problem, you know, is there access out, you know, what do we say to the rest of the students when there’s a problem with a student.

R. Alden: Right.
E. Miller: There are really very simple kinds of things that I don’t know that people are dealing with.

R. Alden: And I think that’s important in this. Even thought I kind of presented it as a communication of the process from Student Affairs to the campus, I think this is something that’s evolving nationwide as we try and evaluate what came out of the Virginia Tech incident so I think there’s a lot of opportunity when we develop these venues for faculty and staff to talk about what their concerns are about the various steps. We have one of the more proactive policies I’ve seen at universities for removing disruptive or disturbed students if they’re unwilling to get treatment. So this process does have a significant end game to it so I want to make sure that everybody realizes that whatever concerns they express, will be taken seriously and could lead to the removal of the student – involuntary removal of the student. So I, you know, if there are some specific suggestions – one of the things we wanted to do was have one point of contact in Judicial Affairs so that if the same student is getting not necessarily extraordinarily bad reports from different parts of campus – but the pattern is such that this is accelerating, whatever emotional or other issues this person having seems to be going beyond just writing something disturbing in a creative writing class but has gone beyond that, then we have one point of contact and then the counselors can determine whether – is this symptomatic of a much, much more wide-spread problem with this particular student. But if there’s some sort of interaction – most faculty that I’ve heard from want to maintain a certain anonymity so that they can maintain their relationship to their other students rather than being the one that, you know, that carries it through the process so they’re glad to hand it off to somebody else but if there’s a role there, we certainly can explore that.

P. Stoddard: I think Buck and then Alan.

J. Stephen: I’ve thought about this and I see two problems. One is the Family Privacy Act of 1974 which is the thing which probably effects the reason why Beth didn’t get any feedback on that and ---

R. Alden: Plus there’s HIPA issues too but ---

J. Stephen: Right and ---

R. Alden: There’s a nationwide rethinking of what those really mean in light of Virginia Tech.

J. Stephen: Well I’m thinking that maybe working with Larry Boyles and Tim Griffith with a problematic student, we might be able to come up with some sort of waiver which allows us as faculty members to be forewarned, although that may not be a good idea – that should be thought about also.

R. Alden: Yeah, yeah.

J. Stephen: But one of the other things that came out of the Virginia Tech report that came out just last week or so ---
R. Alden: Yes.

J. Stephen: --- and I liked the fact that the governor did not pounce on the idea that firing the president would fix it – um, and that’s the fact that we don’t get anything about high school disciplinary records for our students and the particular student at Virginia Tech had exhibited this type of behavior in high school also.

R. Alden: Right.

J. Stephen: But there’s no way to get around that either.

R. Alden: It’s – I don’t know, I mean, of the eighty or so recommendations coming out of that report, some of them are, like you say, either – probably not very useful – let’s put it kindly but others I think are important in terms of the interpretation of what our limitations truly are and what’s just the perceived limitations because we tend to hide behind FERPA and HIPA simply because we don’t know specifically how far it can be pushed. I was at a provosts’ meeting earlier this summer and a legal expert says that no university has ever been brought to court federally over FERPA issues at all and so, you know, there is no test case – how far can you push it without getting into trouble and losing your federal funding which is always the hammer they have over you and I think that’s a national dialogue we’re going through now and certainly, you know, opportunity for discussion.

P. Stoddard: Alan?

A. Rosenbaum: I think that ??? – off mike – but removing students doesn’t really accomplish much because the student can just come back on campus; they don’t have to be a student and I think sometimes you just anger them more by throwing them out, whereas the approach that seems to make the most sense is to have adequate psychiatric services available for the students so that students who are upset, feel disenfranchised or whatever, can speak to a counselor who’s there to help him and try to make some progress with them and one of the things that concerns me is whether there is action on this campus to look at the psychiatric services that are available and whether those psychiatric services are adequate and there was a whole commotion last spring because the psychiatrist that we had that was treating large numbers of our students just precipitously resigned and students were left without psychiatric care. So I’m wondering number one, is Student Affairs taking into account the need for adequate psychiatric services for students number one and number two, we represent one of the counseling facilities that is on campus. There are several counseling facilities on campus. To my knowledge, there has been no effort to organize these counseling services and to find out what kind of expertise there is on the campus already for addressing these kinds of student problems. So I think, you know, a lot of this is sort of window dressing but, you know, what’s really being done in terms of what are the needs of the students and what are we actually doing to address those issues?

R. Alden: Right. Well, as I mentioned, we have this proactive policy for removal of disruptive students but that’s only the extreme. It goes through a series of steps where counseling is first recommended and then mandated which is the option of removal is either you get reviewed by the counseling staff or you leave campus and I, you know, I fully understand that people can
come up from off-campus with any number of agendas and the only thing I would suggest is any faculty with a concern is to talk to the police about that because they can provide some level of security, even plain clothes security so that’s an option.

In terms of whether we have enough psychiatric services, I mean, I don’t – I know that issue in the spring was somewhat unusual because there was not a significant amount of notice given and it was related to a personnel matter that I can’t discuss but we certainly would hope that that’s being reviewed as in the context of these additional processes that are being advertised campus-wide. Do we ever have enough? I don’t know but are you suggesting that there are counseling services outside of Student Affairs that could take on students as part of this effort?

A. Rosenbaum: Or that should be involved in the process of coming up with a strategic plan for handling these types of situations. So I am actually concerned still that the psychiatric services on the campus are not adequate even at the start of the semester so what happened last year, to my knowledge, hasn’t been remedied at this point unless you know of something that’s happened that I’m not aware of.

R. Alden: From what I understand they did get coverage of the individual that left – we did get coverage and then there was a search and I believe that search led to a replacement. Now whether one psychiatric expert is enough, I can’t comment on that because I just don’t know.

P. Stoddard: Linda?

L. Sons: Linda Sons from Mathematics. Let just say when we’re talking proactive, availability of these people in a timely fashion for somebody who’s likely to do something like commit suicide, needs to be there. I mean, students sometimes know that they have some problem and then you want to refer them and you suggest that they go get an appointment and they find out they can’t get one for three weeks and this was before last spring’s incident. Under those kinds of circumstances, I don’t think we have adequate availability. I think it really needs to be addressed.

P. Stoddard: Earl and then ---

E. Hansen: ??? off mike – I just want to address, as a person who’s worked in disaster preparedness risk management almost all my life that, until the university comes within code in just basic general things like, if you’ll look around the room here, I don’t see any evacuation plan for this room nor do I see it in any of the classrooms that I’m in. That’s the simplistic aspect of it. You know, somewhere along the line, policies and procedures need to be developed to pick up at the ground level, whether it be in a building in its facility or in psychiatric care. We can sit here and we can beat this horse to death. We’re not going to solve the problem like that. It’s going to have to come from the top down because we as faculty members – I’m not qualified with four college degrees – to go out here and analyze someone and say this guy or this gal has an emotional problem. We had an incident in our department and I would have no idea why it occurred and I couldn’t believe it happened between the two individuals that it did. So, I mean, I just think that until we have a formal format that starts at grassroots level and goes through all the other things, we’re just beating our gums to death.
N. Churyk: Natalie Churyk, Accountancy. I do want to say that I’ve had suicidal students and I’ve brought them over to Campus Life and there has been someone there at that time who would take them immediately when I’ve walked the student over there so I’m not sure where you’re sending your students – you’re telling them to go get an appointment – but when I have a student problem, I walk them over and say come with me; you’re coming now – I’m not going to send them somewhere else on their own but I’ve had counselors there take them at that point.

R. Alden: I do know when students die either – hopefully not on campus – but in the campus community, they have a crisis response team that is there that day, I mean, so I do know that they are very proactive dealing with grief counseling and that sort of thing so I think part of – well, I can’t say anything more about what happened last spring.

P. Stoddard: Buck and then Dianna.

J. Stephen: One question I think Alan brought up was – you talked about mandated psychological treatment – that turned out to be one of the problems at Virginia Tech that he was required to go through a psychological program – I don’t know the right word – say he was required to go see a psychologist for a certain period of time and he did not do it and there was no mechanism at the university to make sure that he completed that process. In terms of our policy, if we mandate that somebody should seek psychiatric or psychological services, is there a feedback so that we know that they’re following through?

R. Alden: The way that the policy is written is that if someone threatens harm to self or others, they have to see a counselor and they have to see the counselor until the counselor releases the person or they leave campus or both. So it’s not an optional thing. There is that mandate that – if it comes to a threat, if somebody says I’m going to get a gun and shot myself or shot others, then that sort of thing is implemented immediately. They’re taken off campus. They’re told they have to see counsel and they may be removed even if they do see a counselor or psychiatrist. So that there is that hammer there.

J. Stephen: But if they’re not removed and they fail to meet their obligation, are we informed and told that this student is not coming in for their appointments.

R. Alden: Theoretically if they don’t come in for their appointments, they’re a trespass to campus. That’s what the policy says.

J. Stephen: But do we know it?

R. Alden: Now there is a distinction here and it’s a fine line that anybody dealing with academic freedom and creative writing will understand, you know, if they’re not making a direct threat; they don’t say something threatening, they don’t commit a verbal assault on somebody or say they’re going to do themselves harm but it comes up a writing assignment, you know, at what point does it go from creative writing to the next – I don’t know, Patricia Cornwell writing a gory novel and when is it something that represents a threat and I think that’s the fine line that
I’m not sure I can determine but if the person is reported, at least they can be given the option of going to counseling if that’s a problem. So that’s the bright line I can’t say is there.

**P. Stoddard:** Dianna?

**D. ???:** I wanted to respond to Linda’s and Natalie’s comments about the availability of counseling on campus. I think yes, if it’s such an immediate crisis that you as the instructor or whoever is with the student, actually walks them over to the counseling in the Student Development Center, they will see that person immediately. However, by four weeks or six weeks or seven weeks into this semester, if a student is, you know, having trouble and tries to get an appointment and it’s not that immediate crisis situation, I agree with you Linda, I’ve had students who have called over there, tried to get in and it could be three weeks, it could be four weeks, it could be the beginning of the next semester because they do not have enough staff to see people on a regular basis. One meeting with a counselor does not solve these kinds of problems, you know, so they have ongoing meetings with each particular student who comes to them, right? Well, by the middle of the semester, usually, they’re booked up. Well, and it’s often by the middle of the semester that a lot of the students are finally realizing that they’re kind of in trouble and they need something. So I agree. I don’t think that there’s enough staff availability for counseling.

The other thing I was going to respond to – I’m sorry, I don’t remember your name – was talking about the crisis management – I’m sorry what was your name again? Okay, Earl, sorry – well I’m sorry, I’ve never met you before. Anyway, what I was going to pick up on was your comments about basic, you know, crisis management response information. I mean, to tell you the truth, probably the most vulnerable time for faculty is when they are in the classroom teaching a class. I don’t know how many of you teach in DuSable for example. You know, there’s no phones. There’s one door in and out of that classroom. There’s no windows. There’s no – I have no idea what the plan might be if there’s a problem in a classroom building. You know! There’s nothing to do.

**E. Hansen:** ??? not on mike.

**P. Stoddard:** Earl, you’ve got to --- all right. Go ahead Beth.

**E. Miller:** I just want to make two points. When the Student Development and Counseling Center is full in the middle of the semester, the Family Center is still taking appointments. The FC&S Family Center – 753-1684 – it is part of the NIU Center that is not linked but part of what Alan was mentioning to all of the crisis intervention programs. I think DuSable is a good example. It’s a classroom building; most of us don’t have offices there so we don’t have contact with a way – you know, we drive over, we teach in that building but we don’t have a way to, you know, make a connection if we have a problem and if you teach at night or early in the morning there’s no one else around so it is, I think, more vulnerable than if you were teaching in a classroom where you have an office or knew someplace else where there were other administrative people.
P. Stoddard: What I would suggest is – the Provost indicated there’s a little pamphlet that’s coming out – I don’t know of pamphlet is quite the word, but a set of instructions on what to do in various types of emergencies whether personal or whatever. That’s going, I believe, to everybody?

R. Alden: Yes.

P. Stoddard: It will be posted in all the classrooms I’m told but I would suggest strongly you take a look at that and if you find deficiencies, it doesn’t say how to deal with a crisis in DuSable or someplace, let the Provost, let me, let Tom Krepel, the President’s assistant, know and, I mean, this is a – it’s really not meant to be the last word on all of this. We need to have something out there but there’s always room for improvement in these types of documents as we learn more and as we see more so let people know and I’m sure there’ll be updated versions as we go through time.

R. Alden: And as I indicated, there will be a task force looking at the Emergency Operations Plan in comparison to this Virginia Tech report and I’m sure that Paul could get Tom to put somebody representing the faculty on that committee to review it. The Emergency Operations Plan itself is somewhat of a confidential document simply because past history has shown that once it falls into the wrong hands, it can be used against an institution in terms of somebody knowing exactly what the responses are going to be. I believe that was one of the problems at Columbine, that the students knew exactly what was going to happen if they did what they did. But I’m sure that there would be an opportunity for faculty involvement on a committee of that sort where you could voice these issues. Quite frankly, other than the Student Affairs component, a lot of these are not in my area but I certainly will pass them along to cabinets – other people know that there are concerns. Now I think it would be more responsive if there’s a committee looking at this to bring those up through that representative so you may want to talk to Tom about getting representation.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Bill?

W. Tolhurst: Just a quick observation question. As far as the safety in DuSable, most of the rooms are smart classrooms and all of those rooms have a phone in them. Now although that phone puts you in touch with ITS, wouldn’t it be reasonable for us in an emergency to ask the IT person to call the cops?

D. ???: There are no more phones in there; they’ve been taken out.

W. Tolhurst: No more phones in the smart classrooms? Oh, well somebody should tell them to put them back.

D. ???: You have to have a cell phone with you.

P. Stoddard: All right. Well I think we’ve probably monopolized the Provost’s time enough – we have a full agenda – but I’m sure he’s very thankful for all your comments.
R. Alden: Definitely and I will pass them along to the appropriate people. Again, I think you need to keep on it and make sure you get a voice on some of these committees to make sure the other side – I represent all of academic and student affairs but it’s always good to have somebody else there speaking from the faculty perspective.

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you very much.

J. Stephen: While the Provost is still here, I’d like to make a comment?

P. Stoddard: Sure – don’t run away yet.

J. Stephen: In the spring, Michelle Mickey Emmett, Vice President of Student Affairs and myself were involved in a Loyola University Masters’ project studying different forms of governance of universities and a team headed by Olivia Heath, one of our graduates, Amanda Hitterman and Alicia Halterman spent a great deal of time communicating both with Vice President Emmett and myself about the structure of the governance at NIU and they came up with a paper on which they got a high grade in which they gave the name “Northern Illinois University – Shared Governance at Its Best” and I can get copies of this to people who’d like to read it. The other comment is that I’m very proud of the fact that, although universities have abandoned the *in loco parentis* method it’s certainly obvious that we as a faculty care about our students and their health and safety. Thank you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate.

P. Stoddard: Moving on, we need to do – did we actually come up with names on these two? Is that what they are. Excuse me? Okay, yeah, we need to select formally, Vice President for the Faculty Senate who fills in for me if for some reason I can’t. I assure everybody I’m in perfectly health and then a Secretary – we have not yet figured out exactly what that person does. Yes, Nancy?

N. Castle: ???Not on mike.

P. Stoddard: Okay, do you accept that?

K. Thu: But first I’m going to nominate Nancy for Secretary and then I’ll accept.

P. Stoddard: I sense collusion here. Is this mutually acceptable?

N. Castle: It is also open to other people.

P. Stoddard: I understand; I’m not moving to close nominations just yet. I just want to make sure that the two people nominated are okay. Earl?

E. Hansen: I was going to move to close nominations.
Hansen moved; Cason seconded. The motion passed.

**P. Stoddard**: Okay, do we have a second on the motion to close nominations? All in favor of closing nominations? Opposed? Congratulations. I promise not to get too sick and we’ll figure out something for you to do Nancy. Oh, what did we figure out?

**N. Castle**: It is not the Secretary’s job to take the minutes when you ---

**P. Stoddard**: Oh, that’s right. During Executive Session when I have to leave and Donna has to leave and Kendall’s running the show, it’s Nancy’s job – anyway, thank you both for agreeing. That’s helpful.

B. University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees.

**P. Stoddard**: University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. We have lost one member of this committee so we need to replace that person. I think we have somebody who’s just been nominated for something else who’s offered to fill in on that role, that would be Professor Castle again. Are there any other folks interested in filling in on the Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees? This is the faculty voice to the Board. We get about thirty second to say something every time they meet. This is just – I decide subcommittees – this is just to get somebody on the boards that I can assign to the subcommittees. They don’t have to be a Faculty Senate or a University Council person. They do report to the Senate and Council so we can save time and double-dip and so forth. So if you know of anybody that’s interested, we already have somebody who I think is quite capable and interested but we don’t want to rule anybody out – let me know. We do not have – I’m sorry, go ahead.

**C. Garcia**: When do they meet?

**P. Stoddard**: They meet – the Board of Trustees, the full Board, meets quarterly on Thursday mornings in September, December, March, and June. The subcommittees will meet a couple of weeks before that, usually on Thursdays although Legislative Oversight and Audit has been moved so they are also now meeting on Thursday mornings at 9:00 for the Student Affairs and Personnel and Academic Affairs. Finance, Facilities and Operations meets at 10:00 and Legislative Oversight, etc., meets at 11:00. Those are nominal times only as they are never on time. The first one starts on time; the rest of them get there late and if they go into Executive Session, all bets are off. So you’ve got to commit Thursday morning to it. Okay.

C. Nominations for a representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE.

**P. Stoddard**: The next item for consideration is nominations for a representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. This is the faculty voice – Northern’s sole faculty voice – to the IBHE. The President, the Provost, they get their say in there whenever they can and they always speak in favor – very nicely of the university I’m told – but if we want somebody specifically to express faculty concerns, this is the body that does it. Last year you may remember there was a bit of a firestorm created when that body came up with a set of guidelines
on teacher preparation. We did not have a voice consistently on that body while they were deliberating and coming up with that. That is an important body. It does make recommendations to the full Board. The full Board does not necessarily listen to them but they do make them. It’s very useful, it gives us a way of knowing what the other universities are thinking – the other colleges in the state are thinking – it’s good communications. It’s good to be part of that in terms of our standing in the state and it’s very good, again, for feedback from the Board and the faculty at Northern. This position requires generally that you travel to another campus in the state. The meetings are once a month, eleven times a year on Fridays. Typically, especially if the meeting is at a distant campus, you go down on Thursday afternoon, Thursday evening you have dinner with the group. This allows for informal conversation which is actually very useful, then you have the meeting on Friday. It’s usually over by about 3:00 or so you can get back generally speaking by evening. Edwardsville or Carbondale I guess is about as far away as you’d ever have to go which is far enough. It is very important. Our last two people both have left so it would be nice to find somebody who would be willing to commit to this as well as committing to the university for a few years. It is a time drain on your Fridays, no doubt about it. It’s very difficult if you’re teaching general education courses on Fridays. As of this moment, and you’ll see I guess probably in the University Council, I guess that’s where we’re doing it – we’re going to look into trying to get some kind of support for this position but as yet, there really is no support for this position. Buck?

J. Stephen: I did this as a substitute for one semester. It sounds like a dry, nasty obligation. It is not. It’s actually a lively, active, positive experience. It is a time drain but you get to meet people from all of the state universities, some of the privates and some of the community colleges. You oftentimes get to meet with some very high level people in the state government and just put them over the coals. It can be fun if you have such a mindset. But again, it does take a Friday every month and it takes that whole day and that can be problematic for those of us who teach general education courses but it is not near as dry as it sounds nor boring.

P. Stoddard: I can echo that. I filled in a couple of times too last year and frankly, I think it’s a lot of fun. In addition to the Friday and sometimes Thursday obligation, you do have to report to the Senate and Council and like the previous position, you don’t have to be a member of either body but once again, just in terms of time committed, if you already are a member of one of those bodies and you’re already committed to the time to make the reports – hey, what’s a Friday. Kendall, go ahead.

K. Thu: Just to clarify Paul, you said that there’s no support for this position but there is money for travel. Is that correct?

P. Stoddard: Yes, yes, you do get reimbursed for the hotel and your mileage or we’ll provide a car for you if you want to try one of the university’s hybrids in case you feel that you really need to be buying one and want to test drive it first, it’s a great opportunity. I’ve done that. We are looking into some model, be it a month’s summer salary, TA support – something. We don’t know what format it will take yet. There’s no guarantee that whatever form we vote on will get financial backing from the Provost’s office but it is something we’re looking into but it’s not going to be there this year I would say. The other thing is we are hosting the next FAC meeting on the 21st, that’s two weeks – three weeks – it’s two weeks from Friday over in Altgeld Hall. So
if you’re really curious about it and want to stop by and see what’s going on, I think we can probably accommodate a couple of guests. President Peters will be speaking to the group. We’ve so far got Senator Burzynski to come in and speak to the group. We’re working on Representative Pritchard to come in and speak to the group. We requested to our local reps there. So, as Buck says, you do get to speak to some uppity-ups every now and then and as far as I’m concerned, if you a thing to say to them, say it to them and I’ll back you. So if you know of anybody who is interested, if you yourself are interested, like I said, it does not need to be a member of the Council or Senate, I would suggest a tenured member of the faculty is better just because of the time constraints and also a tenured member might have a better feel – have a better perspective on things. I think it would be unfair to ask an untenured member to do that much work but if you know somebody who’s really interested, please let me know and we will try to get their names onto that board as soon as possible. I’ll be acting in that capacity on the 21st.

C. Garcia: Clersida Garcia. Again, I have another question. When will the FAC meet?

P. Stoddard: The first FAC meeting is the 21st; that’s a Friday. It starts at 9:00.

C. Garcia: And where, here?

P. Stoddard: And that will be here. There is a schedule. They will all be on Fridays. It will be once a month and they are at various locations around the state. Usually, the third Friday. Okay.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Moving on then, the Consent Agenda for those of you new to this process, this is where we put a bunch of stuff that we think is non-controversial. Generally, it means referring it to some committee to look at and then after they look at it we may get some controversy but for the time being this is a time saving device. So we have four items on the Consent Agenda. One is an item we looked at a couple of years ago we’ve been asked to take another look and that’s student evaluations in the merit process so we’ll refer that – how they’re being used, is there any uniformity, etc., etc. We’ll refer that to Academic Affairs. Looking into the desirability of uniform syllabi in multiple section courses – this is especially for courses that are prerequisites for other courses. Apparently there was a complaint or have been complaints that students feel better prepared in some sections than in other sections of the same course for later course work. So that’s something we should like Academic Affairs to look into the desirability of institution some sort of policy on uniform syllabi and we don’t need to debate it. We’ll just refer it to them and let them debate it for now. Also we do have a statement of professional ethics for the faculty. This is posted on the Faculty Senate’s website. I would encourage you all to read it and I would encourage you all to go back to your departments and have everybody else read it. The question is should it be anywhere other than in the ether, like in the APPM or in the Bylaws or some other place that you might think of. Also, it was suggested that we might want to put some teeth in this. What happens if we have a faculty member who violates the ethics policy or there’s an allegation that a faculty member has violated the ethics policy. So we’re going to refer that issue to Rules and Governance. They get all the good stuff and then finally, “D” is the approval of the Senate committees. I think you all got an e-mail telling you what committees you are on,
what the duties of that committee are and also who the chair of your committee is. I need to point out that due to a scheduling conflict, we changed the chairs, or switched rather, the chairs of Economic Status and Resource, Space and Budget to now C.T. Lin will be the Senate chair of Resource, Space and Budget and Cason Snow will be Economic Status chair. So your e-mail that you got a couple of weeks ago if you’re on either of those committees be advised that there is a different chair. Otherwise, I’ll look for a motion to accept the Consent Agenda. Second? Thank you Cason. All in favor? Opposed? Okay. Thank you for consenting to the Consent Agenda.

Stephen made the motion; Snow seconded. The Consent Agenda was accepted.

A. Student Evaluation use in the Merit Process – refer to Academic Affairs

B. Look into desirability of uniform syllabi in multiple section courses – refer to Academic Affairs

C. Proper placement of “Statement of Professional Ethics” – refer to Rules and Governance

D. Approval of Faculty Senate Committees (Page 9)

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – no report

P. Stoddard: In the interest of time, there will not be a FAC report to the IBHE this month.


P. Stoddard: BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee, this is part of the UAC that we talked about earlier, Buck or Ferald?

J. Stephen: I didn’t get the written one in to Donna on time. I had the date wrong for this meeting. Basically, they approved some offsite offerings, several minors that type of thing, traditional type of things. This meeting in June was the one where they approve sabbaticals. All sabbaticals put forward were approved and there was a new feature to the BOT meeting this time that the BOT actually asked for last year and that was presentations by two faculty members about their activities during their previous year’s sabbatical. Again, the Board of Trustees came out with very strong support for the need of sabbaticals in the academic community and expressed quite a reasonable understanding of their importance and I don’t think we should worry about our sabbatical process being in any type of jeopardy at this time. The Board strongly supports them. By the way, I think there were fifty-five or fifty-seven sabbaticals this year; I can’t remember the exact number.

P. Stoddard: That includes yours.
J. Stephen: That includes mine.

P. Stoddard: All right. Any questions for Buck? Okay, thank you.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – report

P. Stoddard: Moving on, the Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee did meet. It was all boilerplate stuff so I’m not going to report on it.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monterio and Bobbie Cesarek – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: Bobbie do you want to report?

B. Cesarek: Thank you Paul. The report is in front of you so I won’t read it to you. There was a lot of discussion relative to House Bills and Senate Bills that were proposed. I just read the BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee booklet that’s for tomorrow’s meeting and there are tons more of importance to NIU. I’m anxious to see which ones they’re going to highlight because there were pages and pages of them so I’m sure there will be much more of an update to this after tomorrow’s meeting. Congressional Report also – there was higher education – the authorization was not passed. Reading tomorrow’s booklet, it is still not passed so the saga goes on. Information on the Proton Therapy Treatment Facility, which again you can read in front of you, a couple of findings relative to audits which I know the repeat findings were not pleasing to the institution and there was some discussion relative to how we were going to insure that that doesn’t happen again and introduction of Lori Clark’s new position in Chicago and NIU’s presence there. Again, in front of you to read but this was a couple of months ago and the updated version will be after tomorrow’s meeting.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any questions for Bobbie? Yes, Kendall?

K. Thu: A quick question. What does it mean when you say that we have the second lowest in the state? Does that mean compared to all of the public institutions?

B. Cesarek: I’m sorry, where are you please?

K. Thu: In the Compliance ??? Report, it says that there are four findings which is second lowest in the state. I assume that’s a good thing.

B. Cesarek: Yes, number of findings, correct.

K. Thu: So that second lowest in the state means out of all of the ---

B. Cesarek: State institutions.
K. Thu: Okay.

B. Cesarek: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions? All right. Very good.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report.

P. Stoddard: The full Board met back in June. They approved everything that the subcommittees approved. That’s very typical. All the real action goes on behind the scenes; we never see it.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: This being the first meeting of the year, I suspect we’re not going to get very many. Let’s just run through them so everybody can see who the chair is.

A. Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair

P. Stoddard: Academic Affairs. Kendall you have anything?

K. Thu: No.

P. Stoddard: Very good.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair

P. Stoddard: Economic Status of the Profession. Cason?

C. Snow: No.

P. Stoddard: Very good.

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

P. Stoddard: Resource, Space, and Budget. C. T.?

C. T. Lin: No

P. Stoddard: Okay.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Alan Rosenbaum, Chair

P. Stoddard: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Alan?

A. Rosenbaum: No.
**P. Stoddard:** All right.

**E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair**

**P. Stoddard:** Rules and Governance. Nancy?

**N. Castle:** Yes, I have a little thing. One piece of business that carried over from last year and will require all of us to pay more attention to it this year since we didn’t come to resolution and that was the request that had to look at committee structures for the Faculty Senate given that there are a number of colleges that have only one rep who then by default are on all of the committees or have only a couple of reps and so we will come up with a couple of alternatives and take them to the whole group and see if we can come to resolution this year.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you. If you have any ideas let Nancy know. I’m sure she’ll be calling meetings of some sort or another.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Elections and Legislative Oversight. We do have some business that we always have to take care of at the first meeting. This is primarily electing people who may be called upon to handle certain tasks. I’ll turn it over to Earl and Donna who know what’s going on.

**E. Hansen:** I want to get the committee up here to help us pass out some material. That will do to start.

**D. Mathesius:** Do you want to explain the Hearing Panel.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, the Hearing Panel is the first ballots I guess that they’re handing out. This is essentially the group – if there arises a case of dismissal for cause of a tenured faculty member or a tenure track faculty member before his or her contract has expired, this goes through a long process. If there is an appeal, they get to appeal to a board of faculty and so that board would be picked from the names that we vote on now. This is forty names on the ballot – thirty-four names on the ballot that were chosen at random by a computer so assuming ITS doesn’t have it in for you, this is all random. You are voting for twenty names I believe so circle twenty people. Preferably people who you think are fair minded and don’t have personal biases and grudges and the like. Of that twenty group, if a case comes up and actually this year there might be a case or two that will come up, we’ll select five names I believe it is or five names will be selected from the twenty for each case. So like I say, this year I think – this group has not met recently but this year it very well may.

**F. Bryan:** As parliamentarian, I very seldom say anything at this first meeting, but given the nature of the personnel process that Paul has just described, this would be a good opportunity to remind you that you may want to look at Article 7 of the University Constitution and Bylaws which outlines this whole process of appeals, appeal procedures for personnel decisions. The University rarely uses this article but essentially process that we’re going through – the selection
of the panel process – is all outlined here and those of you who may be selected on this panel need to read this section of our Constitution to understand the process.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, this really is very rarely used but unfortunately it looks like this year we might have to make use of it. Actually, maybe even twice so ---

**E. Hansen:** Okay, I’m going to pass out ballots now by college so first one going around is College of Business so indicate that you’re in the College of Business; you’ll get a ballot.

**D. Mathesius:** The ballots that are going to be passed out now are for alternates to the University Council so if a University Council member cannot make the meeting, they will call whoever is at the top of this list as an alternate from the Faculty Senate members.

**E. Hansen:** College of Education.

**P. Stoddard:** In the back Nancy.

**E. Hansen:** Health and Human Services. Liberal Arts and Science.

**P. Stoddard:** Hold on. They haven’t quite finished with Health and Human Services yet.

**D. Mathesius:** Health and Human Sciences.

**P. Stoddard:** Sciences, sorry.

**E. Hansen:** Liberal Arts and Science.

**P. Stoddard:** Most of these are voting for more than one person so be aware of that. If you haven’t gotten a ballot and feel you should have, let somebody know.

**D. Mathesius:** The first one was for the alternate list. These are for UCPC.

**P. Stoddard:** Another set of ballots are going out for UCPC.

**E. Hansen:** College of Liberal Arts and Science.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, just the LA&S.

**D. Mathesius:** There are also ballots for Health and Human Sciences.

**P. Stoddard:** For UCPC?

**D. Mathesius:** Jody was ---

**P. Stoddard:** Oh, okay.
D. Mathesius: You don’t need to separate them. They can all go in one pile and I’ll separate them.

P. Stoddard: Okay, this is replacing Professor Stephen who’s going on sabbatical so he will not be able to fulfill his duties this year. This is a one year replacement. The LA&S one. The other one is – I don’t know how many years.

D. Mathesius: It’s a two year – no, the one for LA&S is a one year. The one for Health and Human Sciences is a two year.

P. Stoddard: Okay, so the yellow one is for two years; the pink one is for one year and if you’re not one of those schools, that’s too bad.

D. Mathesius: The last thing ---

P. Stoddard: It’s not the last thing. We also have the Grievance Committee.

D. Mathesius: I know. I’m going back to Grievance now. The last thing he had to do. You didn’t let me finish. You get to pick fifteen names.

E. Hansen: I get to pick fifteen names! I’ve offended everybody in here already.

P. Stoddard: All right. What we’re about to do now is pick names at random. I assume Earl does not have x-ray vision, of people who will be in the pool to serve on the Grievance Hearing Committee so if a grievance comes up that cannot be resolved amicably ???. So there’s no guarantee you’ll be asked to serve on this committee but you’re eligible if Earl read your name. Who is the first name?

E. Hansen: Earl Hansen.

P. Stoddard: He obviously does not have x-ray vision.

E. Hansen: This thing is rigged. James Johnson, you’re #2.

P. Stoddard: This doesn’t mean you’ll be picked first or second.


P. Stoddard: We need five alternates, don’t we? No? I guess not. Okay. All right. Those of you selected, like I say, you may very well not be called. Again, this is an important part of our shared governance process, the Grievance Committee. This allows people to get a hearing among their peers for things that they think have gone wrong so this allows us to do it hopefully in a less confrontational way. We can resolve some problems. If five of your peers agree with
you or disagree with you, that lends a lot more support to your case and a lot of times people –
usually the real answer is someplace in between – and the Grievance Panel is usually pretty good
at finding that. Nobody ever goes away totally happy but nobody ever goes away totally
dissatisfied unless one side or the other is way out to lunch. But that’s easy to find too so it’s
very helpful in maintaining morale on campus and making sure that everybody – nobody feels
put upon. To those of you who were selected in advance, I think you. Those of you who may
end up on the Hearing Panel, again, a very similar type of rationale for that body so thank you
advance also if you’re called upon and so on.

The last thing under Elections and Legislative Oversight is we need to name two Senate
members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. This is not exactly
related to the Ethics but it’s pretty close. This is a committee chaired by the Vice-President for
Research and the Undergraduate School who is currently Rathindra Bose. Of the two names we
forward to him, he will pick one to serve on the Committee. This is again important faculty
representation on a committee that oversees faculty activities in certain places. So if you are
interested or your neighbor looks interested or your neighbor has left early, we will open the
floor to nominations. Buck?

**J. Stephen:** I nominate Douglas Bowman from Math Science. He’s an active researcher and
he’s involved in groups such as the Gutenberg Project and these kinds of issues are of great
importance to him.

**P. Stoddard:** Is he a member of the Senate?

**J. Stephen:** Yes he is.

**P. Stoddard:** Is Doug here to complain or accept? All right. I will check with each individual
personally before forwarding the names so nobody gets a rude shock to make sure that it’s alright
with them. Any other nominations? Well, I guess we should have a second to the nomination.
All right.

Stephen made the nomination; Thompson seconded.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other nominations? It would be nice to have one more.

**J. Stephen:** I nominate Beth Miller.

**P. Stoddard:** She left. Okay. That will teach her. We have a second.

Stephen made the nomination; Thompson seconded.

**P. Stoddard:** Do we have a motion to close? We have a motion to close. Jeff seconds the
motion by repeating it I guess. All in favor of closing the nominations? All right. I will check
with Beth and Doug Bowman, right, and make sure that either or both of them are okay. If so,
I’ll forward their names on to Dr. Bose.
1. Hearing Panel Election – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting.

2. Election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee.

3. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting.

4. Election of LAS and HHS UCPC representative to replace Joseph Stephen.

5. Nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School will choose one member from the two nominations to serve on the committee.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: We have no unfinished business; no new business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

I do want to make one quick comment while most of us are still here. We do have as faculty somebody who when grievance cases come up, when you find you’re being dismissed for cause, when tenure and promotion aren’t going quite the way you thought they should. Merit, other issues come up that you feel in over your head on, we do have somebody to help guide folks through the process. That person happens, well his title is Faculty Personnel Advisor, he happens to be a member of the Senate. That’s not necessarily the case, but he is. That’s Alan Rosenbaum over there and I won’t put him on the spot by asking him to say anything today but maybe next time we’ll ask him to say a few words about what he does and how he does it and so forth. I know he wants to let everybody on campus know that he exists. He is a useful resource so bring that information please back to your departments and we’ll have him talk to us for a few minutes next month.

Are there any other comments? Yes, Professor Thompson. Mike please.

C. Thompson: There are a lot of minutes in the information items. Most of them are missing. When you go there, last year’s minutes, say for example, the Graduate Council aren’t on there. A lot of our Faculty Senate is not and since we stopped of course passing out ones to the faculty, it’s kind of distressing to see when I go on there that I couldn’t figure out what goes on when I decided to be very earnest and prepare myself.

P. Stoddard: Well, we appreciate your efforts. You’re probably the first person to notice that. But yeah, this is a busy time of year. We have them; we have not gotten them posted yet but we will. September is not fun. So we apologize for not getting it done but we will have them up. Alan?
A. Rosenbaum: Speaking not as Faculty Personnel Advisor but I just wanted to go back to something that is a little unsettling and that has to do with the question that was asked of Provost Alden about the way our motion regarding raises was dealt with and it seemed like that was not the best example of shared governance. It seemed like, you know, the Faculty Senate’s wishes on this was sort of in the ether and the way this started last year was, I believe, the SPS Council decided to have their raises done in a specific way and that was different from what the faculty had done and we were sort of wondering why the faculty didn’t have something to say about that and now we’re being told in that semi-answer that there are a lot of different people that have something to say about that and I’m sort of wondering who all these different people are that carry more weight than the faculty.

P. Stoddard: Council of Deans, the Provost, the President.

A. Rosenbaum: I guess what I’m really wondering is are we just leaving this where it is or are we going to sort of be more forceful and more proactive at this point before this whole raise thing is handled within the next ---

P. Stoddard: I will forward – and I should have done this last year – this was my fault. I told the Provost what we had decided. I told him the specifics of what we had decided but I did that verbally. I did not actually forward him the minutes from the Senate although we specifically discussed all those issues so I still have those available. I will forward him that so that it is more officially landed in his court. But even last year, I tried to warn people that ours was not the only say in the process. That the deans have a very different idea about how increments should be used; they have some rationale for that – it’s not that they’re mean. The President and Provost have their own priorities. The Provost is the one who ultimately makes the decision but we should get our voice in there and that’s what I wanted to try to insure the Provost knows where we stand but I will forward him something more concrete.

A. Rosenbaum: I didn’t mean to make it sound like we should have the sole vote but it seemed like we should have a fairly important say and it didn’t seem like it was registering at that level with the Provost so ---

P. Stoddard: Right, well I mean, how important our say is – I know we think it’s very important and I tend to agree with you on that. We are the ones being affected but, you know, we’re not the highest pegs on the ladder – rungs on the ladder I guess. Buck?

J. Stephen: The UCPC was informally aware of the recommendation of Faculty Senate and in agreement with that and it was our understanding that that would be a basic guideline. I think that one of the things Provost Alden does not want to be pinned down on is the fact that one of the things that can effect a merit increase are things such as Dean’s Points. My sense of what happened on the UCPC and discussions with those people is that they’ll try to follow that recommendation although the deans do have some latitude with the Dean’s Points and I believe that you should forward your recommendation.

P. Stoddard: I will. Okay, any other comments? Professor Stephen.
P. Stephen: Okay, two important curricular issues that you should be aware of. One is, again because of Oracle, the expiration date or the stale date for an incomplete is now 200 days. It’s not 10 weeks. However, keep in mind that when you fill out that incomplete form, it is a contract between you and the student. You can shorten that period of time but the stale date is now 200 days no matter what semester it is, not 10 weeks into the next semester.

The second thing that is very important, especially for those of you who are responsible for dealing with paperwork regarding graduation is that for years, if we made a mistake, we could fix it and we backdated graduations. We no longer will be doing that. We found out that that is against the rules. So, in particular, the education folks because of the nature of their reports from cooperating teachers and such should be as timely as possible with their paperwork. It has to be in by the time that the records are closed which is approximately two weeks after the graduation announced date. If your paperwork is not there by then, we will no longer be backdating to fix mistakes. So the best thing to do is not make mistakes but, of course, we’re not perfect and there’s always the boilerplate in the catalog that says that the student is responsible for making sure they have everything done to meet graduation. But we’re responsible to fill out certain paperwork in a timely manner.

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Academic Planning Council minutes
2. Athletic Board minutes
3. Campus Security and Environmental Quality minutes
4. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification minutes
5. Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum minutes
6. Graduate Council minutes
7. University Assessment Panel minutes
8. University Benefits Committee minutes
9. Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
10. 2007-2008 Meeting Schedule (Page 10)

XIII. ADMOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: We have a motion to adjourn? We have lots of seconds. All in favor get up and go away.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 P.M.