I.  CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

A. Rosenbaum: Welcome. Unlike Southwest Airlines, I’m glad we didn’t cancel before seeing if there was actually going to be any snow. We have a fairly heavy agenda which became heavier as we’ve added a number of walk-in items today so I’d like to get started. I think pretty much there is no one out in the hall so we’ll get going.

II.  ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first item is the adoption of the agenda and I want to call to your attention that we have three walk-in items from the Board of Trustees Committee. We also have some materials related to the academic misconduct issue that we’re going to talk about under New Business. Those two pieces are a segment from the Student Code of Conduct and also from the undergraduate catalog and those relate to the policies around academic misconduct. You also have a copy of the President’s letter that came from that committee of presidents and chancellors which many of you have already seen. I didn’t know if everyone had seen that. I know the President sent it out but I just put that in there for your information and in the event we decide to support that, there’s a draft of a potential letter from the Faculty Senate that we will discuss but that will be discussed under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. So, given the walk-ins, I need a motion to accept the agenda. Do I have a motion? David Valentiner. Second? I can’t see. George? Okay, George Slotsve. Any discussion? All in favor of accepting the agenda say aye. Opposed? The agenda is accepted.

Valentiner made the motion; Slotsve made the second. The agenda was accepted as written.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 20, 2010 FS MEETING  
(sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is the approval of the minutes from the January 20 Faculty Senate Meeting. These were sent electronically. I know there are a number of small typo errors in there. Did anyone find anything major or any omissions that you would like to call to our attention? I need a motion to accept the minutes. Okay. Pat. Second? David? Okay. Any discussion of the minutes; additions, subtractions? All in favor of accepting the minutes say aye. Oppose? Minutes are accepted.

Henry made the motion; Valentiner made the second. The minutes were accepted as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, in terms of announcements, the first announcement I’m sure you’ve all been waiting to hear what the status of the committee – this is the committee to look at the equity of raise distributions across the university. When we last left the Faculty Senate, we had a motion to participate under certain circumstances. The university accepted the provisions and the Executive Committee going along with the wishes of the Senate, met and appointed the committee to look into raise equity issues. The members of that committee included three individuals from the Faculty Senate and two individuals from the faculty but outside the Faculty Senate. The faculty members of this committee are Rosemary Feurer – is Rosemary here? Okay. Charles Cappell and George Slotsve and from outside the faculty we have Bala Hosmane and Brent Hobin??. The Operating Staff Council nominated Alan Smith who is from the police department and SPS nominated Dan House. Ex-officio members include Joe Grush, Fred Schwantes, Celeste Latham who is the data manager for HR, and Steve Cunningham. Steve Cunningham was added to the committee because Celeste Latham reports to him and to speed things up we thought it would be a good idea to allow him to be on the committee ex-officio so if there are issues she has to talk over with him, we don’t have to wait an extra week to find out about it. The commission actually got started rather quickly. We have met twice and we are planning to meet again this Friday. We are very pleased that the university has furnished the data to us so the committee, after signing confidentiality agreements, now has access to the data. This is not a complete data set but it is the data that they were using. We have let them know that this does not contain enough data points; it does not go back enough years and we need additional material and they are saying that they are going to be working on that. The President, President Peters, met with the committee at the first meeting and charged the committee to get to the bottom of this and sort of empowered us to get whatever questions answered that we needed to have answered and was very convincing in telling us that he wants us to find out if there are any problems that need to be addressed. So he sort of gave the commission carte blanch to look at this question as they saw fit and I think the committee was very satisfied with the President’s charge. We are also I think satisfied with the speed at which the university is apparently providing the materials that the committee has asked for. Charles and George are here so do either of you want to add anything to that or comment on the committee’s work? George? No. Charles? No. Does anyone have any questions about this? I don’t want to spend a ton of time. We’re still just starting to look at it. Milli? Do you have a microphone?
M. Kostic: I’m wondering about the confidentiality agreement of the committee with regard to the data. Are those made the public or not?

A. Rosenbaum: According to the legal services, Ken Davidson who’s our counsel, university’s counsel, apparently although the salary data is public information, that once you start manipulating it by putting additional information in or changing its form or analyzing it, it suddenly becomes a different set of data and so I should tell you that this confidentiality agreement does not prevent us from talking about anything that’s in the data as long as we talk about it in aggregated form. So we can tell anyone we want what the data shows, we simply can’t disclose individual information and this was – seemed like a reasonable accommodation. The committee signed off and this and we made it very clear that this would not restrict us from presenting any of the results of the analyses that the committee does.

M. Kostic: And the second comment is as recommendation to this committee or something were to us, if university increases somebody’s salary beyond the ??? unusually 50%, it should be very public. Under public scrutiny, in the newspapers, justification and what not if there were such cases.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, this is true. The committee as a whole I think feels that it is the aggregated data and the trends within that data which are of importance to use and that it is, you know, if the Northern Star chooses to isolate different individuals in the university, that’s their – up to them but thus the committee has not felt that it’s necessary for us to expose individual outliers in this data set. So if there’s a different feeling among the Senate, I mean certainly we can talk about that but, at this point, the concern is finding out whether there is a fair and equitable distribution of raises across the different divisions of the university and to do that we don’t need individuals identified. Any other comments on this? You know, again it did not seem like the administration was trying to pull a fast one by getting the confidentiality agreement. Legal counsel advised them that, you know, that we need to protect HR data. There are lots of episodes or instances of people who have been sued for violating confidentiality. We all know about FERPA and HIPAA and all those other kinds of things so they’re a little sensitive to those issues but to their credit, they have given us this data set which does include all the information that they were using in producing that set of analyses that Fred Schwantes and Joe Grush produced during the last semester. Incidentally, the committee that we have put together is very statistically sophisticated and the committee pretty felt that the analyses that have already been done are mostly worthless so we are sort of asking for additional information to do analyses that are less worthless and so far they have been agreeable towards providing that data. We’re optimistic about this and we’ll get back to you if we hit a roadblock or if things bog down but as of right now, we feel we are on track at least to try to get an answer to our questions by the March 19 deadline that was set for us by the Senate. Okay? Any other comments about this? Yes, Barbara?

B. Jaffee: Do you have a plan B?

A. Rosenbaum: We are – no, we have not thought about a plan B. So far we have been getting what we want and we have been getting it in a timely fashion and what the President said was that if we have a problem, we should come to see him so I fully intend to the go to the President
Okay. There are a couple of, what I hope are brief, announcements. I don’t guess that well as to what’s going to be brief and what isn’t. This is an announcement that Ferald Bryan asked me to call to the attention of the faculty and that is that the faculty, excuse me, the library is apparently removing a lot of the printed periodicals from its collection and I’ll read you exactly what it says. It says “To free up library space we took the paper-bound journals to which we have full content access in JSTORE and offered them to the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago or sold or destroyed them under Illinois law. We have not lost content. We have changed the mode of delivery of content. Freed space is being repurposed for student group study.” I think Ferald felt we should call attention to this so the faculty was aware that these journals that have been saved for a long time are now being disposed of and what we will be left with are electronic versions in JSTORE. Jitka, do you know anything about this that you could fill us in on this or answer any questions that we have? Jitka is the library representative on the Senate.

J. Hurych: I feel kind of put on the spot.

A. Rosenbaum: Sorry.

J. Hurych: I must say that I have protested the move in the library and – I don’t know whether that helped or not but I felt that even though we may have electronic access to some of these journals, we have paid for the print and paid for binding them and they should have stayed. They should have not been sent away but, however, I’m speaking against library administration here so ---

A. Rosenbaum: Now is this a done deal? I mean have these all be disposed of or is there still something that if people felt strongly about, it could be perhaps halted?

J. Hurych: Saved? Perhaps. I don’t know; I really don’t know.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other comments about this?

B. Jaffee: Do you know which journals? ???

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, there’s a large list of journals that you can find. The website is – it’s the ulib.niu.edu/information/jstorpulled.cfm so you can go to that website and that will tell you which of the journals either have been or have been marked for extermination. I don’t know the status of that. Jitka seems to say that perhaps some of this has already been done but some of it may not have been done. Okay? So if people are interested in this, apparently this is a place to start and if there seems to be a Faculty Senate role in this, then certainly bring it to my attention. Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: Yeah, it seems to me, I mean, I realize the quandary of storage and so forth but that at least some perhaps off-site storage could be found for these in case, for example, the computers
crash, what an unlikely thing, but it really seems to be putting all of our eggs in a fairly tenuous basket to just completely get rid of the paper.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yeah and I don’t know, you know, people have told me that some of the storage media that we’re using now have limited life spans so storing things I think, for example, on CD’s or DVD’s has something like a twenty year life span so I don’t know how they’re storing this stuff. Ferald?

**F. Bryan:** Pat I just wanted to point out that a number of my colleagues are much more emotional about this and are very upset that this is happening. Those who look at ads or, you know, graphic displays of the journal and want the original print form for many, many legitimate research reasons greatly deplore that this is happening. I think the place to start would be your department library representative. I mean, I was my department library representative for many years. I was surprised. This is the minutes from the November Library Advisory Committee that Alan just quoted from so this is already, you know, a month or two old but if you have concerns about it, address it to your department library representative.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes?

**J. Hrych:** --- from the library and I just wanted to say that the library representatives were, you know, notified of this prior to anything being done. I believe the deans were notified so I don’t think it was really done in secret. Unfortunately, a lot of times information doesn’t trickle down as it should and also JSTORE is considered one of the most stable of the electronic resources that are available right now plus we will keep copies in Portico which is an electronic archiving system.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Can you – do you know what ---

**J.Hurych:** It is the original print format.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Do you know what the status is now? I mean has all this been done already or is this in process?

**J. Hurych:** I don’t know for sure what the status is but I know they’ve been told.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Any other comments? Okay, next item. Jan Rintala has asked for a few moments to make a couple of announcements related to Athletics so Jan, if you have a mike there.

**J. Rintala:** Thank you Alan. As some of you may have seen already, there are student athletes last fall – concluded their 9th straight semester with accumulative GPA over 3.0. They were – finished at a 3.5 right now so they’re staying on track there. This time of semester you also are probably used to getting those nice little yellow note cards if you have student athletes in class asking you to please assist the academic advising group over in, Academic Support, over in Athletics. This year it’s changing a little. It won’t be those nice little yellow note cards. They are shifting to on-line. It’s called “Grades First” so everyone hopefully who has student athletes
enrolled in your classes, should be receiving an e-mail – I believe it’s supposed to go our Friday – and so I would encourage you to please complete that with an electronic submission. It will allow Academic Support Services to get a much quicker response and we’re hoping even more complete response than the good responses we’ve had in the past so I encourage your involvement in that. As a wrap-up for fall semester, one of the things that we do within the Mid-American Conference is to select – and the faculty athletic reps do this – is select students for academic ALL-MAC awards. These are students who balance, clearly balance, both the academic importance for them as well as very strong competition on the field. To even be eligible, they must have at least a 3.2 GPA and have participated in 50% of their team’s competition. Everybody who’s eligible then gets on a list and the faculty athletic representatives basically select the best of the best for academic ALL-MAC. This year we had several women’s soccer – and I tell these in case some of you have these young men and women and can smile back on the jobs they’ve done in your class and that you’ve helped them with – women’s soccer Annie Wyer and Lindsey Cumock. Men’s soccer, Brad Bahr and Luis De La Cerda. Volleyball, Kristin Hoffman, Allison McGlaughlin and Meagan Schoenrock and football, Brandon Bice, Tommy Davis and Chandler Harnish. By the way, we got statistically more than our fair share compared to the MAC average in these sports as well so we’re proud of them.

One final one and this is a very, very special one that occurred just this weekend. There’s a group called the Columbus Quarterback Club which is sort of like the New York Athletic Club that does the Heisman Trophy if you pay any attention to these, but annually they select what they feel are very, very outstanding people in the word of sport. They select one collegiate male athlete of the year and this year the selection was Jake Coffman who is from the NIU football team so best college male athlete of the year and I just want to read a paragraph or two on the significance of his recognition. “Northern Illinois defensive end Jake Coffman took a road less traveled to arrive on the college football field. Before he walked on two years ago as a 23-year old freshman, the 6’5”, 250 pound lineman from German Valley, Illinois served in the U.S. Marine Corps and was deployed twice to Iraq, where he reached the rank of Corporal. The 2009 season showcased Jake’s football skills and he led the Huskies in sacks with 8 1/2, and tackles for loss. For his exceptional season on the field, and his devoted service to his country, Jake Coffman has been named the Touchdown Club of Columbus 2009 Male Athlete of the Year. The award is presented annually to the outstanding amateur athlete who exemplifies dedication and leadership both on and off the field of play. Last year’s winner—Florida State safety Myron Rolle—took a break from football and is currently a Rhodes Scholar.”

So this is an award not given to your run-of-the-mill student athlete. It’s my understanding that Coach Kill went with him. He received a standing ovation when this information introduction was read. He made apparently a very impressive acceptance speech and received another standing ovation so he represented both himself and Northern Illinois University very well. I just wanted to share that with you. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you very much. The next item is the – I’m sorry?

B. Jaffee: I’m trying to beat you guys – it’s about the on-line, you know, is that something that’s password protected so that it comes to the professor like through MyNIU or is it e-mail?

J. Rintala: It should be coming as an e-mail.
B. Jaffee: E-mail. Okay, thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next item. The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women is accepting nominations for three awards. These three awards are the Wilma D. Stricklin Award, the Women Who Make a Difference Award and the Outstanding Mentor Award. The deadlines for these nominations are February 19 and so Deb Haliczer asked me to make this announcement and asked you to please consider nominating a colleague for these awards. I asked Deb to, if she would, take just a few moments to tell us perhaps what the Wilma D. Stricklin Award is. I guess we can figure out what the Women Who Make a Difference Award and the Outstanding Mentor Award are.

D. Haliczer: Okay. Okay, the Wilma Stricklin Award is given to an outstanding administrator who has for a lasting period of time made a difference in the lives of women on campus. It’s given once a year or not and the other awards are given to women in any capacity working on campus who make a difference in the lives of women and who are good at mentoring women. I’d also add that this is the award season and so each of the Presidential Commissions has its own award. The Deacon Davis Award for the Presidential Commission on the Status of Minorities, the John ??? Award for the Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities and the Presidential Commission on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity and the ??? Award. Each of them has nominations. Spring is when nominations happen. Think of nominating colleagues. I might also add that the Outstanding Operating Staff deadline is coming up and so if you have an Operating Staff person in your area, think about making a difference in their lives. Awards make a lot of difference to people’s morale and this is the season to think about. I might also make another announcement to tell you that you have present one of this year’s for Presidential Supporting Professional Staff Award for Excellence winners, Bobbie Cesarek, is one of the four people this year. Congratulations, Bobbie.

B. Cesarek: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions? If you want to make a nomination, I believe you can go to the Presidential Commissions website on the NIU website and make your nominations there.

J. Rintala: One correction. My colleague here reminded me that I read a little quickly. He was a corporal; not a colonel.

A. Rosenbaum: He deserved the promotion so. Okay. Okay, next item. There was some conversation in the last Senate meeting about faculty participation in the university budget and this originated as one of the items that came from one of the departments when we asked Faculty Senate members to go out and see what their departments wanted the Senate to be working on and so we have – I’ve been trying to get a little more information for you on the budget process and the way faculty feed into or advise on the budget process. There are at least three mechanisms by which faculty play a role in the budget. The first is the Committee on Resource, Space and Budget. The Committee on Resource, Space and Budget is a joint committee of the Faculty Senate and the University Council. There are four members from the Senate on it; there are four members from the Council on it and there is a chair, there is a co-chair from the Senate
and a co-chair from the University Council. The role of this committee is supposedly to participate with the President and Executive Vice President in the development of long-range planning and allocation and real allocation of resources. The committee is supposed to meet with the President and the Executive Vice President and Provost either together or separately at least twice a semester and offer advice on budget and space issues and in a moment I’m going to ask Barbara Jaffee who is one of the co-chairs of that committee to talk about the role of the committee in the budgetary process so we can find out how that’s working. Another way that the faculty participates in the budget process is on the Academic Planning Council. The Academic Planning Council is one of the three councils that deals with curriculum issues and the Academic Planning Council is supposed to advise the Executive Vice President and Provost on academic priorities and strategies for the achievement of these priorities including the establishment of priorities in budgeting and so the Academic Planning Council, and again, this is largely a faculty peopled committee so the committee consists largely of faculty. The third way is through the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees and a little big later I’m going to present the report that was generated from the most recent Board of Trustees meeting. You know that the Board of Trustees has sub-committees. The sub-committees meet once every three months. The sub-committees then present their findings or their decisions to the full Board. The faculty is represented by the UAC and that stands for the University Advisory Committee. Right now the University Advisory Committee members for the Finance, Facilities and Operations sub-committee consists of myself and Greg Waas. Greg Waas is the chairman in Psychology. The way that works is the day or two before that meeting, Greg and I meet with Eddie Williams and he tells us what is going to be presented to the Board of Trustees’ Finance, Facilities and Operations sub-committee. We are allowed to ask him questions. He answers those questions for us and that is one of the ways that the faculty can try and raise certain issues. So I’ll address that a little bit later but first I’ve asked Barbara – Mike Morris is the Faculty Senate co-chair. Mike is not here today; he had a conflict but Barbara is here and she can talk to us a little bit about what that Resource, Space and Budget Committee does or doesn’t do. So, Barbara?

B. Jaffee: Well, I can talk to you quite a bit about what it doesn’t do.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s what I was afraid of.

B. Jaffee: I don’t know if people received a copy of this report. It didn’t come electronically, my attached report on Resource Space and Budget Committee’s meeting of October 1, 2009 but it may have circulated other ---

A. Rosenbaum: That was in the agenda, was it not?

B. Jaffee: It was in the printed copy but not the electronic so I’m not sure, excellent, okay, all right. So if you take a look at this, the first paragraph just lists the members for this year and I want to point out that in addition to the eight faculty members that Alan described, according to University Bylaw 2.8, there is also supposed to be a student appointed through the Student Association and there’s supposed to be an additional member appointed by the Council of Deans. As well, the Executive Vice President for Business and Finance is a non-voting member, ex-officio, so that’s the composition of the committee and, according to the Constitutional charge, this is Bylaw 2.8, the committee is supposed to meet regularly as a group. So that’s all of the
members just described in order to discuss issues of resource needs and priorities. In addition to that, to meet at least twice each semester and I’m summarizing here but in the Bylaw it actually says “with the President and Provost together or separately”. I said “representatives of the Academic Administration” because just a lot more practical, in order to offer advice on budget and space issues and then to report recommendations and evaluations to the Faculty Senate and University Council. So these charges in the Constitution I think make it very clear that the purpose of this committee really is to be a place that generates – that is a sort of clearing house for faculty input, discussion with administration in both the academic and finance and facilities divisions and the, you know, to report back. I don’t know that it’s – in my – I’ve been on the committee three years. It has not functioned that way in three years. I did in October begin the meeting with sort of high hopes that we could try to do this. As usual, what happened was that I learned a lot about how complicated the budget is. I have a summary here in paragraph three from Dr. Williams in which he talked about the NIU budget process but I will tell you that all of this information is available on line and the home page for the Office of Budget and Planning. That’s under the Division of Finance and Facilities. There is a page called “budget process overview” which has a flowchart. There’s a page called “budgeting calendar” which applies dates to tasks which don’t entirely match up with the flowchart but the point is that there really are two fronts on which the budget process unfolds. One is external and the goal of that is to acquire, to secure a state appropriation, and in this case the Office of Budget and Planning prepares the budget, submits it to the Illinois Board of Higher Education according to the guidelines approved by the Board of Trustees. There simultaneously a process that unfolds internally through Planning and Development that produces a detailed operating budget for each department and you can see in the flowchart how these things sort of cross each other in interesting ways. In the internal process there’s a lot of opportunity for reporting and sort of oversight and discussion. At our meeting in October we were joined by Dr. Grush who pointed out that this would be an opportunity for the committee to play a role in over – reviewing the budget although I didn’t get the sense that this was going to happen just by, you know, wanting it to happen. He said that, in fact, at the meeting – and so now I’m talking about the actual meeting versus what is ideally what is supposed to happen – at the meeting Dr. Grush noted that in his opinion, historically this committee is a kind of artifact. That it is a sort of vestigial group because of the restrictions to the budget, there isn’t a lot of opportunity in his opinion for faculty to advise, that this was once-upon-a-time when the university was growing and maybe the faculty would have an opportunity to comment or, you know, help direct the growth of different academic areas and so on. He did say that the growth or transformations to the budget over the last few years that have happened have happened through the strategic planning process and that, as far as he was concerned, this satisfied the Constitutional charge that faculty be involved in advising and consenting. That, you know, working with a budget was such a big project that it couldn’t be done in the kind of format outlined in Bylaw 2.8 and since the administration conducted strategic planning and strategic planning had faculty input, that was really all that needed to happen. At the end of the meeting, both Drs. Grush and Williams offered the opinion that the real function of this committee should be to promote – provide faculty support for NIU’s external budget request so that when requests go to the legislature, we could be sort of cheerleaders for that and that, you know, that would be the most useful in terms of faculty input into this process. I noticed I skipped over one more thing here which has to do with the detailed operating budget that’s produced internally for each department begins with historical precedent. It’s a baseline budget process and then, you know, whatever the current increment determines the
outcome of that internal budget. The other piece of information from Dr. Williams that this process, this internal process, is constrained by the fact that many of the university’s sources of revenue are by definition statute already allocated so that there wasn’t a whole lot that really could be done. I mean it seemed as if the whole thing where we’re so constrained and so, you know, already determined – predetermined that, you know, there wasn’t opportunity for faculty input other than the strategic planning process. I did offer the opinion at the meeting that I wasn’t sure that strategic planning was entirely faculty driven.

A. Rosenbaum: How’d that go?

B. Jaffee: Well, I mean, you have my report. I, you know, what we were asked for was, you know, to provide support for the external request and if we wanted on our own to provide some input into capital planning, which is occurring, right, we’ve now gotten this capital appropriation of which, I’m going to forget now, 2.3 million is for planning ---

A. Rosenbaum: No ---

B. Jaffee: No, 8 million is – right, but for planning it’s 2.3 million that there could be opportunity for faculty input into that.

A. Rosenbaum: How about the meetings with the President and Provost? Have those not occurred?

B. Jaffee: That’s not happened, no.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s not happened at all.

B. Jaffee: No. I didn’t realize until I became chair this year that that was part of the charge. I had served on the committee for two years prior and I thought what we did was sit in a room while Dr. Williams told us about how all the money was already allocated and what a shame it is that the state is reneging on their commitment, all of which is true, and that we were then supposed to report back to the faculty about that. Once I read the Bylaw and held this meeting trying to sort of assert this procedure as outlawed in – outlined in the Bylaw – that was a conflation of outlined and Bylaw, I’m sorry, I’m very – well, for those of you who were at this meeting, you know it was a very long meeting. It was not pleasant and I came away from this with the feeling that I was not as empowered to ask the kind of questions that I was asking as this Bylaw would suggest.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Any comments/questions for Barbara? Pat?

P. Henry: Well, as someone who was at that meeting I concur in the assessment of it. It seems to me and I’m not sure this is a happy thing but if it was more functional during the growth period, given our particular financial problems now, it seems to me really important to have faculty input as budgets get scaled back and I would hope that there would be some way that we could make that point to the administration.
A. Rosenbaum: In fact there is Article 2.9 something called the Financial Exigency Advisory Committee and the Financial Exigency Advisory Committee says that if the President believes a financial exigency is imminent, actually it says imminent, the President in consultation with Resources, Space and Budget Committee shall form a Financial Exigency Advisory Committee and so it seems like we’re sort of cruising toward that sort of eventuality. Does the committee want to meet with the President and the Provost?

B. Jaffee: Well, I think for a kind of, you know, free-wheeling question and answer. I don’t, I don’t know, I mean it seems to me without some idea of what the budget is, the committee at the moment has no idea, I don’t – what is there to do?

A. Rosenbaum: The budget is published. We have a copy of the budget in the University Council/Faculty Senate office. So we have that. We have the internal budget. Anyone can look at it if you would like to. The committee can have it.

B. Jaffee: That would be very helpful because I asked for it at that meeting and, you know, really never – well, I didn’t ---

A. Rosenbaum: Well, there’s a lag. I just received it this morning so I have the 2009 budget in hand so you’re welcome to have that.

B. Jaffee: All right. Well, that would be different. Yes and it would be useful because if we knew what we were talking about, there would be something to talk about.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Okay, you know, I would concur with Barbara’s report and I don’t know if it’s an effort to be obstructionistic but the budget is such a complicated thing that when you start asking questions about it, trying to figure out who’s actually making all the various decisions and, in fact, whether anyone can make all the myriad of decisions that are involved, I think that’s why they start with this, sort of, they start with the budget from last year. They don’t start from scratch and build a new budget each year because it’s just too much for anyone to do so it is a complicated thing and I think that perhaps the faculty should have a stronger voice and we need to figure out how to go about doing that. So it sounds like our committee on Resource, Space and Budget is not exercising a very strong voice at the present. Would that be fair?

B. Jaffee: No. We were too loud in the beginning and now we’re silent.

A. Rosenbaum: You used all your energy.

B. Jaffee: That’s exactly right but I think that if we had an opportunity to meet as a committee, you know, as described here with those – with the budget as a reference – we could have a conversation that we could then build on in the way, exactly as it says, regularly meetings discussing priorities and needs and then periodic interaction with the President and Provost.

A. Rosenbaum: We can certainly do that. I can provide a copy of the budget to the committee and we can ask the President and/or the Provost to meet as prescribed by the Constitution and
I’m sure they would do that. So if you would like to meet with the committee and get to me as to when they would like to do that, we can facilitate that. Did you have a question, an answer.

**J. Stephen:** I was going to suggest that the meeting with the President would be the most important since he knows about the external face of the budget and their new charge says put a smiley face and say fight for the budget externally and, you know, Eddie is the guy who knows about internally.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We can certainly do that. I think the President certainly would not violate the Constitution and would be willing to meet with the committee if that’s what you would like. So if you come – I can give you the budget and then we can set up the meeting with the President. Any other comments or questions about this? Additions?

**B. Jaffee:** About my own report, what about the other members that are then Constitutionally supposed to be part of the committee, a student representative and one from the Council of Deans. Any chance we’re going to ---

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, we know who these people are because we have the Committee Book and so everybody who’s on these committees is named so we can certainly provide the name and have those people contacted or you can contact them.

**B. Jaffee:** What I’m saying is that this list on my report is the entire composition. I know ??? – this is just in attendance. Not all those people are on the committee. I don’t ---

**A. Rosenbaum:** We have names of people that – the committees are filled so that there are people who are supposed to be. Whether they come to those meetings or not is up to them. So, but at any rate, the committees are filled. Any other thoughts on this? Comments or questions? One additional question I have is would there be any reason why the Senate would want to ask Dr. Williams to address us and talk about the budgetary process and answer questions. Would that be something that would be of interest to us? I don’t know if it would be of interest to him but if the Senate would like to do that, we can certainly extend an invitation.

**B. Jaffee:** You know I think if we had prepared some questions in advance it might be useful because if you look at the third paragraph of my report here, Dr. Williams detailed an informative summary of the NIU budget process. I’ve heard this twice this semester for three years. That’s actually what you get when he summarizes and it’s what’s on the website and it’s, you know, you can look at it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So we don’t need to hear that is what you’re saying?

**B. Jaffee:** Yeah.

**A. Rosenbaum:** But we possibly might want to ask some questions.

**B. Jaffee:** Yeah.
A. Rosenbaum: So at any rate, people can look at the website and then perhaps at the next meeting if there’s a sentiment that we want to ask Dr. Williams to come in, we can extend an invitation. Is that reasonable?

B. Jaffee: Or if you have questions that you would like the committee to raise when we meet with Dr. Williams regularly because he is ex-officio member of the committee. He doesn’t come, you know, twice a semester at the invitation. He’s part of the committee. We really are the vehicle for those faculty questions. Pass them along.

A. Rosenbaum: If people on the Senate have questions for the committee to ask Dr. Williams or President Peters, forward them to either Barbara Jaffee or to Mike Morris who is co-chair from the Faculty Senate. Okay? Rosemary? You need a microphone.

R. Feurer: I would say that we ought to ask about that 2.9 provision and the Financial Exigency Advisory Committee. Everybody – there are a lot of people who are worried about what’s happening fairly quickly and my thought is better not wait until it actually happens.

A. Rosenbaum: When we’re really in an exigency.

R. Feurer: In other words, if we start to assert what we as faculty might envision if we have a crisis that it might be wise to say we have a financial exigency imminent that needs an advisory committee.

A. Rosenbaum: That can certainly be presented to the President at our next discussion. Okay? Next item. I don’t know if we want to get into this. We have a couple of other orders of business but I just want to again ask if people have gone back to their departments to ask about the possible addition of the +/- grading system. I’ve only heard from a couple of departments at this point.

???:

A. Rosenbaum: Well, either that or communicate – we’re trying to – we need to make decisions about whether we want to raise this issue. This would of course, if we decide to raise it, go to committee and hopefully not Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, but we have to send it to a committee so I’m still looking for input. I’ve heard from two or three departments but it would be nice to see if there is a ground swell of interest in this before we do it. Ayhan?

A. Lash: We started a conversation on the discussion board so people are writing and talking on the discussion board that hasn’t ended yet but there’s ?? data coming from the School of Nursing and Health Sciences. I didn’t know where to present it so I’ll send it to you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Buck did you have something?

J. Stephen: ?? about every three years.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, that’s the thing. We keep doing it and we’re ---
A. Rosenbaum: I didn’t know what we would get back but that is, I guess, what started it. David?

David Valentiner from Psychology. I raised this at a Psychology meeting, departmental meeting, and there was no strong opinion one way or the other about the issue.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

P. Henry: Did Michael Morris pass on Foreign Languages?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, they were in favor of it.

P. Henry: They were.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes. There are a number of departments who are strongly in favor of it. Yes?

R. Schneider: Theatre and Dance is interested in the minuses but not the pluses.

A. Rosenbaum: They’re what?

R. Schneider: They would rather have a B- than a C+.

A. Rosenbaum: My – okay. Are you saying your department would like minuses but not pluses.

R. Schneider: They don’t see the point in having both.

A. Rosenbaum: Well so you can balance out a minus if you get one.

R. Schneider: I never thought of that.

P. Henry: You had mentioned this before that the system that’s used in some places where you have A, A/B, B, B/C really seems to make a lot of sense in terms of how it would interface with the 4.0 grade system that we’ve got now.

A. Rosenbaum: And I think the thing is these are some of the systems that are – would be valuable to the committee to think about and talk about in forming a recommendation so the question is whether we put it to a committee, once again, to come up with a recommendation and to make that decision I would like to sort of have a sense that it’s more than one or two departments that are looking for this to happen so if you could please get me some feedback on this we can then try to reach a decision as to whether we want to bring this up once. Again, we’d send it to committee and we’d get a recommendation as to what the best system is. Yes?
**T. Fisher:** Teresa Fisher from CAHE. Was it tabled last time? I know this issue came up to my faculty before I was elected to Senate and I was told that CAHE was interested but I didn’t know what happened last time.

**A. Rosenbaum:** It wasn’t tabled; the Senate choose not to act.

**T. Fisher:** Okay.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So we did not put it off for a future date, we simply did not have the votes to do anything about it and so it was left the way it is. So this would mean once again, resurrecting the issue, sending it to committee and the committee would then make a recommendation. The Senate would discuss it and decide whether or not to make a recommendation to the University Council. Okay? Okay. Okay.

The last announcement item is that at the March meeting we will entertain nominations for the position of Executive Secretary and President of the Faculty Senate and so if anyone else is interested in this position, the March meeting is the time when we will take nominations. So we are not at this point needing to nominate anyone for either the FAC to the IBHE and Earl is only in his first year and we are not needing nominations for the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor because he is also in his first year of a two year term. So fair warning, if anyone is interested in my job, the March meeting would be the time to make those wishes known. Okay.

V. **ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

A. Illinois Public University Presidents & Chancellors Letter and Faculty Senate draft letter of support

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next item, we have items for faculty senate consideration. You all have a copy of that letter that the presidents and chancellors of the public universities put out. This was sent out by the President, I believe yesterday. The copy is there in case you don’t read the President’s messages. I have also included the draft of a possible, this is just a quick thing I put together to see if we were interested in doing this. If we are interested in also putting our – making our feelings known, we can start with that draft and either accept it or modify it so any thoughts from the Senate on this? Do we want to do this or not? Earl?

**E. Hansen:** I know that the other institutions are coming out in support of this with their faculty; the same letter. So I would strongly recommend that we do that. From what I’ve seen sitting on this advisory committee, we really need to show a united front across the board.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Others? Pat?

NOT ON MIKE

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Is anyone opposed to the idea? Does anyone think this would be a bad idea? No? You know, if you had a class like this, you would not be happy. You know, you like people to sort of, you know, join in, ask questions, participate. John?
John Novak: --- very important it should be in bold faced. It’s very important.

A. Rosenbaum: The letter. Okay. So let’s start with this; I’ll take a straw vote on this. How many people on the Senate think we should put some kind of a statement out? Anyone think we should not? Okay, so we’re going to do that. Now we can start with that as a base unless someone would like to suggest something different. Would anyone like to suggest modifications, additions, subtractions, deletions or anything like that? Short and direct. Okay. So this is satisfactory people; no one is asking for changes? Okay. Do we make this as a motion?

John Novak: I just did.

A. Rosenbaum: You moved?

John Novak: Yeah. I can’t vote but I can move.

A. Rosenbaum: Do we have a second? Two seconds? Okay, David Wade or David Valentiner. Okay, all in favor signify by – oh, wait – we have a motion and second. Any discussion of this? So we’re talking about sending this letter just as it is written. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? It carries unanimously.

Buck Made the motion David Valentiner made the second. The motion passed.

A. Rosenbaum: There’s a second question here. Who do you want this sent to? We can send this to the Governor. We can send this to the Governor and our various representatives. We can send it to the Governor, various representatives and the President. All of the above. Earl?

E. Hansen: I’d send it to the Governor, the Comptroller and our representatives.

A. Rosenbaum: Our representatives being?

E. Hansen: Our state representatives.

A. Rosenbaum: And the President?

E. Hansen: Yes. Make sure the Comptroller gets a copy of this.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, do we have this noted down? Okay. Anyone else? I’m sorry?


A. Rosenbaum: So we add it to those as well?

J. Stephen: Those are the people who were cc’s on the letter from the President.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Any objections to that? Okay. We will send it to all of these people. If anyone comes up with someone else that we ought to send it to, just call the office and let us know and we will make it available. Okay. Good.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: We have three reports from the advisory committees to the Board of Trustees. Remember, these are the times when the individual items are brought to Board attention. We then hear them all over again at the full Board of Trustees meetings so these are the reports of the different representatives. The first one we have is Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel. Buck, is it going to be you or Ferald?

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report – walk-in

J. Stephen: Me. Hopefully, I’ll figure out which format fits well for Robin. This is a mess. The Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee, that committee takes a look at changes in curriculum both from fees and everything that effects student experience here and also things that effect personnel decisions. This term the basic thing is sabbaticals. One thing they’ve asked for over the last couple years is they have guests come in and give reports on their – what they did on their sabbatical or summer vacation and these have turned out to be quite nice. Bob Boey suggested them. This year we had Professor Dan Gebo and he gave a nice discussion on fossilized remains found in China and discussion about the implications following ??? about what this meant about the spread of such prehistoric primates and Professor Virginia Wilcox-Gok. This professor – she discussed her study of the correlations between rates of prescriptions of anti-depressants, income and secondary insurance in a group of Medicare eligible patients, mostly women. This study is in preparation for a contrasting study of what will happen after Part D prescription care comes in and she had a secondary project concerning the income loss associated with a family when they take care of relatives with moderate to severe Alzheimer’s disease. That’s a population in Britain. They were both very lively, interesting discussions and then for the first time they requested an annual report on the outcomes of sabbatical leaves. That sort of aggregated data about what we manage to do and the highlights are for 2006/07 we got 11 books, 35 chapters of books, 53 journal articles, 11 technical reports, 11 or 31 works of art, 16 musical performances and a whole bunch of talks and lectures and things like that. It’s quite an impressive list. They talked about sabbaticals and we can expect to continue that the Board of Trustees will support the sabbatical program here. The next thing they saw in sabbaticals was the application or the 49 sabbatical proposals by faculty members and 1 by an SPS colleague. All of these requests were endorsed unanimously after supportive discussion which included a reflection upon the care that is taken in the review process by colleagues, you know, before we even make a recommendation to the Board. They seemed to gain quite an understanding of this process.
There were some information items on money and fees that will come up in legislative in autumn auditing. Let’s see, what else.

Dr. Lisa Freedman was recommended for appointment as Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies effective July 1, 2010 together with an appointment at the rank of professor in Biological Sciences. This recommendation was endorsed unanimously and we had several new degree programs including Bachelor of Science in Philosophy. They’re expanding the Nursing Program to several different regional sites on a rotating basis and then we had some new minors in College of Engineering and Engineering Technology and a new specialization in Non-Profit Management. That’s quite a new thing for us.

We had two things deleted. One was a specialization in Human Services Administration. That department has changed and it doesn’t suite its purposes anymore. But they’re also proposing to delete the Bachelor of Arts in the Russian language from the Department of Foreign Languages. They have a strong case for deletion but President Peters expressed an interest in exploring this further before he communicated this to the Board. I’ll explain that in a second because of a long history of Russian studies here.

Everything here that was an action item was approved but an action item on this agenda just means it’s endorsed. They send it to the full Board of Trustees and the full Board of Trustees then approves anything they want to off of this so it doesn’t and in terms of whether or not we have input as opposed to the other committee, we meet with ???, the other representative, and Ferald and I meet with Ray Alden approximately a week before each meeting and go over the agenda and we may have our questions or form our questions at that time. We generally get recognized to speak when we want to speak at the Board of Trustees meetings and I have an unfortunate habit of just speaking if I want to anyway whether I’m recognized so we do get heard there.


A. Rosenbaum: Okay, no other questions for Buck?

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee - Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. The next report is my report, or actually it’s Greg Waas’s report; it’s his turn to do it. This is on the Board of Trustees Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee meeting. All the Board of Trustees committees meet on the same day which is February 4. The committee, the FFO committee was chaired by Manny Sanchez. As you can see, there are 21 action items and 11 informational items. It was my impression both at the meeting and also in conversations with Eddie Williams prior to the meeting that most of these items are already approved in the budget and the Board of Trustees is simply authorizing the expenditure of money. Many of these items are what are called pass-throughs. A pass-through means that the money is coming from some other source which means we’re not expending money from our own operating budget. Much of the money that is in these pass-throughs comes from grants that
have been received by faculty or other groups within the university. Some of these have to do with things like the camps that are run during the summer and the money all comes from student tuition or the overseas programs where again, the money comes from student fees and there is no outlay of money from within the budget. So you can see the many items that were approved. We’re buying paper, we’re buying paper plates, we’re buying cups, we’re buying software. We are authorizing money to be used for the development for a plan for the Cole Hall and what is now being called the Cole-Stevens Complex. They have, as you might know, changed the design a little bit so that the replacement for the one lecture hall in the Cole Complex instead of, since it’s never going to be used as a lecture hall again, we need the lecture hall space and so they have authorized the construction of a stand-alone lecture hall. They’ve now decided they can save money by making that lecture hall a part of the Stevens Building and so the new plans apparently will call for that lecture hall to be part of the Stevens Building abutting Cole Hall or close to Cole Hall. There are also recommendations here for student fees and there’s going to be an increase of student fees and also room and board rates. These are done in conjunction with students so student input is incorporated in these fees. The students are in agreement that there’s a need for these fees and so those are really the items. If anyone has a question on these, I’m not going to go through them all, obviously we’ll be here until tonight but if anyone has a question on any of these items I’d be happy to try to answer it. Any questions? No questions. Okay.

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

A. Rosenbaum: The last report is the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee report and Jay Monteiro is going to give us that report. Jay.

J. Monteiro: Thank you. Cherilyn Murer chaired the meeting and she opened by reporting that Dennis Cesarotti, a professor in Technology had passed away recently. Dr. Cunningham had given a report on benefit provisions for marital status/domestic partnerships. He gave a historical timeline of how things had progressed here at NIU. The Board had asked Dr. Cunningham for more comparative information to go to other states and check out what the state universities were doing and he will provide that information at a future meeting.

Danielle Schultz, NIU’s new Internal Auditor was introduced and she gave a PowerPoint outlining NIU’s internal auditing department and she also introduced her staff.

Then Kathy Buettner gave a brief outline of some of the things that we should be concerned about at NIU if they are passed. One is HB4706 which would do away with 50% tuition waivers for employee dependents. Senate Bill 2472 which eliminates General Assembly Scholarships and then the Unemployment Insurance for Academic Workers which establishes a task force and they will estimate costs to hire education institutions in regards to collecting unemployment benefits.

Kathy Buettner discussed the state budget and we all know what that’s like so I won’t even go into that.

And then the Congressional Report – people were urged to read that on their own because the
meeting was running quite late so that’s all I have.

A. Rosenbaum: Questions for Jay? Pat?

P. Henry: The II thing, what actually is the status now or is that something that’s being developed in terms of provisions for domestic partnerships?

D. Haliczer: Deb Haliczer, Human Resources. Currently we offer same sex domestic partner benefits through the State of Illinois plan and the university has offered same in opposite sex domestic partner benefits to faculty and staff here on campus on anything that is discretionary and revenue neutral. The Board of Trustee member is asking for a clarification in the Board of Trustees’ regulations that explicitly acknowledges domestic partner as a status instead of the current wording which includes “member of the household” and so Human Resources provided an extensive comparison of benefits between the different universities which you can all look at on the Human Resources website.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

J. Kowalski: Jeff Kowalski. I was wondering if there was any discussion about whether there’s whether you think there’s a chance this effort to repeal the 50% tuition waiver is likely to pass or not?

J. Monteiro: From what I’ve been told, the person who has suggested this rarely gets anything voted in and quite often he’s on another planet with his suggestions but it’s certainly something we need to watch.

A. Rosenbaum: And remember the Saints rarely win the Super Bowl so the fact that it rarely happens may not help us.

E. Hansen: This is one of the pieces of legislature that the Faculty Advisory Committee has been actively fighting against through their representation in Springfield. They’re continually aware of this and I had not heard of the legislator being described such as you described him but then I don’t know the person but I do know that the Faculty Advisory Committee has gone to the IBHE and really hammered them on this one. We need to not have that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other comments/questions? ???

Abhijit Gupta: Considering the implication of this particular bill, maybe somehow, I don’t know, we need to inform maybe all faculty that this is at least one bill that has been proposed and if they want to contact ??? or whatever, they may do so.

A. Rosenbaum: This was fairly widely disseminated to the faculty. Along with the names of the people they should contact if they wanted to do something about it. Barbara?

B. Jaffee: Jay if you could clarify in point V here what you mean by the four options in FY2011 budget. I mean I see them listed here but I don’t – they’re very different. Under what
circumstances one or the other might be ---

**J. Monteiro:** Earl could probably address that better than I can. It came from the IBHE.

**E. Hansen:** Probably not.

**A. Rosenbaum:** What I heard from the President’s Office is the first option is the most likely and the ones that involve an increase are the least likely, that they are op --- you know, trying to be wishfully optimistic I guess but the most likely one is going to be a reduction in the budget. Okay, but apparently they provide these choices and then they select which choice fits best with the budget balancing game that they play. Okay, any other questions on this? Bobbie?

**B. Cesarek:** I just wanted to make a comment that during the conversation, Kathy Buettner did acknowledge that the university was well aware that the constituents at NIU were very much against HB4706 and they were fighting on our behalf indeed to ensure that that does not pass.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any other comments?

E. **BOT - Alan Rosenbaum** – no report

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we have no reports from any of the standing committees I don’t think. Correct me if I’m mistaken. Any chairs want to say anything about that?

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair – no report

C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair – no report

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair – no report

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Academic Misconduct Issue
   Undergraduate Catalog excerpt and Student Code of Conduct excerpt

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, the last item that we have, we have no unfinished business. There is one item of new business. This is an interesting item. This involves the academic misconduct issue
and you have two pieces of – two documents in your packet. One of them comes from the Student Code of Conduct; the other comes from the Undergraduate Catalog. The problem is that the Undergraduate Catalog and the Student Code of Conduct are inconsistent regarding the academic misconduct policies. Specifically, the Undergraduate Catalog states that if an instructor finds a student guilty of plagiarism or any other academic misconduct, he or she may assign up to an F in the class. The student may appeal to the Judicial Board but can only appeal the verdict, not the penalty. So if a student pleads guilty to plagiarism no appeal of the penalty is possible, however, the Student Code of Conduct allows them to appeal both of the verdict but also of the penalty and we have a number of cases pending where a student has been found guilty of academic misconduct and where the Judicial Board has recommended a penalty that is different from that of the faculty member and where the faculty member has refused to change it and where this has created a legal liability for the university. And so the deans and the Provost are asking that we reconcile the policy as it’s stated in both the Undergraduate Catalog and also in the Student Code of Conduct. Now, part of the problem is that the Undergraduate Catalog is controlled, catalog language, controlled by the Undergraduate, the UCC, and the Student Code of Conduct is controlled by Student Affairs and specifically the Judicial Advisory Board and of them are really beholden to us, the Faculty Senate, and so we have to come up with a way of reconciling this language because it’s clearly a significant liability for the university and so the way that we have chosen to do this is to first get the faculty opinion on this and the issue clearly is one that involves academic freedom and that’s why the faculty really has to play a very important role in this and so we should not have, necessarily have, Student Affairs dictating faculty behavior. However, it also seems reasonable that we want to protect against faculty members who are being completely unreasonable in their actions ??? students. So this is a complicated issue and the deans and the Provost are not weighing in on which of the versions that they would prefer, whether it’s the Undergraduate Catalog version or the Student Code of Conduct, they’re just asking that it be reconciled, that we have one code of conduct and that it’s the same in both locations and so what we’re asking is for us to sort of give this to, I would say, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities but Rosemary will kill me so I’m going to say Academic Affairs so Charles could kill me. But what we need is for a recommendation from the faculty regarding what the policy should be and we would ask that the faculty committee that looks into this includes student input into the decision making process and we need a recommendation to the Senate. The Senate can then discuss it and vote on it and then we can give that to the UCC and also the Student Affairs and hopefully they will agree to the language that the faculty feels is the most appropriate. So that would be our starting point if the Faculty Senate agrees. So what I’m looking for here is either a motion to send this to Academic Affairs. David, are you moving?

Moved by David Valentiner; seconded by Earl Hansen. Okay, we have a motion. We can have some discussion. Is there any discussion on this? Would anyone like clarification of anything I’ve said? We’re getting to that time when nobody wants to talk about anything, we just want to get out. So we’re okay with, well, it’ll be okay if we vote on it. Let’s vote on the motion to give this issue on reconciling the academic – the Student Code of Conduct and the Undergraduate Catalog language to Academic Affairs for consideration. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.
XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Any comments or questions from the floor? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT


Hansen made the motion; Henry made the second.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:23 p.m.