FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
Wednesday, August 31, 2011, 3 p.m. 
Holmes Student Sky Room

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Faculty Senate / Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Arado, Bateni, Bisplinghoff, Calvo, Cappell, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Collins, Corwin, Cripe, Daniel, Deng, Downing, Elish-Piper, Fang, Frank, Gaillard, Goldblum, Kolb, Lash, Lenczewski, Lin, Lopez, Magnusson (for Zahay-Blatz), Martin, Mirman, Nissen, Novak, Onyuksel, Pitney, Poole, Rheineck, Rosenbaum, Ryan (for May) Sagarin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Tonks, Valentiner, VandeCreek, Von Ende, Willis


OTHERS PRESENT: Austin, Bak, Bryan, Freeman, Griffin, Hansen, Latham, Rintala

OTHERS ABSENT: Freedman, Haliczer, Prawitz, Small, Snow, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: First order of business is the adoption of the agenda. There are four walk-in items.

J. Corwin made the motion with the inclusion of the walk-in items, R. Lopez was second.

The Agenda was approved unanimously with the inclusion of four walk-in items as follows:

VII. B. BOT-AASAP report for August 25, 2011 meeting
VII. C. BOT-FFO report for May 12, 2011 meeting
VII. C. BOT-FFO report for August 25, 2011 meeting
VII. E. BOT report for June 9, 2011 meeting
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 20, 2011 FS MEETING

J. Corwin: Moved to approve the minutes, S. Willis was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

A. Rosenbaum: asked senators to make sure the minutes accurately reflect any comments that they make during a meeting and also reminded them that the minutes are not verbatim, but rather an abridged summary of the proceedings.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Lisa Freeman, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies – presentation

A. Rosenbaum: Introduced Lisa Freeman, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, who requested time to speak to the Senate about changes in the research office and also in the Research and Artistry awards program. Dr. Freeman joined Northern Illinois University in July of 2010 as the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. She is also a professor of biology at NIU and in 2002 she was named the Outstanding Woman Veterinarian of the Year by the Association for Women Veterinarians. She was recently named by Governor Quinn to the Illinois Innovation Council.

L. Freeman: It’s really a pleasure to speak to you today. I’m just a little bit past my first year at NIU and I really couldn’t be happier with my decision to accept the position here. Over the course of the year, I’ve had a lot of conversations, made some observations and I’m really here to talk to you today about some of the changes that we’re making in how the division and some of its programs operate, particularly the programmatic changes that impact faculty. Dr. Freeman presented on the following:

- The structure of the Office of Research and the individuals holding offices within the division.
- The vacancy for the Assistant Vice President for Compliance and Research Integrity the conducting of a national search.
- The creation of two new advisory bodies – the Research and Graduate Studies Development Council and the Research Instruction and Public Service Advisory Council.
- Changes to the way that faculty travel funds will be distributed. Block grants will be given to the colleges and the library, to support faculty travel with a stipulation that we would be willing to provide up to $750.00 a year and that there would be a one-to-one match by a combination of the college and the departments; that the funds would be administered by the colleges; that the deans and department heads would be empowered to develop the procedures within those units that made sense for them; and that there would be verification reporting back to us that, indeed, the funds were used to support a faculty member making a presentation.
and that the match actually occurred. This year, we’ve made $100,000.00 available.

Changes to the Research and Artistry Grants program. There will be no department or college level review. There will be external peer review. The way this is going to work is Associate Vice President Stone and I and faculty, who are selected from the two councils I described, will look at the grants when they come in, will look at the external reviewers who are suggested by the people who submit grants (everyone’s asked to submit three to five names), and we’ll send these out for review. This will function the way federal grant reviews function at the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation or the National Endowment for the Humanities. The submission deadline will be Nov 4th.

The PowerPoint slides from Dr. Freeman’s presentation can be accessed from agenda, minutes and transcript of the August 31 meeting.

R. Lopez: Thank you. I have a question on the external peer review process. Can you say a little bit about that?

L. Freeman: We are asking faculty, when they submit their grant, to suggest three to five people who are not collaborators, who they would consider qualified to review the grant and we’re guaranteeing that at least one of those people will be a reviewer of the grant. We will probably seek two or three external reviews for each grant. The reviewers will be instructed to use a five-point scale. It’s available in the RFP; it’s what we’ve always done. We will read the written reviews that come in and use those to decide what the ranking and the relative funding lines will be.

A. Rosenbaum: thanked Lisa Freeman who then left the meeting. We have a lot of new members and so I want to make a few general comments. First, I want to remind everybody that we are covered by the Northern Star, so there is at least some chance that things that you say can make their way into the school newspaper and that’s fine, but you should be at least mindful of that possibility. We are, technically, not an open meeting and so we are not covered by the Illinois Open Meetings Act but, traditionally, we have always invited the Northern Star to come to these meetings and, unless someone wants to make a motion to change that, we’ll continue to allow Northern Star to attend.

I want to emphasize that Faculty Senators represent their departments. Your role is to do two things. One is to represent the wishes, ideas and issues that are coming out of your department, that your department wants brought forward to the Faculty Senate, but also for you to bring information back to your department. And so when Lisa, for example, talks to us about changes that are being made in the Research and Artistry Grants, this is a mechanism for getting that information to the faculty as a whole.

It has been one of my objectives for us to really operate as a Faculty Senate. In other words, when we vote on things, we’re voting the wishes of the faculty as a whole and a good example of that is what happened last year. Many of you heard about our plus/minus grading situation and we passed a resolution advocating that the system of grading be changed to included pluses and
minuses. We made sure that each of the Faculty Senate representatives went back to their departments and took a vote and then represented that vote in Senate, so we actually got good picture of the wishes of the faculty on this matter.

Now, I’ll tell you a little bit later what the status of that is, it’s not completely satisfactory, but it is still a work in progress. But, nevertheless, the principle was an important one and I would like for us to represent the faculty and that means Faculty Senate members going to their departments, asking them about the issues that are coming up and representing what the faculty in their departments want. We very rarely have the opportunity to take a poll of the full faculty and so this is a proxy for that. I also feel that one of our objectives is to not simply deal with issues that are dropped on us from above by the administration, but rather to begin issues at our level that are of import to the faculty and then send those up to the University Council and to the administration as things that the faculty would like to see enacted.

There are many issues that confront the faculty. Some of the things that we are going to be facing this year have to do with things like recruitment and enrollment. What is the impact of that on standards? Faculty set the standards for admissions at this university. If enrollment becomes an important issue, which it obviously is, it is up to us to make sure that we are maintaining the standards that we feel the faculty want to maintain. As many of you know, the general assembly in Illinois passed legislation that will lead to performance-based funding of universities and they appointed a committee to develop standards for this process. There are three university presidents on that committee and President Peters is not one of them. This committee is going to be making decisions about what the standards are; the way performance will be evaluated. Graduation and dropout rates may be part of the criteria. There is always the potential that that could be translated into pressure on faculty to reduce standards, to give higher grades, and so these are issues to which we are going to have to be paying close attention.

Another issue of which you are all aware are the financial constraints related to the State’s failure to pay NIU money owed, which is somewhere around $42 million. They are supposed to be paying that money to us by December 31st. We are now in the 2012 budget year and, so far, the State has been paying some of the bills for FY2012 although they have not finished paying for 2011. When you go to Board of Trustees meetings, the thing that is front and center is funding and whether the State is going to give us the money that we are entitled to, what the impact will be on our budget going forward. We were actually quite lucky this year because, at least on paper, we were only given about a 1.15 percent decrease in our budget which was much, lower than the administration had expected. The budget situation continues to be a significant one.

The faculty have to be very vigilant about these issues. We have been lucky in that we have not had furlough days; we’ve not had faculty layoffs. There are also questions, though, about whether the numbers of faculty have grown or shrunk and, unfortunately, it looks like they’ve shrunk. The University continues to support replacement of positions for people who have retired or been denied tenure, but I don’t know that we are increasing the number of faculty members. We’re going to have to really stay on top of the budget situation and you’ll be hearing more about this as things develop.
One of the big projects last year was the Vision 2020 initiative. The priorities developed by the Vision 2020 subcommittees were ranked in importance by the Steering Committee. The results were that the two most imperative priority items were student success (graduation and retention rates) and faculty salaries. The Vision 2020 Committee was very aware that faculty salaries are an important issue if we are going to go forward and improve the quality of students that apply to NIU, which is another one of their objectives. It will be interesting to see how that plays out given the current financial situation.

In the FY2012 internal budget, there was no money for salary increases. The University proposed a three percent salary increase, IBHE nixed it and so the budget went through without a salary increase for faculty and staff. That doesn’t mean there won’t be one, it just means that it’s less likely, and whatever salary increase there is will have to come out of internal funds. There is this balance that they are going to have to strike between trying to improve faculty and staff salaries and at the same time deal with decreasing support from the State of Illinois.

I said that I would mention the status of plus/minus grading, so for those who were on the Senate last year, I want to tell you what happened. We passed the resolution that said that the faculty were fully supportive of a plus/minus grading system. That went to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and to APASC. APASC was given the charge of dealing with that by the UCC. APASC voted it down.

We found out about this and I went and spoke to APASC and they tried to talk about some of the reasons why they had. They didn’t believe the Faculty Senate’s poll of the faculty was an accurate one. They did a little poll of their own and, in their poll, they felt that the support was not there. They also got a fair number of complaints by the students. Students were not in favor, for the most part, of the plus/minus system.

I then went to the UCC and was successful in arguing that the UCC not accept the minutes of APASC. They sent it back and said they wanted APASC to form a joint committee with the Faculty Senate to iron out the problems and it sounded like they were supportive of plus/minus grading and so we need to form that committee. Charles Cappell who is our Chair of Academic Affairs will be on that group along with Steve Martin. Charles and Steve really did the bulk of the work on putting together that report on plus/minus grading.

The Graduate Council was much more favorable toward the plus/minus grading so it’s very likely that the Graduate Council will approve the plus minus system and we will have that at least for graduate students while we continue to work on the plus/minus grading for undergraduates.

Consistent with what I was talking about before in terms of representing the departments, you should continue to poll your departments. We don’t want to misrepresent the wishes of the faculty. If the faculty as a whole is not in favor of plus/minus grading, we do not want to keep pushing for it. We can do a re-vote, if necessary. We want to accurately represent the will of the faculty.
Last year we got a report on the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Workload. David Wade was our representative to that committee. David came back to us at the end of last year and was concerned that the process had stalled. I spoke to Ray Alden and asked him if he would give me a comment for the Faculty Senate and I will read you his comment.

He says that “I believe that we are close with the main policy document but I have asked a small sub-committee to come up with an appendix with more quantitative default guidelines so that each college can react and make recommendations for appropriate changes to suit their particular disciplinary needs. I hope that we can have the entire document completed and vetted by the ad hoc committee within the next month or so. From that point on, I will begin circulating it for comments”. So I expect it will come to the Faculty Senate for our comments as well.

The University Advisory Committee consists of the presidents of the three councils, that would be myself, Todd Latham and Andy Small, who is replacing Jay Montero as President of the Operating Staff Council. We also have three faculty representatives on that committee. Currently those are Rosita Lopez who’s on the University Council, Greg Waas who’s the Chair of the Department of Psychology and Kerry Freedman who is in Visual and Performing Arts and she’s been a very vocal spokesperson for the faculty. The Constitution says that the UAC is supposed to meet regularly with the President who is supposed to serve as the intermediary between the UAC and the Board of Trustees. That has not happened and the UAC, in the past, has functioned primarily as reporters on what goes on at the meetings of the Board of Trustees and the Board of Trustees subcommittees.

I spoke to the President and he has agreed to meet with the UAC on a regular basis before Board of Trustees meetings so that the Board of Trustees could ask our input and counsel on issues coming before the board and we could funnel those through the President to the Board of Trustees. We are trying very hard to make the UAC function the way the UAC is intended to function.

Starting today, I have invited the Student Association to make a report to us every month. This evolved out of some meetings that I had with Austin Quick and the Student Association staff and President Echols. I don’t know how many faculty members are aware of the Student Association. I think this debate about plus/minus grading brings into focus the lack of communication between the Faculty Senate the Student Association. We are trying this on an experimental basis.

Finally, for the last two years, I have been working to get the School of Art to display faculty works in the University Council office. I thought that this would be an appropriate way to decorate the University Council office. The School of Art has now sent us a number of works by faculty artists and they are hanging in the University Council office. I would encourage you to stop by the office and take a look at the artwork from our faculty and say hello and see the office.

I should also, again, introduce Pat Erickson who is our administrative assistant both to the Faculty Senate and to the University Council. Pat is the one who is communicating with you and sending stuff out to you. If you have any problems or issues, Pat is a good person to contact.
I also want to introduce Ferald Bryan who is our Parliamentarian and has been a UAC representative. His term ended last spring and he’s going to be giving us one of the reports from one of the subcommittees.

And, of course, we also have Tim Griffin up here. Tim is the Ombudsman. He is here to address issues for faculty, staff and students and so if you need confidential advice and counsel, Tim is a good person to go to.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is this item for Faculty Senate consideration which is the approval of the Vice President and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. I have asked George Slotsve to be Vice President. He was Vice President last year and he has agreed to do it. And I’ve asked Wayne Finley from the Library to be our secretary. The function of the Secretary of the Faculty Senate is to take notes when we go into executive session during the last meeting of the year. I’ll make the motion since it’s my selection. I move that we approve George Slotsve as Vice President and Wayne Finley as Secretary of the Senate.

D. Valentiner: was second.

The motion passed without dissent or abstention.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Faculty Senate Standing Committees for 2011-2012 – Pages 4-7

J. Novak made the motion to approve the consent agenda, S. Willis was second.

The Consent Agenda as passed without dissent or abstention.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – Pages 8-14

E. Hansen: The reports from the three meetings that have taken place since the last time I gave a report are in the minutes. If you have any questions about them, please feel free to contact me. A number of the topics that have been discussed here have been discussed by the Faculty Advisory Council. In addition, I received correspondence related to the article in The Chronicle of Higher Education about the University of Texas and its adoption of the published performance data on the professors on their campus. If anybody wants that link, contact me and I’ll send it to you. In following up on that, one of the notes I just received from one of the officers of the Faculty Advisory Council is that they are pushing the almanac issue from The Chronicle of Higher Education with the data that it has in it. I can send you information on that too. Some of the data that’s interesting is that financing in Illinois was down by four percent during the 2010-2011
school year. The projected number of high school graduates in Illinois will be down by five percent in the next ten years and compared to states like Arizona, Nevada, Florida, Texas, Georgia – those states are going to grow 20 to 40 percent in high school graduates – that will have an effect. Illinois is one of 16 states where the percentage of adults with Bachelors degree or higher is over 30 percent.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Clearly the IBHE is a very significant player in things that are very important to us. I was surprised that the IBHE simply could have said no three percent raise and it goes away. Furthermore, they’re clearly involved in this performance-based funding thing. So the IBHE is an important organization.

**E. Hansen:** It’s the major player.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, one of the things I would like to be able to do or like the Senate to be able to do is to have a heads-up on what’s coming up at the IBHE meetings so that we can send input through you to the IBHE.

**E. Hansen:** Certain community colleges are trying to become four year institutions and they want to eat out of two different troughs. They want to get into the state funding of higher education, yet they still want to be funded from their local tax base. So there are issues like that that are on the horizon and when I have something of substance where I can come back and give you something that’s actually happening or going to occur other than just a heads up, I’ll be glad to do that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** As you all know, we have a Faculty Senate Blackboard community. Those of you who are new to the Senate may not be aware of this, but if you open your blackboard, you will find that there should be a Faculty Senate link. I have been posting many things on this. I don’t know how many of you check it, how often, but this is a very good way for us to communicate since we only meet once a month. So if Earl sends us questions for the IBHE for the FAC for the IBHE meeting, I can post those on Blackboard, you can give feedback, we have discussion threads on Blackboard and we can actually get information to Earl for the meeting. I would encourage you to please go to the Faculty Senate blackboard site, check it from time to time. Every time I post something new I send out an e-mail notice that something has been posted on the website.

**F. Bryan:** Most of this is well-known information so I will make this very brief. It is the May 12th meeting and this committee in May approves the tenure and promotion with tenure name and those were all approved. The biggest discussion was about the reorganization the College of Education, and I was very careful to check with the Dean’s office and her report, her PowerPoint, about the intent of the reorganization. So please read that very carefully. There was also considerable discussion from the Board about the change from an Ed.D. in Educational Psychology to a Ph.D., and the Board showed its willingness to ask hard questions and, in fact,
while they approved it, they did want their questions answered by the time of the full board meeting in June. So those were the two major items.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We also have Andy’s walk-in report on the August 25th meeting which you can read.


**A. Rosenbaum:** Next we have the BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee reports. You have in the packet Greg Waas’s report on the May 12th meeting and you have my report from the August 25th meeting. They are both walk-ins. I’m not going to give you that report because the same stuff that is in that report then goes to the full board. At these sub-committee meetings, the sub-committee recommends approval but they have to go to the full board for actual approval. The BOT sub-committee reports are almost identical to the BOT meeting itself and so we’ll skip those for the moment, but you can read them at your leisure.

**D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Pages 17-18**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Todd Latham is going to give us the report from May 12th and we do not yet have an August 25th report.

**T. Latham:** The report before you was the last voting meeting of the Board of Trustees from May 12th.

Item 7.a. was approved to bring NIU policies in regulation and compliance with Public Act 961513 also known as civil unions.

Item 7.c regarding the General Assembly report, much of the focus was on pensions. That’s very much an area for which you should be concerned especially going into the October 25th veto session. I don’t think that this has gone away. Please note that there has been a 50 percent increase in retirement applications as reported by Dr. Cunningham.

For those of you that are not aware of required time reporting, I put the link in there. That’s a scenario where salaried individuals like myself have to report how we utilize our time and how much time we worked in a typical work day.

The last item was regarding the new Blackboard mobile application which many of you have now used and been familiar with in your classes. We received a demonstration of that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Just to emphasize one thing that Todd said, there are changes that are already in the works. Many of you know that they have changed the money purchase figures that they are using to calculate retirement benefits. Those will go into effect July 2nd, so if you retire before July 2nd and some of you can do that and others of you can’t, you will be much better off than if you retire after July 2nd. There is a concern at the university that there will be a large number of
retirements coming through which the concern is that this will cut a lot of the senior faculty and a lot of the expertise from the faculty.

We will try and post this material on the Blackboard community when we become aware of it but you should also not just erase anything that’s coming from Steve Cunningham’s office. Steve is our liaison with respect to retirement issues and, when he sends something out about retirement, it is up to date.

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – walk-in

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t think we have any actual reports but I did want to introduce the committee chairs and so I’ll name them and ask them to stand up. And, if you are on one of their committees, you might want to get together with them after this meeting to talk about what would be a good meeting time for your committee.

Each of the chairs was introduced.

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

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

C. Economic Status of the Profession – Michael Kolb, Chair – no report

D. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum, Liaison-Spokesperson – no report

A. Rosenbaum: David Goldblum is our liaison and spokesperson. Laurie Elish-Piper is also here; Laurie is the University Council Chair and therefore the chair of this committee. This committee, by the way, is continuing to be active in trying to have some input into the budgetary process here at NIU.

F. Student Association – Elliott Echols, President, and Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 19-20

A. Rosenbaum: I would like to introduce Austin Quick who is the Speaker for the Student Association Senate. Elliot Echols is the President and he is not here, but Austin will be presenting a report on the Student Association.

A. Quick: Thank you. I just want to say thank you. It’s a great honor to come before you. I see a lot of you obviously at University Council, but it’s great to actually be here and not see what you talk about tomorrow in the paper. So I can actually see it for myself all the business that you are doing today. First off, let me just tell you about what we do.
The Student Association is really trying to improve our image around the campus both with students and also with faculty. I did meet with Alan and Patricia this summer. We discussed how to work together better. We’re going to give more reports on what we’re doing so again you’re not just reading what the Northern Star writes.

I will talk about briefly about the plus/minus system. When we heard about it last year, we decided to do a poll with students. We held raffles and all kinds of things to get students to come out and actually vote on this issue. When we did the polls and I’ll get you the numbers, it was overwhelming, most students said no. The one group of students demographically, if I remember right, was that were in support of the plus/minus system were those in the honors program. But your typical, average student, which I am, voted it down.

We met this summer with four different congressmen from the area, both our congressmen from this district and the surrounding districts. We’ve met with Bob Pritchard, multiple-state senators and other state representatives, and it keeps coming up with us is we definitely see that there needs to be an improvement with the type of students that we are putting out, the education level.

Funny story, I just recommended a guy for an internship with a congressional office and they got back to me and said, “did you really just send that writing sample?” And I read it and he said, “this was atrocious,” and I talked to the student and he said, “I got an A on that paper.” So these are the types of things that we definitely would like to work on, but the issue that we have and this is just one of the things that I will talk more in the future, is specifically in my college, I’ll speak just from my experience in my college in Liberal Arts and Science. We have a lot of classes in the 300- and 400-level in the undergraduate system that are taught by GAs. There is no permanent faculty involved whatsoever, and that is a problem. I’ll be honest, we’d like to hear from you, you are experts in your fields, and we’re taught by a student who just took the class the semester before and now they’re teaching us. So if we are going to hold people to these higher standards, which the plus/minus systems does, we need to make sure we’re giving them the quality education. Again, I’m only speaking from my colleges’ experience. I’m a political science major and most of my classes have been taught by GAs. The other concern was it seemed, and I’m speaking from memory, that different colleges had the choice whether or not they were going to do the plus/minus if it passed.

**A. Rosenbaum:** No. Faculty had a choice because it’s an academic freedom issue; faculty can give whatever grade they want.

**A. Quick:** So I guess there just needs to be more information to us. I’m going to give you my e-mail address so if there anything that you would like from us, please contact us, we definitely want to have open dialog. My e-mail address is aquick@niu. Anything we can do if you’d like to discuss anything with us on the student level that we can bring to the student level, we definitely would like to hear from you. But again, I thank you for allowing us the opportunity. Anything we can do to help and make this place the best institution both for you because you’ll be here long after we are and make this the best place we can for future students, I would love to help and I know President Echols is very much in support as well. Thank you.
A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know Austin, that writing sample that got an A probably would have gotten an A- if we had plus/minus grading. It wouldn’t have been as embarrassing.

G. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

A. Rosenbaum: Next, we have elections, but before we do that, I just wanted to tell you a little bit about what these elections are about. I don’t know how many of you are familiar with the different grievance procedures and hearing panels and all of that, but I think you should at least know what it is that you are voting for. So the first item that G.1. Those are hearing panel members and they are specifically designated for two types of hearings. If the University tries to dismiss a tenured faculty member, they are entitled to a due process hearing and those people that we’re electing in that item G.1. are the group that those panels will be drawn from if there is such a dismissal. It also applies to non-tenured faculty members who are let go before the end of their contract. And the last thing that this particular hearing panel does, are hearings or grievances that involve academic freedom. Due process hearings are described in Bylaws, Article 7.3. The academic freedom grievances are described in Bylaws, Article 10. The first election is for the 20 faculty members that will comprise this panel. These 20 faculty members are drawn from the University faculty at large. Every summer we get a list of all the faculty that are eligible in this category, they are numbered. We then go to a random number generating website and we get 34 numbers which we then match up to faculty members and that’s where this list comes from. So this is a random selection from the faculty at large and you will be voting for 20 from this list of 34.

The second one is the by-lot election of Faculty Grievance Committee members. These are grievances that involve anything other than academic freedom filed by a faculty member If you want to look at the grounds that are covered under this particular category, they are in Bylaws, Article 11. When these grievances are filed, sometimes it is a grievance between a faculty member and an administrator, in other words, SPS. When that happens, there is a committee of five that will include faculty members and also representatives from SPS. So it might be three faculty and two representatives of SPS. Each of the councils will identify a list of 15 and that is what we use in comprising the committees to hear the grievances. So if you grieve against someone who is not a faculty member, that committee will have to have members from either operating staff or SPS. So we have 15 from each of the councils and what we are going to be doing is drawing by lot those members from the Faculty Senate.

Last, under G.3., we have the election of University Council alternates. When a faculty member of the University Council is unable to attend the meeting, they are not allowed to send a proxy. They must notify our office, we go to the list of alternates, and get an alternate to stand in for them. If someone is out for the semester because of illness or pregnancy or some sabbatical or whatever, we appoint an alternate from that list. This is done by college. The rules are that the alternates shall be elected by and from the respective faculty on the Faculty Senate.

T. Arado: If you haven’t already found it yet, the Hearing Panel election ballot is already at your table with the papers and you just need to select twenty people listed on this list and then leave
the form at your table and it will be collected afterwards. This is only for voting members of the Senate to fill out.

2. By-lot election of Faculty Grievance Committee members

**T. Arado:** Fifteen names were drawn by lot they are: Debra Zahay-Blatz, Marketing; Vicki Collins, Educational Technology; Richard Greene, Geography; George Slotsve; Kryssi Staikidis, Art; Melissa Lenczewski; Lynette Chandler; Rosita Lopez; Ibrahim Onyuksel; Charlotte Rollman; Eric Mogren; Gary Chen; Gretchen Blisplinghoff; Carl Von Ende; William Pitney.

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

4. Nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee for a one-year term. Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies will choose one member from the two nominations to serve on this committee for one year.

**T. Arado:** Alan can you say more about what they do?

**A. Rosenbaum:** read the description from the Committees of the University book.

**A. Rosenbaum:** The current person that’s in the position is Joel Jefferies. So if anyone wants to know how big a chore this is, Joel would be somebody you could ask.

**B. Pitney and R. Lopez:** volunteered.

**A. Rosenbaum:** By the way, Therese is from the College of Law, so I thought it was good that we had a College of Law person as Chair of Elections and Legislative Oversight. We are also going to try and get the legislative oversight part this year. This is something in recent years we have not done and so Therese’s committee will try to give us updates on legislation that is of import to us on a monthly basis.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**A. Rosenbaum:** I have one more thing before we adjourn and that is we’ve been asked by the Provost’s office to appoint a representative to the Board of Trustees Professorship Selection Committee. We need a Faculty Senate representative. This does not have to be a tenured faculty member nor does it have to be a full professor. We just have to designate somebody so it doesn’t even have to be a Faculty Senate member. This committee meets once in December and once again in either January or February.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Meeting schedule, 2011-2012 – Page 21
B. Annual Report, Affirmative Action & Diversity Resources Advisory Committee
C. Annual Report, Academic Planning Council
D. Annual Report, Campus Security & Environmental Quality Committee
E. Annual Report, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
F. Annual Report, Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor
G. Annual Report, Graduate Council
H. Annual Report, Office of the Ombudsman
I. Annual Report, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
J. Annual Report, University Assessment Panel
K. Annual Report, University Council Personnel Committee
L. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
M. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
N. Minutes, Athletic Board
O. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
P. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
Q. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
R. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
S. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
T. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
U. Minutes, General Education Committee
V. Minutes, Honors Committee
W. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
X. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
Y. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
Z. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
AA. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: We have no unfinished business, we have no new business. Any comments or questions from the floor? Seeing none I will I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

S. Willis: So moved. D. Valentiner: Second

Meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.