

FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, Feb. 18, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Arriola, Azad, Briscoe, Bujarski, Chakraborty, Chung, Conderman, Demir, Feurer, Fredericks, Hathaway, Hou, Hung (for Schwartz-Bechet), Hunt, Irwin, Konen, Koren, Lenczewski, G. Long, Macdonald, Mackie, Manning, Markowitz, Martin, McHone-Chase, Millis, Montana, Moraga, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Pitney, Rush, Ryan, Ryu, Sagarin, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Stoddard, Than, Un, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Baker, Bateni, Brubaker, Campbell, Cefaratti, Chen, Chmaissem, Deng, Giese, Hedin, Henning, Jaffee, Khoury, Lee, Mogren, Mohabbat, Plonczynski, Riley, Schwartz-Bechet, Shin, Tonks

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Doederlein, Haliczzer, Klaper, D. Long, Ruxton, Stafstrom, Streb, Tucker

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Gebo, Falkoff, Monteiro, Shortridge, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

W. Pitney: Welcome on this nice sunny, warm, day. We've got a pretty good sized group this time. So thank you for being here and representing your departments. I'd like to call us to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

W. Pitney: I would accept a motion to adopt our agenda.

R. Siegesmund: So moved.

W. Pitney: Thank you Richard.

G. Slotsve: Second.

W. Pitney: And George Slotsve second. I think the only revision we need to make to the current agenda is that we will not have a Resource, Space and Budget report. That report is not available and so we'll strike that from the agenda. Any other changes? Hearing none, all in favor of adopting the agenda with that edit signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 21, 2015 FS MEETING

W. Pitney: I'll accept a motion to approve the minutes from our January 21 meeting. May I have a motion for that please? Richard, thank you. Second? Thank you from the floor. So we have a motion and a second. Any edits, modifications, any suggested changes to the minutes? Seeing none all in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Minutes are passed.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Recognizing and Assisting Students in Crisis – presentation
Melanie Tucker, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Brooke Ruxton, Executive Director, Counseling & Student Development Center

W. Pitney: It is my pleasure to introduce to you Melanie Tucker and Brooke Ruxton. Melanie is the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Brooke is the Executive Director of Counseling and Student Development here on campus. We've asked them to come and speak to faculty about recognizing and assisting students in crisis. This was a suggestion brought forth to the Executive Committee last semester and so thank you very much for being responsive and willing to come in and present today. So I'm going to turn the floor over to you. After the presentation, we'll have a chance for any questions and answers. Thank you.

M. Tucker: Thank you for that introduction. Today we have a short agenda for you. We really want to allow time for questions. So we've pulled together a bit of information for you but really to set the foundation for us to be able to respond to questions you might have and we'll see if they can get to the next slide. I think the presentation was sent to you. I'm not sure how many of you have that in front of you but what we wanted to cover today was just a little bit about faculty and staff as helpers; warning signs for students in crisis; responding to concerning behavior that you might see demonstrated; go over some of our administrative procedures on campus; and then talk a little bit about referrals that you might want to be familiar with on campus.

One of the reasons that we believe we were asked to come and give this information to you today is in relation to the psychological climate that's in higher education not just at NIU but really this is across the country. There are a growing number of students that are seeking post-secondary education with an increased number of mental health diagnoses. And we share that because we want to make sure that we're here to be helpful with you all in navigating what this looks like as campus cultures, campus climate, and trying to create an environment in which this is accessible for our students. So Brooke's going to talk to you some about warning signs, some boundary setting, those sorts of things and then we'll come back to how we navigate that specifically at NIU.

B. Ruxton: Okay, so I wanted to start by highlighting this statistic which comes directly from the data that we collect from students who use our services at the Counseling and Student Development Center. And really we just wanted to use that to signify the direct connection that there is between academic performance and mental health concerns. And we see this across our data, we see this in national trends and data, that students who are presenting with mental health concerns, depression, anxiety, relationship problems, those problems are really highly correlated to a level of academic distress.

So students are coming into classrooms on campus and those mental health concerns are really impacting their ability to perform successfully. That means that often faculty and staff are put into the roles of helper whether that's something that they're comfortable with or not, it becomes a role that faculty and staff pursue. For students, there is not a separation between academic life and personal life. It's all their life. And so when they are in your classrooms and they're dealing with personal issues or mental health issues, those are likely to come out in the classroom in some form or another. And often then likely to set the stage for faculty and staff to serve as helpers and develop relationships with students.

We want faculty and staff to develop relationships with students. Research shows that feeling connected to the institutions and feeling connected to faculty and staff impacts retention. So this is something that we want but it's something that people feel comfortable with I think at very differing levels across campus. Some kind of general guideline for faculty and staff to think about in terms of being in that role at times of being a mentor, advisor, caretaker with students is really to be aware of sort of what the boundaries are. When we're saying that we want students to come to you and bring issues to you, we're not suggesting that faculty and staff should be counselors or be trained as counselors. So being really mindful of kind of what your own triggers and reactions to students are, being mindful of how to set appropriate boundaries whether that be in large scale classroom discussions or setting up the syllabus or whether that be more on one-on-one settings, how you're managing what may be students bringing personal concerns to you.

That piece of knowing your triggers also can be really helpful in terms of then how you respond to a student. Understanding if you are particularly impacted by students who might be depressed or students who might be angry or understanding that, if something kind of feels different with an interaction with a student just internally for you, that might be a time when it's really most appropriate to consult either with colleagues within your department or with staff at the Counseling and Student Development Center. So really kind of being aware of those signs with students. When you're used to working with students on a day-to-day basis, if something feels different, then it likely is different. And so it's a sign to think about how you're going to interact differently with that particular student or that particular group.

A little bit ago, Melanie mentioned the psychological climate in higher education right now. A little bit more specific, specifically about what does that mean, what are we seeing in college students? We know both nationally and at NIU that students are presenting with a much higher level of mental health concerns and history of contact with mental health providers before they come to campus. Some national surveys will report that about 30 percent of students, all students so not just students who seek counseling at the counseling center, about 30 percent of all students nationally report feeling so overwhelmed or sad that it was difficult to function at some point

within the last 12 months. About 30 percent also report overwhelming anxiety within the last 12 months. So again, if we at the counseling center are seeing a really small portion of students on campus, everyone else on campus is serving in that caretaker role with students who are feeling them.

There's a lot of conversation within the mental health world and universities about why is it that students are coming to campus with increasing mental health concerns. Some of those things are positive. Some of those things we think are just a reflection of a society that's more accepting of help seeking and more understanding of mental health issues so students are able to access higher education in a way that they may not have been in the past.

But we also know that students as the demographic populations of our student bodies are changing, students are also coming to campuses with a lot more pressures, a lot more stress, financial stress, family stress. And trying to juggle all of that with their academic demands really has an impact on the way that they're presenting from a mental health perspective.

I also wanted to highlight the increasing numbers of students who are coming to campus with a history of trauma. Again at the Counseling Center, our data suggests that about 30 percent of our clients have some type of history of trauma. That might be a history of childhood abuse. That might be a history of sexual assault or dating violence. Often for our students at NIU that's a history of witnessing violence either in their home or outside of their home. Trauma in particular can have some pretty big impacts in the classroom. Students who have a history of trauma might be more easily startled or more easily impacted by things in the environment around them. They might be inclined to sit by the door in the back of the classroom because of that history and wanting an escape route. So sometimes those behaviors can look unusual in a classroom setting, but are really those students' ways of coping.

I refer to then also on that slide just a resource that's available on the Counseling and Student Development Center website so it goes a little more specifically. I'm giving you, I'm aware, a pretty broad overview of some of the mental health issues. This resource on our website kind of gives some of the specific things that you may see in class. We also just want to note that, in addition to that, we have some other resources about talking with students, about having some difficult conversations with students. And at any time, if there's a student that you have a concern about, our counselors are available to consult about how to respond or what to do in a particular situation. You can reach us by calling the Counseling and Student Development Center, asking to speak to an available counselor. We're also available in the evening. We have a counselor on call 24 hours a day so, should a crisis come up in the evening, you are more than welcome to contact the non-emergency public safety number and ask to speak to the counselor on call and we'll be able to talk you through something. I should note that by crisis I do not mean a safety crisis. If a safety crisis comes up, call the emergency number of the NIU police department and they'll be able to help you with that situation.

This is another resource from our website and kind of gives some of that quick guidance of where to go with sort of what level of distress. You can think of these levels of distress as sort of an inverted pyramid. So most students don't even fall on this chart, but the majority of students who are in distress are going to fall in that Level 1: Mild Distress category. These are students

who might be a little bit depressed; you might notice in class some differences in their appearance; they may say that they're not sleeping well; but they're not particularly disruptive in class. Up to a Level 3 or High Distress student who is clearly in crisis, who is at a risk of harming themselves or harming someone else. And again, there's more detailed information about that on our website. Again, some of these are things that I've mentioned, but I think it's important to be aware that mental health issues broadly can come up in a lot of different ways in class. Often times that can come up by over disclosure in classroom discussions; students sharing stories in a way that might make other people feel uncomfortable. That can come up as hostility in the classroom, anger, irritability, difficulties concentrating. That can come up in the way that students send messages. So in their written materials in class or messages that they post on Blackboard. Things that again seem kind of concerning, disturbing, seem a little bit unusual might be signs that this is a student who's really at some level of crisis.

So what do we want you to do other than call us and consult? Just some kind of general guidelines for thinking about how to have what can be a difficult conversation with a student particularly if that's not something you're used to doing. Being aware of the time and place to set up a meeting with a student, to express concerns with them. Being aware of a student's privacy, so as much as you're able to, not calling a student out in class or expressing that concern in class. At times, obviously, you're going to have to deal with a behavior or an incident that happens in the classroom in terms of classroom management. But, if there are times that you can avoid that and ask to speak with a student privately, that can be most helpful. Being aware that regardless of a potential mental health history, it is more than appropriate to address a student's behavior in the classroom. We talk about separating their behavior from what may be the cause of the behavior. So even if a student has a huge history of mental health concerns or a lot of things that are going on in their life, that's a separate thing than how are they behaving in your classroom. And if they're behaving in a way that's disruptive, that behavior is something that can still be managed and addressed very directly with students. Also being aware if there's a situation that might be potentially threatening. Being aware of your own sense of safety. So we talked to folks on campus about, if you're going to meet with a student that you have some concern about, make sure that your neighbors know that you're having that meeting. Make sure that you're sitting so that you're closer to the door or a way to get out if you need to. If you want somebody else to be present, ask someone to come in with you. There may be times even when it's appropriate to inform the police and have the police be sort of aware or be nearby when you're going to have a conversation that you know is likely to be difficult with a student. And again some resources that you can contact. And now it's your turn.

M. Tucker: So, Brooke had covered for you some things that you might want to do proactively to help set up your classroom environment so that you feel like you're empowered to do some things if behavior starts to be demonstrated in your classroom. But what do you do when it gets beyond that if you're not maybe able to contain the behavior in the classroom or you feel like it's time for somebody else to intervene? So we wanted to cover some of those options for you today as well so you know what's available for you outside of the classroom as well.

On the next slide: Sometimes we find that folks are now aware of what's publicized out there and so we're called sometimes to be asked what can we do. So I wanted just to share, if you are not familiar, in the undergraduate catalog it does talk about faculty's ability to address behavior

in the classroom. And, obviously, I will not read that to you. But I also wanted to share from the Student Code of Conduct how we construe disruptive behavior and this doesn't mean that this is all encompassing but it gives you a nice definition of how we might be looking at aspects of disruptive behavior that we could respond to from a violation of the student code process. So that's in the presentation materials for you.

The next thing that I wanted to share with you is the existence of ways called a Student Threat Assessment Team on campus. We also have an Employee Threat Assessment Team. There is state law in place that requires that each institution of higher education have a threat assessment team and Northern has made the choice to break that into two entities: one that looks at students and one that looks at employees. I have the opportunity to chair that Threat Assessment Team and so I meet with a good group of folks. We are scheduled to meet every week and I share that to say we don't have threatening behavior that we're reviewing every week, but I share that to say we are a group that works on an on-going regular basis. We're a very thorough well-run machine I would say in that so if we have a situation in which we need to respond to threatening behavior, we are well prepared to do so. That team has been in existence since 2009 and we follow a very specific threat assessment model that speaks to what kinds of behaviors we might be looking at and how we might respond to those. We have a threat matrix that we use. However, we find that most of our students don't rise to a level of a threat. And so about a year ago we started to speak to what we call concerning behaviors.

And so we took the Threat Assessment Team and the next slide will show you that we have also turned that team into a group that we call the Student of Concern Committee. We found that research out there was really speaking to the fact that, when institutions are able to intervene with students earlier rather than later, they're more likely to be able to intervene at a time in which they can contain the behavior, reduce the behavior, as well as keep a student in a place in which they can be successful at the institution. Internally, we piloted this Student of Concern Committee with the same members of the Student Threat Assessment Team really to see how did that function for us and then this past fall we made that more public. We came to some of your college meetings, we presented to the Council of Deans. We shared the availability of this team and I am happy to share that folks have been taking advantage of this resource. There is a report form that's available on a website called the Community of Care website. It's also available on our student conduct website in which you can go and report behaviors that are concerning to you. What that allows us to do is get that information and, with this team, identify where is the student connected, how might we best be intrusive with the student and try to contain the behavior before it escalates to a point in which we might need to remove the student from the institution. The link for that form is in your materials as well. The threat assessment is kind of one end of the extreme and the Student of Concern Committee is somewhere in the middle.

Another option that you have is to use our student conduct process which includes that Student Code of Conduct. If you have students that are demonstrating aggressive behavior, concerning behavior, disruptive behavior in the classroom, we highly encourage you to use our conduct system. What we find is that it isn't a lot of students that are demonstrating disruptive and aggressive behavior, it's a handful of students. But they might be doing that in multiple places and it is a little bit more challenging for those of us that are asked to follow-up and intervene when we maybe have heard about them offhand but we don't necessarily have the specifics.

I work in the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs Enrollment Management and we are a resource to many folks. So we get called on a regular basis, but sometimes people will call us and say I don't what to tell you the student's name, I just want to tell you about a situation. And then they might call the Counseling and Student Development Center, then they might call the Disability Resource Center, and then it might be a student who is living in a residence hall and we're trying to piece together who the students are. And so it's very helpful to us when you share your concerns and include the person's name so that we can do some proactive outreach and try to get students connected to resources that can help them be successful.

One way we have an ability to do that is through our student conduct process. So when a student violates our student code, which includes behavior in the classroom, then we're able to put some sanctions in place, we're able to speak to them. If they don't come in and speak to us we're able to do some other sanctions. It's not meant to be punitive, it's meant to be educational and help students get connected to the resources again that can help them be a successful Huskie here at NIU.

One of our last resorts when we've tried nearly every other thing to try to intervene when a student is demonstrating rather aggressive, disruptive concerning, threatening behavior, is: There is the existence of our involuntary withdrawal. And that is a process that, although any of the three assistant vice presidents in our division can implement this policy, I am typically the person that does that on behalf of the vice president. And again this is not something that we jump to immediately because we're removing the student from the institution until which time they can demonstrate to me that they are no longer a threat to themselves or others and no longer a threat to our campus community. So I share that because we don't jump immediately to doing this and because a student is disruptive one place, doesn't necessarily mean that we will find them a threat to the campus community. I wanted you to know that this exists because it is one of the tools that we have in hand when a situation has escalated to the point of us finding someone that is an imminent threat, this is the process that we would use.

This then requires the student to submit to us documentation and verification from an appropriate medical provider that they are no longer a threat to the community. What usually happens when a student is involuntarily withdrawn is they find it within themselves to realize that they're probably not meant to be at school at that point in time. I would say nine times out of ten, when I withdraw a student, they don't come back that semester. They make some other choices. They usually get the assistance they need and often, when they do come back, which is kind of 50/50 if they choose to come back, for those students who have come back and met with me and provided documentation to come back, it's quite amazing and phenomenal to see the difference in them that the help that was needed was able to get them the help that they require to be able to be a successful student.

So I really wanted to give you those overviews to help us move forward as a community about how we might proactively help our students be successful and address those concerning behaviors on a more proactive basis. We included some contact information for you in case it will be helpful to you. There are some links there to the community care website, areas that may be able to provide additional resources for you. Many of you should have received the faculty

and staff guide for assisting emotionally troubled students. That's something if you've been on campus for a while, that typically goes out in hard copy every fall semester. It is not also available online electronically. We realize that not every faculty member is on campus all the time teaching and we wanted to make sure you could access those resources 24/7. With that Brooke and I are very happy to take any questions that you might have.

W. Pitney: Any questions? I've got one. Could you comment on the Threat Assessment Team? You mentioned the threat assessment matrix. What types of things does that team look at when alerted to a crisis?

M. Tucker: I happen to travel with my matrix because I never know when I will need it. So I can quote you some things from there. When our Threat Assessment Team was pulled together in 2009 quite honestly Illinois was one of the first states to follow such a process and it was unfortunately tied to our tragedy of 2/14. And so we were grant funded along with Virginia Tech to create some of the original threat assessment lexicon that's out there now because of the situation that we were in. So really the matrix that we use, that we're looking at, is based on the Delworth model of looking at different aspects of what might be out there. So we are looking to determine is the behavior disruptive? Is it distressing? There's different categorizations and definitions of behavior so we're looking to see what category might it fall in. We're looking at things like the level of risk. So has the student, for example, voiced a plan or have they implied a plan? Or have they said I have a gun and it's in my pocket and I'm walking to my car? So we're looking at: How detailed is the plan? What does it include? Do they have a history of other incidents? Part of our team is made up of campus police and we're looking: Do they have access to a weapon, for example? Do they have a history of harming themselves or others? Those are some of the pieces that we're looking at and then also management strategies.

So as Brooke had said earlier on in the presentation, there are some behaviors that can be responded to pretty quickly maybe with somebody having a conversation. And so that would be a lower level of a threat than say if the determination was made that we needed to call 911 or we needed somebody arrested or that sort of thing. So we have a category of levels. We're looking from one to five and that helps us identify as a team how often we might revisit the situation.

I would ask you then to be mindful and thoughtful about how you talk about the team. So a lot of research out there talks about the fact that you don't necessarily want to publicize greatly the existence of a Threat Assessment Team because that might imply an oversensitivity or a hypersensitivity to the existence of threats. And I would say that it's important particularly with our campus history that we not necessarily have lots of conversations with students about the fact that there's a Student Threat Assessment Team. I wanted you all to know that it exists because it is a state law that talks about that, but it's really one of the reasons that we moved forward with creating a Student of Concern Committee. That felt a little more inviting to us and hopefully a little more inviting to you to be able to have a way to talk to someone and frame your concerns. Because often what we are getting contacted about really is behavior that's concerning, not threatening. The majority of students that we have the opportunity as a team to look at, don't fall high on our threat assessment level. And it's one of the reasons that I wanted to bring another iteration of the group into play because the majority of students that we do get contacted about are not students that we involuntarily withdraw. They are not students that we would find a

threat. They are students that are demonstrating behavior in which we find concerning and people are concerned about and we wanted to identify ways in which we could intervene. Is that helpful?

W. Pitney: Any other questions? I have one more if you don't mind. I think most of the issues or concerns that faculty face, might be a disruptive student in class and it's something we can address with the student after class with a private conversation. In instances, however, when there are some outbursts and it doesn't stop and it's really interfering with the current class and the end of the class isn't anywhere close to being done, what advice would you give to a faculty member in those sorts of instances?

M. Tucker: My advice is really to back from that conduct perspective. As a faculty member, you have the right to remove the student from your class for that period of time. You don't, based on your policy in the undergraduate manual, you don't immediately have the right to remove the student forever, but you do in that moment for that day. And I would say that some of the information that Brooke shared with you about setting up your classroom environment. Set those expectations early on. I don't know necessarily if you need to say on the first day of class if you act like a jerk I'm going to kick you out of class. I don't know that you need to do that. You could, but I think it's the piece of setting those expectations as a group about behavior in the class and what's acceptable or not and then in that moment I think you have the right to remove the student and ask them to leave. If they don't, if they're escalated, if they're aggravated, if they're not leaving, quite honestly the next step may be to call the campus police. They can remove a student. Obviously that's not what we would love to see happen but sometimes that does need to happen.

One of the reasons that I think more and more institutions are looking at this concept of concerning behavior and what that might look like as Brooke had shared with you all, is there are a growing number of students not just with what we would consider mental health diagnosis but we have veterans coming back that may have PTSD. We have students who are a victim of traumatization in the home life, in their community. We have a growing number of students that have autism spectrum disorders. So we have a growing number of students that are coming that might not behave in ways that we are used to or like. It doesn't necessarily mean that they themselves are threatening, but there's a growing number of students behaving in a wide range of ways. And again this isn't unique to NIU, but it's something in higher ed that lots of people are having conversations about, about how do we create an environment in which we separate, as Brooke had said. We're not really here to look or judge at a diagnosis per se, but the behavior in the classroom and setting those expectations. So if you have been clear about your expectations and a student is not following those, you have the right to remove them. We would strongly encourage you then to follow that student conduct process and report that because it becomes very challenging on the administrative side for anything to happen if there isn't that follow-through piece.

We're happy to do another presentation on the conduct process because I know that sometimes faculty might not be familiar or used to that system. I do want you to know, when you file a report through the conduct office, should the student ask, they have a right to see the report. I share that not so that you don't file a report, but that you're mindful that what you're writing

may be shared with the student and so that you write that in a way that expresses your concern perhaps minimizing personal opinion about it and just speaking to the facts of the behavior and what's occurred.

W. Pitney: Thank you very much and I'm grateful for Student Affairs and Counseling and Student Development. I think it's through your efforts we have these very rare instances. Thank you for sharing this information.

W. Pitney: Okay, some other announcements. You likely received via e-mail from myself and Provost Freeman about some check cards that were distributed to a few folks. I don't believe these were widely distributed, but these were received by some folks and they reached out to query us as to what these were and what this meant. The check cards from a labor union is a way to ascertain the extent to which employees of a certain classification might be interested in forming a union. At least that's the interpretation. In reality, if more than half of individuals sign these and submit them, it would indeed establish a bargaining unit. And so we just sent that memo out just to make folks aware of what it meant if you were to sign the check card and send out. It was not meant to restrict anybody's ability to investigate that or learn more about that process if they were interested.

David Long is here from the Operating Staff Council filling in today for Jay Montero. David I think you had a couple of announcements for us?

D. Long: Jay wanted me to pass along that the Operating Staff Council is continuing to work on various employee morale issues and identify things we're contributing to employee morale and wanted also to pass along that a good way to boost employee morale, especially among operating staff, is nominating folks for the Operating Staff Outstanding Service Award. The deadline for that to submit for nominations is Friday, February 27. Information and forms can be found on the Operating Staff Council website.

W. Pitney: Thank you, David. Our Benefits Committee provided me with a series of questions and I will distribute those questions via an electronic survey to Faculty Senate members, actually all faculty members on campus. It is a survey related to employee morale. We had some small discussions on that topic earlier in the academic year. We still get some queries about this and it's raised as an issue, so we're going to do a survey and then kind of cross check our findings with the SPS Council and the Operating Staff Council and kind of see where the common themes are amongst the three groups.

My last official announcement: Faculty Club lunch, the next one is March 19. March 9 is the deadline to reserve a spot for that. That will be over in Ellington. I don't know what the menu is going to be, but I'm sure it will be great. Feel free to come on by and interact with your colleagues.

J. Novak: What day of the week is that?

W. Pitney: That's a Thursday.

J. Novak: Thank you.

W. Pitney: You're welcome. So, I think there was a state budget address today. I don't know all the ins and outs. I was in a flurry of activities this afternoon. There is some speculation out there in terms of the cuts to higher education. I've got to sift through the transcripts of that and I'm sure that's been recorded somewhere too. I'd like to listen to that. But for a little while today there was speculation about a 30 to 31 percent cut to higher ed. I think it's important to understand that that's likely the first volley in many sets of dialog back and forth about what should be funded what shouldn't be funded, where the cuts should occur. It's likely to be less than that. We'll have to see how that plays out. Yes, George?

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to – about 31 percent that's roughly true. Just to give a dollar figure roughly that would translate to NIU budget of about \$28 million cut to just give you a rough idea. The other thing is that, if you look at the budget, take a look at what might be happening to healthcare costs being passed on to employees. And, too, what might be happening with pensions? I'd recommend people take a close look at this when this could have potentially big implications. Brian will be reporting for the University Benefits Committee, but some of this I know Brian and I will be trying to bring up at the University Benefits Committee later in March, March 5.

W. Pitney: Thank you, George. Any other comments on that or anybody with some other information?

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy [Award](#) – page 4
Faculty Senate will vote on the recipient during the February 18 Faculty Senate Meeting. Recipient will be honored at the March 25 Faculty Senate meeting.

1. Nomination of [George Slotsve](#) – Page 5

W. Pitney: Well, let's move on. Item V. Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. On page 5, you can see a nomination of George Slotsve, speak of the devil just hot off the microphone there. I've nominated George for the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. I think this award was started in 1996. I think initially it was called the Bottom of the Deck Spokesperson Award. It was then the Eternal Vigilance Award. I think it went back to Faculty Spokesperson and then for a while it was discussed whether it should be called the Bob Lane Shared Governance Award. And, in fact, I think that's what my letter calls it for nominating George. At the end of the day I nominated George because of his diligence in keeping abreast of issues that affect faculty, but also staff. I think we've all been at these meetings and have been pleased by George's enthusiasm and willingness to ask questions and say hey don't forget about this or don't forget about that. I've nominated George for this and that's the only nomination we had. George has been nominated. Can I have a second from the floor? M.E., thank you. So we have a nomination, a second. All in favor of awarding this to Dr. George Slotsve, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: That was overwhelming. I think we're all set. George, congratulations and thank you for all your continued efforts. Can you pass the microphone down to Rosemary, please? Thank you.

R. Feurer: Just to clarify there's been discussions about the title before, but I think George deserves this for the original meaning, which is vigilance for faculty. I'm fine with sharing it with his concern for staff because I think we have an obligation as Faculty Senate to be concerned with the well being of SPS and staff as well, but I really think that we need a vigilance award for faculty so I just wanted to clarify that that this has always been meant as an award for somebody who is vigilant for the rights of faculty.

W. Pitney: Absolutely, thank you. Yes, Paul?

P. Stoddard: I would just like to second what Rosemary said. I've always thought of this as the biggest pain in the side of the administration award. It should be the faculty member who does the most to speak up for our rights as faculty and for staff to keep administration types from just running roughshod over us, so I echo what Rosemary says.

W. Pitney: And, Deborah.

D. Haliczzer: I do not have a voice here but I'm going to speak. Thank you Bill. As the past chair of the University Benefits Committee and I have watched George assiduously devotedly expressing the needs of faculty and staff on the benefits area and he's been vocal, articulate and persistent. So Rosemary it really does qualify under the spirit of the award in many categories, so I second this.

W. Pitney: All right, thank you.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – no report

B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – report

W. Pitney: We have no Consent Agenda so we'll move on down to our reports from advisory committees. I think our first report is from Brian Mackie the University Benefits Committee. Brian are you all set?

B. Mackie: Of course not. Can you get back to me in a minute? Or wait a minute either one.

W. Pitney: We are a patient group. You're okay.

C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – no report

- D. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – no report
- E. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – no report
- F. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – no report
- G. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – no report
- H. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – [report](#) – Page 6

W. Pitney: If there's no opposition, I can jump ahead to my ad hoc committee. Would that be okay with you, Brian? Anybody opposed to that? We'll work on the fly here. So as you might recall, the Board of Trustees created two ad hoc committees one of which was the Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee. At this point in time, this is their second meeting here on January 16. Thus far, it's been an information gathering exercise. They heard some reports by Mike Mann on NIU's tuition and fees and Mike walked them through how we compare at NIU to many other schools, other state institutions as well as other MAC schools and also some comparisons to schools where we believe many of our students from Illinois go to: University of Iowa, University of Wisconsin, etc. So they looked at such things as the in-state tuition price, fee pricing histories, also the collective tuition and fee history, kind of the cost of attendance as well as the Illinois higher ed appropriations. Right now they're looking at all the trends, the trended data.

They also learned from Dr. Eric Weldy how NIU distributes its scholarships to students and what those scholarships are based on. So we basically have three classifications of scholarships all related to a formula that calculates GPA and ACT scores. There was a move a year or two ago as it relates to creating more four-year scholarships instead of just having so many two-year scholarships. It was often thought that perhaps that was one of the reasons why we didn't retain students beyond the sophomore year. So again just information gathering at this point in time. It will be interesting to see how this unfold and what the Board of Trustees is going to do with this information and what rises to the level of Board of Trustee policy, etc. So that's my report. Any questions on that? Yes sir.

J. Stephen: If this \$24 million shortfall comes up, that's approximately a \$1,200 increase to make us even per student and I don't know if you really know what tuition's like right now, but my daughter came back for nine hours of graduate courses last semester. It's \$5,100 with fees and insurance. If we have to go up another 20 percent, the question of enrollment and retention is going to become kind of moot because, if you look at students thinking \$14,000 to take my first year of college, I think that's going to be a turnoff right there. I think expenses are the thing we have to worry the most about retention and recruitment.

W. Pitney: Yeah, in my last report from the Board of Trustees they had approved an overall

reduction in the cost of attendance. It was thought that we might price ourselves out of getting some students attracted and, given the state cuts, enrollment is going to be key. We'll have to see how this unfolds. Good thought. Any others?

B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – report

W. Pitney: Brian, are we ready?

B. Mackie: We'll get by. The last University Benefits Committee which was on the 29th, some of these were talked about but one of them, I'm bringing this up only because it was mentioned. There was something regarding release time for employees to travel to SURS Naperville for counseling appointments and the update was there is no release time. Also the smoking cessation that was brought up in our meeting. I know it's been talked about in different places, and I guess one of the things we were mentioning was, as much as we may or may not like smoking or dislike smokers sometimes, it's sort of an almost say a drastic statement when you say basically nobody can smoke anywhere on campus. At least that's the way I'm understanding it. And so one of the arguments we were talking about was the cessation, helping people try to, if that's going to be the case, we need to try to help people with this. And they were talking about trying to do a (inaudible) fair and even talked about trying to get some of the vendors there to mention things that they have available or what we can do on it. Okay, that's in the works because that was left that you were going to take care of that. Thank you. Also it was mentioned about annuitants with e-mail since e-mail is being moved over to Outlook and they're gradually moving over each department. Annuitants became concerned where they're going to be in this realm and so we did verify that at this point they are still going to be on GroupWise. They will probably be in the last phase being moved over. They will be moved over but they're sort of setting up that plan. And then the other question was asked about in particular their e-mail directory and that stated yes they would be able to have that. And then the third one was the library benefit and the statement was: As long the library was allowing that benefit, ITS would take care of it for them. Those were the main things that we come up from.

W. Pitney: Any questions for Brian? Yes sir.

J. Stephen: Who is going to be doing the smoking enforcement? Because I've down at UIUC and that great big community college there has had non-smoking on campus for 10 or 12 years and behind every shrub there is a hill about four feet tall of cigarette butts.

B. Mackie: But you don't see the people smoking though.

J. Stephen: No, you don't, but they are there and you're not going to see the ones smoking, them that are hiding in stairways and leaving piles all over. I don't see that walking up and giving them a card saying here's – it's one of those things that's just going to keep happening.

B. Mackie: Again, I think the statement there is that it's going to happen whatever. It's probably going to decrease. The one that I am happiest with is that you don't have to walk through a column of smoke as you walk out the door but that's an opinion on my part. I was a smoker for 30 years before I quit, 30 years or 25. My math is off. But the argument to it is I still sympathize

with smokers. As much as I dislike smoking it's going to be very, very hard on them and we really need to support them.

J. Stephen: I think that's reasonable.

B. Mackie: George, who's getting this award, also has stopped smoking for almost eight weeks.

J. Stephen: We are still going to see piles of them behind the shrubs, though.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Brian.

- I. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – Deborah Haliczer, Jay Monteiro and William Pitney – reports
[January 15, 2015](#) – Page 7
[February 5, 2015](#) – Page 8

W. Pitney: Our next report is our Governance Ad Hoc Committee report. You can see that on page 7. So the Board of Trustees has been trying to tidy up its own regulations and own operating principles and they've looked at these with the guidance of General Counsel Jerry Blakemore and Deputy Counsel Greg Brady. They have done a first reading of a presidential succession policy, well at least at this meeting, the January 15 meeting. They did a first reading of that policy. The Board of Trustee Records and Retention Policy, they look to update that. They looked up the indemnification policy, looked at some of the election procedures and those sorts of things. Again, they're trying to tidy up their own operating principles. Any questions on that? The next report was the same committee. That's on page 8. Jay Monteiro covered this one for me. This will be a written report only, but as you can see from his report, they kind of fine-tuned the language of those just to kind of go over the nitty-gritty details related to those. But that's a written report only this time. Any questions for me on the previous report, though?

- J. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair –

- 1. [Statement of Concern](#) related to State University Civil Service System and Academic Professional positions – Page 9

W. Pitney: So, that moves us now to our standing committees. We've got a few items to discuss here. The first one will be from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. We'll look first at the statement of concern related to the State University Civil Service System and you might recall that last semester we looked at some issues related to that or I announced some issues related to that. We sent that to committee and so they've got a report. Richard, can I turn that over to you?

R. Siegesmund: So, the first item that we are bringing back from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee is the statement of concern related to the State University Civil Service System and academic professional positions. When we looked at some of the statements that had been made, there was a concern expressed that they were perhaps overly confrontational and that there was perhaps a more moderated position that could be taken that while asserting our concern that academic professional positions should not be classified through a series of systematic audit reviews but rather through a process of negotiation and collegial discussion at the same time. That's the spirit of this statement that has come forward.

W. Pitney: So we've got this committee's statement of concern. I suppose we could take a motion from the floor to accept this statement of concern. Get it seconded and then we can open it up for discussion. Can I have a motion to accept this statement of concern? George has a motion. Any second? Greg Long second. Let's discuss this please, Deb.

D. Haliczzer: Representing SPS Council, I must say that my colleagues and I really appreciate the reasonable, balanced statement that you have all made about a very complex issue where we are colleagues and close friends with all of our operating staff colleagues. But this is a complicated statewide issue and we want to make sure that, as you say, positions are not just moved because of an audit finding. Thank you very much.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Any other discussion points or questions? Richard, thank you to your committee for putting this together. Seeing no other discussion points or questions, we've got a motion and a second to accept this statement of concern. All in favor of this, actually I guess we should use the clickers. I forgot about that part. So we'll set this up. So, if you haven't gotten a clicker, make sure you grab one out of the box in the back. Just a reminder that those of you on University Council here today, you too are voting members of Faculty Senate. So for our clickers, we've got a motion and a second to approve this statement of concern. Push 1 or A to approve the motion; 2 or B to oppose the motion; and 3 or C to abstain. So again 1 to approve, 2 to vote no and 3 to abstain. So if you could vote now please. And if you get a smiley face, you are good to go. Does anybody need any more time? 1 is yes to approve the motion; 2 is no; and 3 is to abstain. We all set? Close the vote.

Yes – 38

No – 0

Abstain – 2

W. Pitney: The motion carries so that statement is approved. I'll share this with the president and provost. Thank you Richard.

2. [FMLA and Stopping the Tenure Clock](#) – Pages 10-11

W. Pitney: Looks like you have another item.

R. Siegesmund: I do; we do. We're not done yet. This is a more complicated statement and it goes back to the presentation that was made on October 1 regarding career satisfaction and gender among NIU stem faculty. There were a series of action statements. One of these was

directed to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee for review and that was the concern of faculty members who report a lack of clarity about what constitutes an appropriate work plan for return from Family and Medical Leave Act leave. And they expressed concerns about consistency and policy implementation. Some report that they have been discouraged from applying to stop the clock by peers and unit administrators. The committee looked at this. I also interviewed stakeholders in the university. There was the graduate assistant who assembled comparative plans from ten other universities around the country. Our sense is it's not a problem of language. It's a problem of culture. And in that sense, it's not that you need to rewrite it top down, but there needs to be a greater awareness of what Family and Medical Leave Act provides for. Not only just for administrators but for faculty, themselves. And that ultimately the way this law needs to be implemented is bottom up, not top down.

First of all, there's a principle that the committee thinks needs to be reasserted of that bottom up negotiation, that this needs to be worked out closest to the unit in which the responsibilities of the person seeking the leave and the responsibilities of the administration are understood. To build that culture, we are recommending that there is some kind of module training developed by human resources. Something similar to the ethics training that we go through so that people are aware of what their rights are, both administrators and faculty. We think it's impossible to create templates to try to negotiate every nuance of the law. The law is incredibly complex. And that in particular, when do you turn off the tenure clock, is something that is or when you have a stoppage. For instance if someone takes leave because of the birth of child or an adoption, that's a block of time that makes it clear that you're going to stop the tenure clock. If someone has an event which qualifies them for leave every Friday for 16 weeks, do you stop the tenure clock over that? I don't know. Do you want to get into a 50 hours you stop the tenure clock at 49 hours. Our recommendation is that it needs to be done collegially at the local level and people need training in those negotiations. That's the implementation recommendation.

W. Pitney: So, we've got some committee recommendations in terms of awareness of FMLA and implementation as it relates to FMLA and also you've got just to clarify on number 2 under implementation, the committee identifies extraordinary circumstances that may not be covered under FMLA.

R. Siegesmund: Yes, absolutely and in those cases where I think we've had instances of faculty that have been abroad and they're encountered visa problems and they cannot return to campus, which is not covered by FMLA, that this could also be something that would require stopping the tenure clock if someone cannot continue their duties.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Richard. So I would accept a motion to endorse the recommendations of this committee. Got a motion and a second [J. Stephen moved, J. Novak seconded]. Any discussion points or questions? Rosemary?

R. Feurer: I have been involved in this issue for quite a while and I really commend the work because I know that it's very complex. But on the other hand, the law is pretty simple too. The law says that a person cannot be harmed by an application. And so I think that is the key that I would like to have set in motion as part of this document because it isn't so complex if you recognize that very simple element of the law. It should be up to the faculty member to stop the

clock or not. The problem with this university is that they want that right, it seems to me, to be able to tell you in some cases that has happened. Numerous have reported to me that they've been either harmed by being forced to stop the clock, vice versa, not being able to decide themselves. I think this should be emphasized in that in some ways.

On the issue of the local, I can understand wanting to change the local culture and I endorse that, but the thing that has been corrupting, I don't use that word lightly, of this process is the lack of information that a faculty member who is fighting for their rights has or doesn't have when they go to discuss this. I really would urge us to think about adding that as an element. Somewhere at this university there should be a file so that somebody can access what has been given to other faculty members in similar situations, names removed, something that allows you to see what people have gotten because just comparing my story with other people's stories, I can tell you it's a wide range. So I don't know that having training will really allow us to see what might have been available to other applicants or other FMLA leave recipients. In other words, it will allow us to be sure that everything's being applied with some degree of transparency or standard, we have to have that information. Do you see?

R. Siegesmund: Would that be something – we haven't specified what this training module is. That's a whole nother task and I hope it's not this committee's task to try to do that that; that opens up into a larger conversation. But that aspect of what is consistent across is a huge issue and it's not just something that's just within a department. There are research teams, there are cultures of, there is leave that one can take, but a culture of don't take it because that's going to defeat the team. That kind of a cultural issue that's in place right now and as I recall from the discussion on October 1 that there were male members of the faculty who said this isn't just a woman's I got treated the same way. It's not just – it's a faculty issue and that – your issue of when do you turn the tenure clock off, FMLA does say that it's supposed to be negotiated and in that sense to have the...

R. Feurer: The current policy does but I – and this is where I've done a little research and looked at other universities – it's because of the way our semester works right. So the university says this is way it's going to be, but if you read the law, the actual law itself, you cannot be harmed. So I would argue that as a Faculty Senate we should say the faculty member if they qualify under FLMA and want to stop the tenure clock as a result of qualifying for that amount should be at least given with reason some guidelines there or given that right to stop that clock if they have that. In other words if they can show that they would be harmed without having those conditions. I understand what you're saying, if it's two days I don't think much dispute will be, but when you're taking off 12 weeks.

R. Siegesmund: You know, that's where at least in drafting this coming forward, is it two days – no; 12 weeks – yes; at least for this document trying to negotiate that out is a bigger problem than what the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee can do. It's here now for discussion but in front of the Faculty Senate, but where it goes from here, there is a recommendation that it goes to some kind of an information module so faculty are aware of what those rights are and that consistency that I think we're endorsing that in this document. So that concern does need to be addressed.

R. Feurer: So, this committee would do something like that do you think, would make that issue of transparency and availability of other?

R. Siegesmund: I think that committee – and I’m not sure where that committee is or what we do at this point – but that would be what we would envision, that those concerns are now addressed in a way that we’re saying in this that those issues of transparency, equity, when do you turn it on, reasonableness, absolutely.

R. Feurer: Okay, because I guess I read the handling of it at the local level a little less, you know, applying that standard.

R. Siegesmund: Well.

W. Pitney: So, Rosemary, if I understand one of your concerns, I think it was the second one, it’s the consistent application of this across departments under similar circumstances. So the circumstance that a faculty is facing in one department, they might get to stop the tenure clock but perhaps in another one they may not for whatever reason.

R. Feurer: I actually know of cases that are directly similar where the different outcomes came and so I just think that it had to do with lack of information.

W. Pitney: And so you would like to see maybe some language to the maybe the implementation piece in terms of efforts being made by the university to insure consistent application of the tenure clock stoppage issue, something to that effect?

R. Feurer: Right. Is that acceptable?

R. Siegesmund: I’d take that as a friendly amendment. That’s just being very, as chair of the committee there are other people here who might not agree with me, but I would be willing to accept that as a friendly amendment.

W. Pitney: Because I think this isn’t policy, right, this is a statement coming from the Faculty Senate. I would see this moving forward to the University Council and at which point in time it could be used to model some policy work with HR, for example, etc. So it sounds as though you’re offering a friendly amendment and Richard’s accepted to have a third implementation step that the university investigate how to insure consistency of tenure clock stoppages across departments, something to that affect.

R. Feurer: And I should have said it’s not only tenure clock, it’s like sometimes there’s negotiations for coming back and having to teach an extra class, those kinds of things that are very inconsistent, can be and I’m not saying universally inconsistent but have cases of...

R. Siegesmund: The Family Medical Leave Act is about allowing people to have space because of a situation or an incident and that leave could be two days, it could be one day a week for 16 weeks. And there is this negotiation over what is reasonable in terms of your being able to do duties because of this incident and that might mean reorganizing of your workload and you don’t

teach but you have to do other kinds of service activities. That's totally open to negotiation right now and it is wildly inconsistent right now. And trying to create some kind of information base over what would be consistent policies in these situations would be something I think that training module is what is being envisioned here.

R. Feurer: Great.

W. Pitney: It gets complicated doesn't it because the reasons for FMLA can be so varied and one person's criteria or changes to their roles to come back from FMLA might be much different than somebody else's. But I think the thing I appreciate is the emphasis on the collegial negotiation of these so that it's for the benefit of the faculty member. With that friendly amendment to work in some language like that, we've got that on the table. Any other questions, concerns, suggestions? So hearing none, we've got the motion that's been seconded and we've got the friendly amendment from Rosemary. Hearing no other discussion points or questions, let's go ahead and vote to endorse this set of recommendation. We're going to use the clickers. 1 is to approve the motion; 1 or A is to vote yes to approve; 2 or B is to vote no not approve; and 3 or C is to abstain. I think you can vote at any time Pat right? Anybody need some more time or are we good? Okay so we'll close the vote.

Yes – 33

No – 0

Abstain - 5

W. Pitney: Motion carries. Thank you, Richard and your committee, for this.

B. Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair

1. [Classroom Recording Policy](#) – Page 12

W. Pitney: Our next item is from Academic Affairs, Sarah McHone-Chase and if you look at page 12.

S. McHone-Chase: In making this particular document we took a look at the recording policies for other institutions and tried to think about what our needs were and then model that on those documents. And so we tried to balance concerns of privacy but also knowing that students are probably going to want to record more often than perhaps when we, ourselves, were students. And we were trying to think about disability concerns. And so this is what we've come up in the meantime.

What we were thinking was that the best case scenario would be if it was addressed in the syllabus of every class and would just state outright if you would allow recording in the classroom. And by recording we mean recording in any sense of the word. And, if it didn't address it in the syllabus, then the defacto would be that it is allowed. And then we also would then say as a professor you could also change your mind at any point. And then, if you did, you would have to put that in writing and then also notify everyone also out loud.

I think we've done a pretty good job of trying to address every concern that we could think of, but I also want to make sure that, if you can think of any concerns right now, that we address those also. Bill Pitney's going to run this by legal as well to make sure that we're not missing anything. And then we're also planning on coming up with some boiler plate language that everyone could use for the syllabus as well.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Sarah. I sent this to Greg Brady our deputy legal counsel, deputy general counsel, just for clarification and to see if he had any recommendations to change the language and I've not yet heard back from him. In order for this to become policy, we'd have to get it through University Council anyway, so we could certainly approve this, move it forward, and in the interim have Greg vet this. So let's get a start. I'll take a motion to accept this policy. We have George in the back. Second? Paul Stoddard a second. Discussion?

I'll make a few comments. I sent this to the committee. There have been some interesting articles in the Chronicle of Higher Ed in terms of some problems that have occurred as a result of students having recorded some content in the classroom and then posted it on social media. Things that, in some instances, were taken out of context and in other instances were a violation of copyright. If we have a one-time use agreement, yet a student captures that in the classroom and then broadly distributes it, that becomes an issue. So we thought it would be helpful to have some type of policy for our students. I think this is a good start to that so that's good.

S. McHone-Chase: The policy that we've drafted here makes it clear that all the content that you as a professor produce for your class is your intellectual property, it belongs to you. And also, if your student records anything for their own benefit to study, they can't post it anywhere and they need to delete everything at the end of the semester.

W. Pitney: Correct. Good. I appreciated that. I think having our students record some things for their personal learning use for that duration of the class, I think for most of us, would be pretty good. We often don't want that broadly distributed and so if that's violated, certainly that would be subject to the appropriate student conduct. So that's captured in this as well. So, thank you to you and your committee for putting this together. Any other questions or comments, concerns?

So we've got a motion to approve this draft policy from here and a second. I'll need to take it to University Council from here. It might get vetted a little bit and changed, but I think this is a good start for us. So let's go ahead and vote on this please. Use your clickers. This is clicker day. 1 or A is yes; 2 or B is no; and 3 or C is to abstain. So 1 yes, 2 B no, 3 abstain. You can vote at any time and look for the smiley face. Everybody all set? We can close the vote please, Pat.

Yes – 36

No – 2

Abstain – 1

W. Pitney: The motion carries. Thank you. I appreciate it, Sarah. If there are any substantive changes to this based on legal counsel review, I'll come back to Faculty Senate and announce that.

- C. Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair – no report
- D. Rules and Governance – Gary Baker, Chair – no report
- E. Resources, Space and Budget – Stephen Tonks, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report
- F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair; Therese Arado, Alternate
 - 1. Nomination for Executive Secretary of University Council/
President of Faculty Senate – See [list](#) of University Council
members eligible for election – Page 13

Letters of acceptance are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by noon Friday, March 13, 2015, and will be included in The March 25 FS agenda packets. Election will take place at the April 22 FS meeting.

W. Pitney: I don't believe we have any Economic Status of the Profession report, nor anything from Rules and Governance. Nothing from Resource, Space and Budget, so that brings us to item F which is the nomination for Executive Secretary of University Council and President of the Faculty Senate. Therese Arado is going to fill in for Stephen Tonks today.

T. Arado: All right, thank you, Bill. Good afternoon everyone. It's time to take nominations for the position of Executive Secretary of the University Council and President of Faculty Senate for next academic year. I love our cold February day where we're thinking next academic year already. The update list of members who are eligible to be nominated was a walk-in item so you all should have had this at your spot when you came in. I will not accept nominations from the floor for this position. Yes.

R. Siegesmund: I'd like to nominate Greg Long.

T. Arado: All right we have a nomination for Greg Long. Do I have a second for a nomination for Greg Long?

G. Slotsve: I'd like to second the nomination of Greg Long.

T. Arado: George has seconded the nomination for Greg Long.

V. Demir: I'd like to nominate Virginia Naples.

T. Arado: Virginia Naples. Okay I have a nomination for Virginia Naples. Do I have a second?

R. Feurer: Second.

T. Arado: Rosemary Feurer seconds. Do I have any other nominations?

J. Novak: I'd like to nominate Bill Pitney.

T. Arado: Okay, I have a nomination for Bill Pitney from John Novak. Do I have a second?

P. Stoddard: Second.

T. Arado: Paul Stoddard is seconding our nomination for Bill Pitney. Do I have any other nominations?

I. Montana: I'd like to nominate Eric Mogren.

T. Arado: Okay, we have a nomination for Eric Mogren. Do I have a second for our nomination for Eric Mogren?

A. Azad: Second.

T. Arado: Okay we have a second for Eric Mogren as well. Do I have any other nominations? Okay. So hearing no more nominations, I'm going to now close the nominations. All nominees are to submit a letter of acceptance noting your qualifications and desire to serve to the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate, by noon on Friday, March 13. Those letters will be included in the March 25 Faculty Senate agenda package and then the election of the nominee will take place at the April 22 Faculty Senate meeting. So nomination acceptance letters by Friday, March 13; they will be included in the March 25 packets; and voting will be on April 22 and then summer break.

W. Pitney: And hopefully it's warmer right. Thank you, Therese.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

W. Pitney: Okay we have no Unfinished Business or New Business. Any comments or questions from the floor? Deborah?

D. Haliczzer: I am a member of the infamous Smoke Free Campus Task Force and you heard from Dean Derryl Block. What we're doing this week is having open meetings for people to make comment on the draft policy and we've had two very vocal meetings so far. We have others scheduled for Thursday and Friday this week. We also on the website, which has been posted, have posted the draft policy, the law, and we are inviting comment. We've been having busy comments being sent to the committee and we're responding to all of them. So please, if you have opinions, please submit them to the committee, we really welcome those.

W. Pitney: Awesome. Thank you. Any other comments or questions from the floor? Yes, Rosemary?

R. Feurer: It's a question about another thing of knowledge of different policies. Is it possible to have the Faculty Senate collect merit statements from across the university and be sure that all of them are known to others? You know how people do merit? I've been working with our department on revising a merit statement and it just seems we don't have this kind of information available to us.

W. Pitney: By merit statements do you mean the criteria for merit?

R. Feurer: (microphone off) But in terms of how people are evaluating merit.

W. Pitney: Okay, how about you and I connect on that and we could probably work on getting that done.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- E. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- I. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- J. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- Q. [Annual Report](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

W. Pitney: Okay, we are adjourned. Thank you. Have a great day.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.