

**FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, March 25, 2015, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Azad, Baker, Brubaker, Bujarski, Campbell, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chung, Conderman, Demir, Feurer, Fredericks, Grund, Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Jaffee, Konon, Koren, Lenczewski, Mackie Manning, Martin, Millis, Montana, Moremen, Naples, Newman (for Macdonald), Novak, Patro, Pitney, Rush, Ryan, Ryu, Sagarin, Shin, Slotsve, Stoddard, Than, Tonks, Un, Xie

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Arriola, Bateni, Briscoe, Chen, Chmaissem, Deng, Giese, Hedin, Henning, Irwin, Khoury, Lee, Long, Macdonald, Markowitz, McHone-Chase, Mogren, Mohabbat, Moraga, Plonczynski, Riley, Schwartz-Bechet, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Stephen

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Doederlein, Haliczzer, Falkoff, Klaper, Liu, Schalkoff, Stafstrom

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Armstrong, Gebo, Monteiro, Shortridge, Streb, Waas

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**W. Pitney:** All right, good afternoon. Let's go ahead and call the meeting to order, please.

Meeting called to order at 3:03 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**W. Pitney:** Our first item is to adopt the agenda. I'd accept a motion to adopt the agenda please.

**G. Slotsve:** So moved.

**W. Pitney:** George, thank you. And a second?

**Unidentified:** Second.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Any modifications, changes? Seeing none all in favor of adopting the agenda say aye.

**Senators:** Aye.

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

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2015 FS MEETING**

**W. Pitney:** Next item is the approval of our minutes from the February 18 meeting. I would take a motion to approve the minutes?

**J. Novak:** So moved.

**W. Pitney:** John, a second please. Thank you, Lee. Any edits to the minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the minutes signify by saying aye.

**Senators:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? The minutes are approved.

#### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

A. House Bill 403 – Repeal of University 50% Tuition Waivers

[Letter from President Baker](#) – Page 4

[Shared Governance letter to SUAA](#) – Page 5

**W. Pitney:** I've got a couple of announcements. The first one on page 4 and 5 in your packet, you'll see just a couple of letters that went out. I just wanted this body to be aware that both the president and the leaders of our shared governance bodies were making our voices known in terms of opposing House Bill 403. My understanding is that's passed the House and is now on its way to the Senate. So we'll have to see what happens. I know the president's had many conversations with several legislators and expressed opposition to that. I just want to make you aware of that.

Our second item, and this is for information purposes, our Academic Policy Committee on the University Council has been pretty busy. They have met on several occasions and started to put some things to use for us in terms of looking at ways of modifying our current curricular process. You can see a model up there on the left is the current model and where we're at in terms of our primary department, college, and university level curriculum bodies before curricular changes, modifications, additions, deletions, etc. are moved to the University Council. About two years ago, a small core group of folks, myself included, started looking at changes to the CIUE Committee and the CUAE Committee which aren't true curricular bodies, they are advisory to the current UCC. And we wondered if we might be able to consolidate those.

That conversation kind of morphed into some hot and heavy work over this past probably nine or ten months or so and what started as consolidating not only the CIUE and the CUAE into one advisory committee, but also looking at the possibility of consolidating APASC and the CUC into one body. It became something a little bit more substantive and I think much more positive in terms of a cleaner, more streamlined curricular process.

And so what you see on the right is a model that is much more linear. It takes us from curricular changes at the department to the college to the university level. At the university level we would still have the Gen Ed Committee, the Honors Committee, they would give reports to a new

Baccalaureate Curriculum Council. And the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council would address the work of the previous APASC and CUC committees. And, because the GEC and the Honors would operate a little more independently and because the other committee really isn't a curricular body, it would eliminate the former UCC's level of coordination. This work's been done. Virginia Naples has chaired the Academic Policy Committee of UC and that group, her committee has vetted this, gotten feedback. And so going forward is a first reading at University Council.

I just wanted to bring it to this body for information purposes. It parallels, I think this is an important point, this parallels how we currently operate with our grad level curriculum. We've got one primary university level curricular body for graduate curriculum and certainly some advisory pieces there as well. So we're kind of making these processes parallel. That's a good thing. Any comments, questions, concerns? Virginia, would you like to say anything or make a comment or two?

**V. Naples:** First of all, I'll find a microphone and actually wait for it to be turned on. Following the rules. One of things I'd very much like to say is I want to thank the members of the Academic Policies Committee because they came with a lot of enthusiasm and were extremely well-prepared and we had very worth-while discussions. One of the things that was of concern initially and has been made into the second bullet point that is in the revised model is that we were very interested in insuring that people had a sufficient opportunity to provide input into the curricular process at all different stages and the idea was not simply to consolidate or streamline things and leave people's opportunities to contribute. There will still be lots of opportunities for people to serve on brand new and/or revised committees. And I think it will still make for a smoother process and a faster process. And a faster process is probably really important because of the institution of the PLUS program. So I think this is a timely kind of a move and, if people have other suggestions or ideas that they would like to add that they think would make additional improvements, the committee would welcome them. Thanks.

**W. Pitney:** Very good. Thank you, Virginia, and thank you for all your hard work on this. My only other announcement is our final Faculty Club lunch is schedule for Tuesday, April 7. The reservation deadline is noon on Monday, March 30. Is that at Ellington's? Yeah, that's at Ellington's. The last one was very well attended. I think we had about 20-25 folks over the course of the hour and a half. A lot of great discussion, it's been interesting to learn about some research collaborations that have actually come out of some of those lunches.

## **V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

### **A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to George Slotsve**

**W. Pitney:** Moving on, Item V, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. George Slotsve, could you come on up for me, please? It is my distinct pleasure to award George with our Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. For those of you who have served with George on the Executive Committee, on the Benefits Committee, on CFAC, on the Committee for the Economic Status of the Profession and on and on and on and on – and even those of you here on senate have observed George putting out the faculty voice so that it's heard and that faculty viewpoints and

perspectives are always valued and appreciated. It is with great honor that I provide George with the Faculty Advocacy Award in the name of Bob Lane. George, congratulations.

## **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report  
[February 20, 2015](#) – Pages 6-7  
[March 20, 2015](#) – walk-in

**W. Pitney:** There is no Consent Agenda, so let's move on down to reports from our advisory committees. Our first report in Item A is from Sonya Armstrong. On page 6 and 7 you can see her written report from February 20. The March 20 report is a walk-in item so you should be able to see that somewhere at the table where you're at. Because it's written only, I've taken a look at this. Are there any questions that any of you might have related to Sonya's reports? I don't know that I could answer them, but I'm certainly willing to see if I can or not. Any comments, concerns? Seeing none, we'll move on.

- B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – no report
- C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – no report
- D. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – [report](#) – Pages 8-9

**W. Pitney:** Our next report is from our Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee from our BOT meeting. You can find that on pages 8 and 9. There's a few things I'd like to highlight here. At this committee at the Board of Trustees, they examined several different things at this particular meeting. Some of them are very noteworthy.

They approved, and this moved forward to a full board meeting where it was subsequently approved as well, they approved the Nankai-NIU International College. So this was a collaborative venture in Tianjin, China partnering with NIU. We will offer 2 plus 2 programs. Those programs are in political science with two emphasis: international politics and public administration; and economics as well, right George? So these departments have been hard at work trying to work out the details of this arrangement and in a couple years from now we could conceivably have 150 to 200 international students here on campus enrolled in those programs. So it's very exciting.

The other item, they approved the proposed Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management. They also approved the BS in ed and middle level teaching and learning degree, the College of Ed.

And they also approved sabbaticals for Supportive Professional Staff and faculty. One comment I'd like to make about this, now early on in that discussion, both Bob Marshall and myself kind of added some narrative about the value of sabbaticals, not just to a faculty or a staff member but also to the curriculum and the institution and our students ultimately. There was some dialog related to whether or not we could conceivably continue to have sabbaticals, and whether we should continue to have sabbaticals. Some board members raised that concern. When all is said and done, after the presentation on sabbaticals from Jeanette Rossetti from Nursing and one of her students, and after they saw the written report from our administration on the outcomes of the academic year 2011-2012 sabbaticals, the board was floored at the high quality and level of productivity that came out of that. And so they were very, very impressed and I think those two things helped allay many concerns that were raised by those folks. So I thought that was a very positive thing that came out of that.

They also heard a report on curriculum diversity at Northern Illinois University. So there was information provided on our Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Institute as well as a bit of information in terms of the PLUS general education program and where diversity, and cultural diversity in particular, could be infused throughout there and the potential that is in front of many of our programs. So that concludes my report there. Any questions? Seeing none, we'll move on.

- E. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee –  
Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – [report](#) – Pages 10-11

**W. Pitney:** Our next report is written only. That's from Rebecca Shortridge and that's the Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee. You can see that on pages 10 and 11. You can see where that committee had a laundry list of items that they approved and moved forward to the full board.

- F. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee –  
Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – [report](#) – Page 12
- G. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee –  
Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Page 13

**W. Pitney:** Our next item, Item G, is the Compliance, Audit and Risk Management. I believe this is written only as well. Is that correct, Debbie? Any questions on that written report? Seeing none and moving right along.

- H. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – no report
- I. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and William Pitney – no report
- J. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Pages 14-16

**W. Pitney:** We don't have any Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee reports. That group is actually meeting this Friday and I'll be covering that. I do have the full BOT report. So on pages 14 and

16 you'll see a laundry list of things that the Board of Trustees approved. The ones that are more expanded on page 15 are things I just wanted to draw to your attention.

The Board approved the student health insurance fee and indeed it totals \$1,052.00 per semester for students. The explanation for the dramatic increase in that fee is the Affordable Care Act and the need to expand the coverage for students, but it's pretty substantive, so I think that's something for us to keep our eye on. I've heard concerns of the fee increases at the graduate level and then the health insurance fee in particular being so costly. I think it's being viewed as a bit of a huge concern, a bit of a concern for faculty and students alike. I think the second item in terms of the academic health plans kind of parallels with that.

The other item I wanted to raise to your attention is the tuition remittance program. This was a first reading for the full board. As you know, employees at NIU can get tuition waivers for courses that they take. With this particular program it's designed as such that the tuition generated will eventually be filtered back into the program so that it becomes self-funding. Therefore, what's been proposed is that rather than a tuition waiver to employees who want to take this, a department would have to pay that employee's tuition and then subsequently having the tuition paid for after the degree is confirmed, that employee would be obligated, depending upon the memorandum of understanding, to work a number of years for that department. So that's how the university administration is organizing that one. Any questions, comments? I think that does it for that report.

## **VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report
- 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

- 1. [RSB Budget Survey](#) – Pages 17-20

**W. Pitney:** Moving on down, Reports From Standing Committees. I don't think we have anything until Item E, Resource, Space and Budget. I don't think Stephen or Ibrahim is here. A couple things to... oh, Stephen, you are. Did you want to...

**S. Tonks:** I am here, last minute though.

**W. Pitney:** I'm sorry, thank you for notifying me. Would you like to comment on any of this or would you like me to?

**S. Tonks:** If you want to go ahead and then I'll add to it.

**W. Pitney:** Okay, sounds good. The RSB wanted me to make you aware that they're currently doing a survey of chairs and deans and office managers who have been closely associated with the budget and vacancy hearing process. What they're trying to determine is what's worked well with that process that was changed last year, what the challenges were, so that they can as a committee offer some constructive feedback and maybe change the process to make it better. So that's the purpose of the survey. They've included it here for you to take a look at.

2. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 2.8](#) – Pages 21-23  
Resources, Space and Budget Committee – **INFORMATION ONLY**

**W. Pitney:** The other piece here with our Resource, Space and Budget Committee is for information only. I'll explain why it's for information only, but I'll also share with you what's going to be proposed and voted on at the University Council.

So, as you know, the Resource, Space and Budget Committee is a joint committee. Personnel on that committee are shared between the University Council and the Faculty Senate. The administration approached the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, as well as our Executive Committee of Faculty Senate, was it a month ago, I think roughly a month ago. And the request to meet with these two bodies came as a result of Governor Rauner's proposed budget to higher education. As you might remember, it was a proposed 30-ish percent cut to higher ed. So of our \$90 million we get from the state, we would lose roughly \$29 million of that. Given the nature of that and given the timing of things, we may not know what our state allocations are until part way into June. Now that's obviously outside of the academic year. Our committee structures are such that we tend to operate in the academic year and the administration's concern was that, on one hand, we have a committee structure with the RSB, as example, that operates on the academic year. It meets typically monthly to give input and advice to the administration on the budget, budget priorities, etc.

And, on the other end of the extreme, is the financial exigency where the administration can once declared, can make unilateral changes to budget in allocations. What was asked is for us to weigh and consider what we could do in order to have a little bit more nimble structure and in particular have some voice from our faculty and staff outside of the normal committee structure, outside of the normal academic year. And so we debated that and talked about it at that joint meeting. And at that point in time, I think we had thought about having a sub-committee of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee assembled and that that sub-committee could work outside of the academic year to meet with the administration, weigh and consider budget ideas, even revenue streams, etc.

Once the Resource, Space and Budget Committee met, they came up with an even better process. You can see parts of that on page 21. Page 21 you've got a little bit of rationale for these changes. Essentially what's happening is we're going to increase the number of faculty on the resource, what we're proposing, is we're going to increase the number of faculty on the Resource, Space and Budget Committee from eight to 12. So that gives us a higher number of faculty who would meet monthly, be appraised of the budget, have input and voice into the



budget priorities and be aware of the lay of the land in terms of how the budget works, what our operating expenses are and so forth.

The other key piece is that we've added two items to the duties of the committee and then we're asking for some changes to the committee so that they can operate outside of the academic year. So if you look at page 23 you'll see two duty items added. One is to advise the president and the executive vice president and provost on critical, time-sensitive, budget issues affecting the university. We have to have a voice in that process and that seems like the logical body to do that.

The second Item, E, is to participate and advise the president and executive vice president and provost on resource allocation matters and revenue generating opportunities that may arise.

The last item, Item 2.8.4, is operating outside of the academic calendar. What is proposed is that, in order to address the duty of advising folks on time sensitive issues, that we allow the committee to function outside of the academic year calendar without a quorum, providing there are at least five voting members, the majority of which must be faculty. So by adding more faculty to the body, there's likely to be a higher, at least some that would be able to meet outside of the academic year along with our staff who could also meet. Alternates could be allowed, although we're hoping that with the higher number we could have voices at the table to advise the administration on this.

I think there's a couple good things here if I may. One is that it's the administration that asked to have us at the table and I think that's important to recognize. They don't want to make unilateral cuts. They want to be able to understand what the budget priorities are and be advised on these things and that means we've got to be at the table to do that. So I think that's a good thing.

So that's the piece that will go through University Council. In our Faculty Senate Bylaws, the Resource, Space and Budget Committee is written very generically and very broadly. We can make changes on the UC side and it wouldn't affect our bylaws so that's why this is for information only. But if there are any questions or concerns or thoughts, this would be a great time to raise those. The University Council next week will have this as a first reading, they wouldn't vote on this until April so there's certainly plenty of time if you've got some thoughts on this. But any reactions, any thoughts to this? Stephen anything to add, did I miss anything?

**S. Tonks:** Very well spoken, Bill, thank you.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair; Therese Arado, Alternate

1. Letter of acceptance of nomination for President of Faculty Senate/  
Executive Secretary of University Council;  
Faculty Senate will vote at the April 22, 2015 meeting.

[Greg Long](#) – Pages 24-25

[Virginia Naples](#) – Page 26



**W. Pitney:** Seeing none, let's go ahead and move on. Therese, for the Elections and Legislative Oversight, just a little information item here.

**T. Arado:** As Bill said, just an informational item. We've had two people accept the nomination to serve as the next president of Faculty Senate, executive secretary of University Council. Their letters of acceptance are included in the agenda package towards the end and the election will take place at our next meeting on April 22. So before then take a look at the letters in the packet and we'll, I'm assuming, use our clickers and vote that day.

**W. Pitney:** Okay, very good. Thank you.

## **IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws [Article 3](#) – Pages 27-30  
Rules & Governance Committee and  
Elections & Legislative Oversight Committee  
**FIRST READING**

**W. Pitney:** Wow, we're moving along, this is great. That brings us to New Business. Now this is going to take some discussion and some energy, some mental energy. And we parked it here rather than talking about it at Rules and Governance or Elections and Legislative Oversight because this involves two of our current standing committees. This proposal has come forward from both our Executive Committee of Faculty Senate as well as the Steering Committee of the University Council. Both bodies have weighed and considered some changes here and were putting forward similar changes in both groups but it's not going to work unless both groups, Faculty Senate and University Council, agree to this. This will be our first reading of this item. So no motions necessary, but we're going to discuss our way through this.

So currently with our standing committees, we have both in Faculty Senate and in University Council, we have an Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee as well as a Rules and Governance Committee. The primary responsibility of, as the name implies, Rules and Governance, is to kind of oversee any constitution and bylaws issues that are referred to it for either body. The Rules and Governance at the University Council tends to pay attention only to the university constitution and bylaws. The Rules and Governance Committee at the Faculty Senate level tends to focus solely on the Faculty Senate bylaws. The Elections and Legislative Oversight Committees for both bodies run our election processes and they have got one duty and that is, one additional duty, and that is kind of get a lay of the land for legislation that's being passed that might impact higher ed.

So as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Steering Committee of University Council thought about these, we wondered in the spirit of trying to streamline our processes, free up some human resources, for example moving some folks over to the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, we thought it might be prudent to consolidate those committees in both

bodies. So in other words, consolidating Elections and Legislative Oversight and the Rules and Governance Committees both at the University Council and at the Faculty Senate levels.

Then the conversation went a step further, and that is both of those consolidated committees pretty much focus on the same tasks albeit with Rules and Governance different documents. However, if there is a change to the University bylaws, I think it's prudent that our Faculty Senate be aware of it and weigh and consider it and have a voice in that and vice versa. In fact, earlier this academic year we had a really benign change to make to some bylaw language for the evaluation of our Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor, and we actually had to pass that through both the Senate and the Council because that language is duplicative in both sets of bylaws. So that's an example of some of the overlap.

Once we talked about the value in consolidating committees in both bodies, we had a discussion about making this a joint committee that would serve both the University Council and the Faculty Senate – very much akin to how the resource space and budget committee operates now. There's equal number of faculty from Faculty Senate and University Council on both of those that work together along with some of our faculty and staff. This consolidated and joint committee across University Council and Faculty Senate would operate in the same way. So what you see on page 27 is a proposal to create the Faculty Senate/University Council Committee on Rules, Governance and Elections. It was also thought, and no offense to any folks that have ever served on Elections and Legislative Oversight, that it's not typically a really high impact committee at all. And, in fact, I think those of you who have served on that would say our office, I'm taking credit there which I shouldn't, Pat organizes all of that and has everything scripted and ready to go, so we've got a fair amount of support there for that role.

We don't think that consolidating those would cause too much problems, but you can see the language there as it would be changed in the Faculty Senate bylaws. For our discussion purposes, we thought it would be helpful to also share with you the language changes that will be examined by the University Council. What you see on page 27 and part of 28 is the new Faculty Senate/University Council committee that would be created and then, of course, that would mean deleting Rules and Governance as well as the current Elections and Legislative Oversight.

And then beginning on page 28 and moving on to page 29 and even into 30, you can see we've got the same committee set up for the University Council, the Faculty Senate/University Council Committee on Rules, Governance and Elections. And here you can see the composition. We've got eight faculty members, four of whom would be from University Council, the other four are from the Faculty Senate. So equal representation. We would have to maintain, because it would be a joint body, some student representation, supportive professional staff representation, and operating staff representation. The duties are simply combined from those of the existing Rules and Governance Committee and Elections and Legislative Oversight and those are displayed in Item 2.2.2, A through G.

There was also the idea here that, in terms of legislative oversight, we actually have multiple bodies on campus that help with that. A great example is our Faculty Advisory Committee for the IBHE that Sonya Armstrong is our rep. Every fall, the IBHE produces for those liaisons a list of legislation that might impact higher ed. Our Benefits Committee is another great example of

legislative oversight, and certainly my office as well. So that's the lay of the land with that as a first reading. Comments, questions, concerns, statements? Paul Stoddard?

**P. Stoddard:** I think the consolidation probably has some merit especially Elections and Legislative Oversight consolidating with Rules and Governance. Something like that might be a good idea. I'm a little concerned, not that I can think of any examples off the top of my head, but this body is supposed to be a caucus of the faculty. We have guests we invite and I'm a little concerned that by making a joint committee you then give other constituencies on campus the right to influence the way we conduct business here. Like I said, I can't think of any examples where that would be a negative thing, but I don't know that it's a good idea to go down that road.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, good thought. Any other thoughts, questions, concerns? Again this is a first reading so this is a chance to kind of examine this, weigh and consider it. Think through it just a little further. The second reading would be in April so lots of time to do that. I think Paul makes a very cogent concern there so I appreciate that. Any others?

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

### **A. Faculty leave guidelines**

**W. Pitney:** We skipped Unfinished Business because there was none. That brings us to Comments and Questions from the Floor. I did park there one item just so I wouldn't forget, and that I've had some concerns raised to me from faculty that they've been in situations where, because they missed a, let's say for example a faculty meeting or something like that, that they were either docked, or threatened to have had a dock, in their sick leave. I'm wondering if that is something that is systemic. Is this a onetime type of deal, has anybody else experienced that? Yeah, Paul?

**P. Stoddard:** In my role as Faculty Personnel Advisor, I've had at least one case where somebody was concerned about that and it struck me that that was an unusual circumstance, not that their case was unusual, but that it was unusual that that type of docking would take place.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Related to that when I and I've heard this from two folks, so a small end of course, but it's enough to raise some concern. I started getting some feedback from some of our department chairs, etc. and I think there needs to be some guidelines in terms of faculty leave and how that's viewed and those sorts of things. So I started working with Murali Krishnamurthi and Celeste Latham just to draft some guidelines. We have a leave policy in HR and, obviously, faculty we don't get vacation because we're less than 10 and a half months, but my thought is that from the chair's lens, department chair's lens, they certainly want some accountability. They want faculty to be at meetings and participate appropriately. On the other hand, as faculty we need a level of flexibility to execute our role. Some of us work on weekends and night classes and have varying schedules. And also our research and scholarly activity and engaging in that means that it may not equate to a standard work day.

So what the three of us have started is just some guidelines in terms of having some understanding from both the faculty and the administrative standpoint and the nature of our roles

and the need to have flexibility with those roles and collegial understanding and a level of negotiation at the front end of a semester in terms of what would be expected of faculty. And related to that larger issue, faculty leave and guidelines, are there any thoughts on that issue, questions, concerns? Certainly whatever guidelines we get in place would have to be vetted by legal. We bring it to this body as well. I think we would have to have the faculty's lens to that to make sure it reads appropriately. But we've looked at what a lot of other universities do and so forth. Yeah, George?

**G. Slotsve:** Yes, I just wanted to mention I was at the meeting with HR with Celeste and Bill where we discussed some of this and one other issue that did arise there was: Can you even use your sick time for missing a meeting or would there be some other penalty? In some sense it would have to be used whether it was even legal to use sick time or is that an inappropriate use of your sick time to say, well you're going to be docked sick time because you missed this particular meeting, we're saying you were sick and using that way.

**W. Pitney:** I'm glad you raised that because that reminded me of one other point, and that is we often have competing demands. We often have committee meetings that are at the same time as others and we can't be in two places at once. And that in those instances it's not as though a faculty member isn't doing his or her job right? We've got to have our administration understand that we do the best we can and that it would be inappropriate to do that. I think related to that issue, the point that came up is that the ethical aspect of that in terms of docking somebody's sick time if they're not sick and they're still doing their role right, so that's the other piece of that. So we're working on that, trying to see that through. I think some other concerns have bubbled up and that is if somebody's missed a meeting and we know they're not sick and we know they're on vacation and that hasn't been approved by a supervisor, what issues does that bring up? Having some guidelines in terms of spelling out what's appropriate, what's not appropriate, just so everybody is on the same page might have some value there. So we're working on that, we'll bring that to this body once we get a reasonable draft. Sarah, and then John, how about that we'll go to Sarah then John.

**S. Klaper:** In my role as ombudsperson I have faced this issue three times in the past year-ish, one at a college level and twice at departmental levels. And the discussion also should expand past meetings but also when faculty miss a class or have their TA or somebody else teach the class for them because that's an issue faculty have also addressed or faced with their department chairs; you know, whether they can be docked a day of pay for not attending their class and not getting permission in advance or whatever. So some more expanded guidelines on that as well, for chairs as well as faculty would be helpful probably.

**W. Pitney:** And so far it's only just in its infancy in terms of a draft form, but we're looking at missed class, missed other obligations, committee service, that sort of thing and so forth. John?

**J. Novak:** I wanted to say that I think the idea of missing one meeting is so trivial. There are people who miss all the meetings. And then I think those people usually you know it sound they're docked in their faculty service report. They may change their minds and start coming to meetings and you'll wish they didn't because they do all the talking.

**W. Pitney:** Things cut both ways, don't they sometimes? Very good, thank you. Any other items, questions, comments from the floor? Yes, Paul.

**P. Stoddard:** Another issue that maybe you want to take up that's come out of my FPA work is student evaluations. Specifically I mean what we are I think APPM says we're supposed to use student evaluations in the merit and evaluation process. And the problem has arisen where, especially in departments where student evaluations are done online, response rates can be very low and usually the people responding are the ones who have an axe to grind. And as a result, the student evaluations are skewed very heavily towards the negative when, in fact, that might not represent the faculty member's instructing capabilities at all. But, the way things stand right now, department has to use that and that can really offset a lot of good work that's being done. I think the council probably should take up some thought about response rates and so forth so that we're not unduly impacting people who are otherwise doing a good job.

**W. Pitney:** Right, great comment, and George, you have a follow-up there?

**G. Slotsve:** Just real quick I wanted to mention Charles Cappell and I think the Academic Committee two years ago maybe three, actually did a report that was trying to look at some of these issues so you might to go back and look at that information. They wrote a very good survey as I recall.

**W. Pitney:** It sounds like this issue is bubbling up again, however, right so is that something we'd like to maybe put to our academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee perhaps to have them maybe look at that previous report and maybe they could touch base with you to understand the nature of those concerns? Awesome, good. We'll do that. It sounds good. Any other comments, questions from the floor?

**T. Than:** You probably read about the nominations for the task force for the program prioritization. My department made some inquiries and found out that the nominations will be finally decided or members of the task force will be selected by a four-personnel committee so that committee includes the President, Executive Vice President and Provost, and Vice President for Admin and Finance and finally University Council Executive Secretary or Bill, himself. The question that comes up in the department: Is this body 75 percent administrators and 20 percent faculty members plus instructors? Why can not the instructor units or this body can select people who will represent us but the administrators selecting the members of the task force?

**W. Pitney:** Good question. I've heard that concern expressed from some other groups as well and I can comment on that. So let me let you know where that's at. So I met with Executive Vice President and Provost Lisa Freeman yesterday and raised these concerns. And the issues, as I understood them, are we would have a lower faculty ratio on those who would select the nominated people from the university. And so she and I weighed and considered our options. We looked at some other shared governance groups such as the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate, Steering Committee, and what we ended up thinking and agreeing upon, was to use the UAC Committee, the University Advisory Committee, which consists of all shared governance bodies: That's me, Deb Haliczner representing (and, Deb, this is the first you've heard this) Supportive Professional Staff; Operating Staff President Jay Monteiro, as well as three other

faculty. Right now Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge and Greg Waas are on that group. So in a sense you'd have four faculty plus an Operating Staff plus an SPS position. That seemed to be a reasonable approach in terms of making sure that we've got more faculty at the table, four of us, along with other constituency group representation. Right now that's being vetted to make sure that would be an appropriate thing. So legal is taking a look at that. So thank you for bringing that concern. Yes, Barbara?

**B. Jaffee:** (No microphone) Did I understand you to say that members of that selection committee would not ultimately serve on the task force?

**W. Pitney:** To me, that would be a conflict of interest, so if one of them has been nominated, I think what we'd have to do is figure out an alternate for that person. I think that's how that would have to work out. Yes sir, Tim?

**T. Ryan:** One of those questions that came up when we talked today, Bill, was about why shouldn't Faculty Senate get to approve the task forces once they're appointed? Shouldn't faculty have that much voice in deciding who's on the task force?

**W. Pitney:** We talked about that and I'm not sure we reached any conclusions, right, but the conversation has been started. I'm absolutely a proponent of having more faculty at the table to vet the nominations and identify an appropriate group of individuals who have been nominated and recommended and have a trustee mentality. And I think from that perspective, having a group like we've suggested in terms of UAC makes sense. As I think about that group working to evaluate the nominations in drawing up from however many we have to populate those task forces, we could certainly bring it to senate to vote on it. Now on the one hand, whether it's a blue ribbon panel on the workload policy or whatever other task force is created or constructed, it's not a process we've used a lot. Now I'm not – that doesn't mean we can't or shouldn't use it, but I think that could be very divisive. So you end up with folks who have been nominated by their peers, folks that have written recommendations for that, a committee, a shared governance committee has looked at that, identify the task force members, if they came here to be ratified, we could certainly approve that. We could go that route and if that's what the body wants to do, we could certainly explore that further. Yes, Rosemary?

**R. Feurer:** I would really advocate that. The UAC Committee, four faculty, is good; but I frankly on this issue, I think it should be all faculty. I understand the problems of bringing it here, but there are also problems of not bringing it here. I would urge to consider at least bypassing the UAC and just asking the Faculty Senate. I think that's fair that shared governance, and on this particular issue while I'm all for SPS representatives and Human Resources and all these other groups who are part of the university family, on this issue I think faculty need to have clear advocates and so just my opinion.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Deb?

**D. Haliczzer:** What I can argue about involving a predominate number of faculty and you know anyone on Resource, Space and Budget will quote me as saying that committees that are making selections should be dominated by faculty. That being said, the committee is going to be looking

at both academic programs as well as administrative. And so to have some involvement by a diverse set of personnel from the university to me makes sense as long as we continue with the principle of dominance by faculty.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Any thoughts? I can certainly appraise this group in terms of once we hear that vetted, but we've got a suggestion and certainly Rosemary voiced her support of that. Any others? Okay, so we've got those voices out there. Any motion, any action, Melissa?

**M. Lenczewski:** Should we take a straw poll just to see if we want this? I mean we're kind of quiet right now but should we do something or are we gonna say yes or no to this?

**W. Pitney:** A straw poll of sorts? Ferald can you – I'm typically against straw polls in bodies like this, but I'd like to hear from our parliamentarian.

**F. Bryan:** I can cite several places in Roberts where he makes it clear that they're not in favor of straw polls. We need to have a motion, seconded, to vote on. And it can be up or down, amended, you know the usual process, but Roberts does not support straw polls. So you're correct.

**W. Pitney:** So, if I can just comment, let me just react and I'm going to react by thinking out loud more than anything. So if you'll entertain me just for a moment while I entertain myself I suppose. So shared governance typically means we have sole decision making authority on a piece of something. Typically in higher ed, faculty own the curriculum within reason, right? And we can create our programs, move them through a peer review process and so forth.

The other piece is that we have a level of representation and input in a process. I think if we move to having the UAC representing the constituency groups and the largest portion of faculty, to me to follow that up with a level of ratification means that you don't trust or appreciate or value that group's decision. That's one way to look at it.

What if I took these concerns and maybe we could get an administrator dropped so that there's even proportionately even more faculty? For example, maybe it's the provost and Al Philips as the chief financial officer. He's the fourth one identified along with the president and myself in the current model that we're looking to change. I think Al brings an interesting perspective because he's not been here for even a month. Well he's been here working but not paid in the month of February when he was here, I don't think, so he's kind of an outsider to an extent and would probably bring a really fresh perspective in terms of evaluating the nominations. What about that? So then we'd have the four faculty, president of the SPS Council, president of the Operating Staff Council, the provost and the chief financial officer looking at those things. Does that seem like a win-win? Yes, Tim?

**T. Ryan:** Well, Bill, as we discussed this morning my concern is that the faculty have not been consulted at several key steps of the process at all. We were never consulted about program prioritization and the shape it would take initially. And now we are proposing to move ahead with task forces, one of which will evaluate the faculty and teaching side, again without faculty input. If it's possible for us to make a motion to vote on giving Faculty Senate the power to



approve the task force that is being put together without really any input or decision making from us, I would like to do that if anyone would like to second.

**Unidentified:** Could you repeat the motion?

**W. Pitney:** So Tim has put forward a motion.

**T. Ryan:** The motion is that Faculty Senate should vote to approve the particular task force that's being set up to assess the faculty and teaching side in program prioritization.

**R. Feurer:** I'll second it.

**W. Pitney:** So we have a motion and a second. Let's have some discussion with this item. I think to say that faculty have not been consulted again it goes back to our definitions of shared governance which are probably wide and varied here. From the outset when we were thinking of exploring this as a process, at the advice of the Higher Learning Commission identifying that we should do this prioritization on our campus, and after the Board of Trustees stated that we should align our budget with our strategic initiatives, it looked like this was the way to go. So as we explored that at the outset, Provost Freeman contacted me and said we need representation from everybody. I'm thinking Andy Small from the Operating Staff; certainly from the SPS I'm thinking of Kelly Wesener Michael. Let's think about faculty here for a moment. So in weighing and considering that, we looked at our shared governance bodies and Marc Falkoff was one of the faculty selected. Marc, are you chairing the APC, Academic Planning Council, or co-chairing?

**M. Falkoff:** Yes.

**W. Pitney:** And then Ibrahim Addel-Motaleb, he's the current chair of the Resource, Space and Budget. It seemed like a level of faculty – as well as myself – faculty representation to make sure that we were folded in that process at the outset, in addition to some other folks on the coordinating team. That's a piece so I don't know that we can say faculty weren't consulted or involved in some point in time. Marc, you want to go ahead and jump in now?

**M. Falkoff:** Thanks. So, I'm here as an APC representative. I guess I just want to make the point – I'm agnostic about the motion – but I do want to make the point that the baseline idea with prioritization is that it's a process that invites faculty participation rather than having determinations made from on high. It's an opportunity for us all as a community, faculty and all members of the community, to have some voice about the reallocation potentially of resources. To begin with, it's a process that we've been invited into and I think that we should welcome that opportunity. There has been, to a large degree, faculty participation. Part of it is what Bill has just described. The determination of the criteria to be used during the prioritization has been a campus-wide event. Everyone received those emails and had an opportunity to discuss. The final selection of those criteria is being made by a combined group of RSB and APC and now there's going to be some discussion about how the task force members are going to be chosen. Again, this could merge a little bit, but now it's clear there are two task forces, one of which is academic, academically oriented, and the other is administratively oriented. Then those decisions

are going to be made by, the ultimate decisions on prioritization, are going to be made by faculty. What happens with that information, of course, that lands in the lap of the president and provost and so forth. So I just want to weigh out some of context. There's a lot of faculty involvement. As far as the specific question about whether the members of the task force should be approved or chosen by this body, that's a different question.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, Marc. John and then Barbara.

**J. Novak:** I can say that, of all the faculty I know, nobody knows what's going on with the prioritization at all. That for administration that prides themselves on transparency, this is the most opaque thing I've encountered here. We're supposed to find a way to prove what we're doing is important, but we don't know what we're supposed to do. I just feel like, yeah, we need to know what it is we're supposed to be doing; it sounds so obvious but I don't think it's happening. Lisa Freeman told us a few months ago what the process isn't, but she didn't make clear what the process is.

**W. Pitney:** Barbara?

**B. Jaffee:** My concern goes to – it doesn't seem to me that this – what we've proposed to have the Faculty Senate ratify the selections is really going to make that much of a difference if what we're talking about is feeling confident in our representation on these task forces. And I think the issue really is: If all the colleges are going to have at least one representative on these task forces, why can't the colleges elect their own representative? And if they can't elect their own representative, if they're to be selected by some committee, it seems to me the sticking point is this idea of a trustee's mentality, which I find to be the strangest, most difficult to understand phrase I've ever encountered. You know if you had a trustee's mentality you'd probably be a trustee. I think we all care about the university. I think that, in fact, what is needed on a task force like this is zealous representation for every college so that every college can feel confident in this process. I'm not an economics scholar by any stretch of the imagination, but it seems to me that our fundamental believe in things like markets has to do with zealous self interest competing with zealous self interest. I don't understand this trustee's mentality thing. I don't understand – it seems to me that's the only reason why colleges can't elect their own representative.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Okay. So as I understand it, Tim Ryan's put a motion from the floor to have the Faculty Senate, right Tim, approve the task force. Now is that both task forces or one? Could you clarify that?

**T. Ryan:** I did say just the one task force, but I think that the most recent point raised was I think yet more germane. And if it is possible for me to withdraw the motion and for us to explore this idea of zealous representation of colleges electing members, because I was trying to address the issue I don't think the faculty has been sufficiently involved in the process in a way that gives them authority. We've been invited into the process; we've been invited to meetings; we've been sent emails; we've been given presentations. But we're not in the driving seat and we need to be driving as well. So if I could withdraw that motion and if we can talk further about the implicit

proposal I heard there, I think that sounds like a much more satisfactory way to bring faculty into the process in an authoritative way rather than in a passive way.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Ferald, could you guide me here in terms of withdrawing a motion? Is there anything else we need to do with that?

**F. Bryan:** The motion can be withdrawn if the mover and seconder agree. If they would agree, it doesn't exist.

**W. Pitney:** So, the motion is withdrawn and Rosemary says...Let's talk about this. Yes, Robin?

**R. Moremen:** Having served on numerous task forces over the various years that I have been here, my concern is not so much the constituency of the task force itself, but what input that task force will have in the final budgetary decision making process. We could meet, we can consult, we can provide input, but my concern is: Is this going to be a situation where the decisions are going to be made by individuals who will listen to us, perhaps patiently, but then proceed to do as they wish when all is said and done. So I'm less concerned about who's on the task force though I think zealous representation from all of the colleges would be totally appropriate. My concern extends beyond that to: Then what happens? Will this task force of zealous representatives have any final input in what ultimately happens to all of our programs?

**W. Pitney:** I can, can I comment on that? I think I might be able to lend a little bit of perspective on what happens after the task force. This is just based on how other task forces and institutions have operated within the prioritization process. And, Marc, I'm going to ask you to reel me in if I go off stray here. The task force would evaluate program reports. So the program reports would be built, populated, some data is going to be populated by a data team. There's data we have available that can be used and then the programs would have some narratives to write, some descriptive information, and even some data of their own.

The task forces would look at those and then they would draw up a set of recommendations in terms of all the programs. And when we look at all of these across the board, and from what I've seen most programs will have their, most task forces will have their recommendations aligned in quartiles or quintiles and the upper most quartile tends to be those programs that we should really invest in. There's high internal and external demand, the quality is high, etc. based on the report. And then on the other end of that continuum you've got maybe some that they recommend either further investigation or some form of restructuring. It could be the other end. Those are recommendations.

Those recommendations, as this plays out in other institutions, goes to the president and provost. And they get to put a lens to it because they ultimately are accountable for the budget and finances. They either approve or modify or in some instances I suppose reject some of those recommendations.

So let's take a look at this as it relates to academic programs because I think that's what we're most vested in here with this body. Would we agree, the academic piece? So once recommendations are received and approved by the president, those are going to be passed down

to the various departments and colleges where those programs reside. We have never said that the prioritization process as it stands is taking the place of any of our current curricular processes. That has never been said and we will still have those curricular processes in place. I think that's very critical and important to understand. Once the recommendations are levied down to the departments and maybe even the colleges, those programs will look at those recommendations.

And I think there are probably three things that could occur at that point in time. I think, on one hand, well we don't want three hands – on one end of a continuum, you could have a program say: Yeah you know what, that recommendation tells us what we've known for a long time and those changes make a lot of sense, so we're going to take those changes, and we're going to make them and we're going to work them through the curricular process to change the program or the catalog in whatever way was recommended.

On the other extreme, I suppose a program could say: No we're not going to do it. We don't agree with that recommendation and, therefore, we will not put forth any changes to the curricular process.

And probably somewhere in the middle are the recommendations where program personnel, faculty look at those and they say: Yeah you know what, that's not a bad recommendation, but it's a little off the mark. This was suggested, but maybe if we tweak it in some way, so instead of merging with this other program or changing some things in this way, we should merge with this other program or change it in that way. And then I think a level of negation could occur in terms of if that's a viable alternative to the recommendation. And if it is, they could put those things forward.

And so I kind of see it playing out in that way. Now not ever having gone through a prioritization process and implemented the recommendations, there are like other permutations of that that could occur. But what I understand from all who have done it, that implementation piece is the tough part and probably for those variety of reasons. I think the take home message here is that we're not saying we're getting rid of the curricular process at all and so that will be an added step afterwards. Rosemary?

**R. Feurer:** I think what's missing from this discussion is the very premise of this and the endorsement of faculty of the very premise and also the fact that people have examples from across the United States where this book has been used to implement program prioritization and the picture isn't pretty. It's very dismal and the premise is that you will reduce faculty in most cases. And we already have, you know we have such attrition, it's 650 faculty at this university. In the last four years, we keep having more and more attrition and the premise of this program seems to me to be more attrition of faculty. That is the very premise that's going on. We don't have the statistics of student-to-administrator ratio in saying, well let's figure out how to reduce all of these administrative positions. I think in most of these we have – there's some that might be implemented, but for the most part I think the thing we have to safeguard as a faculty is the very notion of a university and what it is. I think that's what I would like is people who would bring up those kinds of questions before we start telling faculty to do more work, to do more work with less faculty in their department, we need to have a discussion about what the

university looks like. I know that this thing just keeps going on, but without some kind of safeguard and collective bargaining or other rights, that is what is going to be the outcome of this premise.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Yes Barbara?

**B. Jaffee:** I think we all sense that there will be a reduction to the budget – that one of the goals implicit in prioritization is to reduce the budget. And it might have the effect that you're talking about. But at the very least we should know that budgets, monies will be reallocated. Even if it's not about reducing the total, there will be winners and losers in this. And folks that come out at the bottom of the ranking will see their funding reallocated higher. And it's all well and good to say we in the faculty can decide how we want to deal with these recommendations, but we'll be dealing with these recommendations with fewer recourses. That's the kicker that comes along with it. So we will have to deal with them, whatever process we use, to do that. It is a very serious business. In fact I'm wondering now that I'm thinking about it, why are there two separate task forces for administration and academics? I mean that's your point about how we need to look at the university holistically. What's the advantage of two separate task forces?

**W. Pitney:** I think the advantage, as I understand it, is that the criteria may be different to be applied to administrative versus academic. For example if you think of – let's say we had a criteria, for example, the importance of a program to the institution's mission. And we may have that for both programs, administrative and academic. In fact personally I hope we do because I think we have to always have in front of us the mission of the institution and what's important. So in that instance, I guess with that example maybe we could have one task force. What's recommended though is two because there is enough nuances and differences between administrative programs and academic programs. It's hard to evaluate them in the same bucket. Buildings and Grounds versus Biology is an example. How do you compare those? No offense, Joel, I just thought of you there as Biology. Very different types of things so how do you evaluate those and so forth? Joel?

**J. Stafstrom:** Is it known how the recommendations of the two task forces will be intertwined or meshed into a single decision making process?

**W. Pitney:** Good question. Marc, do you happen to have any insights there? I don't recall that we've had that discussion in terms of how the decisions from the two task forces will be intertwined. I don't know.

**M. Falkoff:** No we haven't but I don't believe there's any sense that the lists are going to merge in some way. I think that the end product is going to be two lists, administrative criteria ranked or put into buckets and academic criteria put into buckets.

**W. Pitney:** I'm sorry, I can't answer that. I don't know the answer there.

**B. Jaffee:** Can you remind me of the composition of these task forces? I remember the line about one person from each college as a minimum but does that mean one person from each college on each of the two task forces or?

**W. Pitney:** For the academic program task force, that's true. And then the other piece is up to 20 faculty would be on that, representation from each college. And then there are the other characteristics. But the administrative one, I would have to look at the website, I'm embarrassed to say I'd have to look at the website.

**M. Konon:** It says staff, tenured faculty and instructors, at least one from each division, no more than 20 for the administrative one.

**B. Jaffee:** At least one from each division and those are the three divisions that you just, what are they, staff...so there could be as few as one faculty member on the administrative task force? I'm just responding to what you're saying. Did I hear that right?

**W. Pitney:** I can go back and clarify if there's a set number that is recommended for the faculty. So, Barbara, to answer your question, I don't know the details of the administrative program task forces, but I can certainly check. I'm happy to do so. Any other questions or comments?

**B. Jaffee:** I'd like to move that we – I think that we should – what we would like to see in this process is the election of faculty members representing colleges to happen at the college level for both task forces. This is not part of the motion, but I think in a little bit we're focusing, I'm focusing on the wrong thing. I think it's this administrative task force that maybe we should be thinking more about now that I hear what it's made up of. So I think there should be equal representation on both task forces and that elections of college's representatives should happen on the college level. That's my motion.

**W. Pitney:** So if I understand your motion, it's to have the election of faculty members for the academic task force occur the college level?

**B. Jaffee:** The academic and the administrative. There should be one faculty member from each college, at least one faculty member from each college, on both task forces and the elections of those representatives should happen at the college level.

**R. Feurer:** Some colleges are really numerically small. The faculty is a small number compared to, for instance, LA&S. Would you consider proportional?

**B. Jaffee:** Sure I said at least one so I could have an upper limit.

**R. Feurer:** Right. I think there should be an upper limit too but I was just worried I guess that some department would feel underrepresented in this construction.

**W. Pitney:** From colleges?

**R. Feurer:** Within like College of Engineering versus LA&S.

**B. Jaffee:** I accept that as a friendly amendment, proportional representation from the colleges with elections occurring at the college level.

**W. Pitney:** So, we've got a motion. Is there a second?

**R. Feurer:** I'll second it.

**W. Pitney:** Discussion? Marc, please?

**M. Falkoff:** I was just going to recommend that you might want to, again I'm agnostic about all of it, but you might want to break up the motion into two parts. The college representation might make clear sense for the academic task force and it might be a little more complicated for the administrative. And it just might be easier to talk about the academic first and but it's too late, I'm sorry. The boat sails.

**W. Pitney:** Sorry, sorry I missed that. Discussion? So I'm gonna put forth a couple of discussion points here. So far the way the coordinating team has operated, and to remind you the coordinating team has representation from myself, Marc Falkoff and Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb. And we've operated in looking at how other universities have run their prioritization process. Now that doesn't mean to say we have to do what other folks have done, but I should put it out there that it's not as though we've made these decisions willy-nilly. And I also think that we had a good faith conversation with Provost Freeman. I did yesterday and she understood the concerns of our faculty and was willing to change the approach and make sure there were more faculty represented on the group that selected those who are nominated. I just put that out there as some discussion points. I understand that, on the one hand, there's this thought that, boy the, to use an old expression for the 70's, so-and-so is going to stick it to me, and this thought in higher ed sometimes that the administration is going to run rough shod and try to do what they want to do for their own best interest.

I think a couple things that are noteworthy, and that is with this process here compared to other universities, and Lisa mentioned this at her January presentation, and that is there's no sacred cows. Other universities have said we're going to evaluate all programs except for athletics, for example. We've not done that. Others have said we're going to evaluate all programs except for the president's office. We're not going to do that. That's on the table so all programs will have to submit a report and will be evaluated by the task forces. So you've got that, you've got the good faith effort to say you know what we get the concerns expressed by the faculty and so maybe let's look at some alternatives to having a heavy administrative lens applied to selecting those who are nominated. If, indeed, there is a divide between faculty and administration and if, indeed, we can negotiate a way to make things a win-win as she and I did yesterday, I think that goes a long way to mending some of those fences and tearing down some of those perspectives that we tend to have. I think a motion like this would kind of derail things a little bit, but that's Bill Pitney, that's necessarily the president of the Faculty Senate. Go ahead.

**B. Jaffee:** Well, I don't think we have any binding authority so we can vote it up or we can vote it down, but it would give us a voice in this. Actually what I wanted to say was, it's not so much the idea of heavy administrative representation. I would like someone to explain this phrase, trustee's mentality, to me. The fact that elections aren't happening at the college level suggests



that the administration doesn't think that we would elect someone with a trustee's mentality. I see that as the only sticking block.

**W. Pitney:** We are going to have Marc comment and then I've got a comment related to that.

**M. Falkoff:** The theory is that you want the task forces to be populated by faculty that put the best interests of the entire university at the forefront and that you don't populate the task forces with people who are there to stake out their own territory, prepare to engage in turf wars, prepare to engage in log rolling. That may be a kind of pangolin view of what's going to happen and maybe inevitably there's going to be exactly the kind of log rolling that you don't want. But it's actually, I guess, the vision is not to have the zealous advocacy going on during the task forces but to have a group comprised of people who are going to work together to figure out what's best for the university. Maybe that's impossible and maybe it's worth just giving up on that goal, but that's what it is. It's truly the opposite, the zealous advocacy is supposed to happen by the people, by the folks, the chairs, whoever is writing the reports that are going to be submitted to the task forces. At least that's my understanding of what the vision is. So I think that's what the provost means when she's hoping for people with the trustee mentality.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, Marc, and I think in terms of the selection I think generally when other institutions have done this and used the nomination process the thought has been, whether right or wrong, that if you end up with a pool of individuals who are nominated and those are made in good faith with recommendations from peers and references, that really it's a matter of having a group of individuals selecting the best of the best that have that mentality going forward. So I think that's the spirit of how that plays out.

And you're right, we're advisory right so we've got a motion and a second on the floor. I've expressed my viewpoints, others have as well. Regardless of how this comes forward, please know I will take this forward and represent the faculty based on this vote. So I think we're going to need the clickers, please. Actually I'd like to call for a roll call vote, please. Pat, could you arrange for that? So you won't need your clickers. So the way this will play out, Pat will go through and go through the roll and if you are in favor of the motion you say aye.

**F. Bryan:** Could we have a restatement of the motion so everybody understands it?

**W. Pitney:** Yes, a restatement of the motion, please, so everybody understands it. Barb, are you ready to restate that? It was seconded by Rosemary. So I think you moved to have the Faculty Senate...

**J. Novak:** We are wondering why this can't be confidential. All of a sudden, everything's always been confidential.

**W. Pitney:** It has been. That's not always how we've operated and whether it's minutes to do a verbal vote or whatnot or clickers, I wanted to get an understanding of the votes. I'm seeing heads shaking.

**Unidentified:** Usually the vote shows on the screen.

**W. Pitney:** Correct. I was interested in understanding who voted in what way. If there's opposition to that...

**Unidentified:** There's opposition.

**W. Pitney:** Okay so get your clickers. Meghann, will you bring me a clicker. So, Barbara, what I've got is that you move to have the Faculty Senate approve a proportional representation of faculty from each college on the task force? Is that right?

**B. Jaffee:** The voting should happen at the college level.

**W. Pitney:** Okay so let me restate the motion as I think I understand it and make sure we have clarity. The motion that was moved and seconded was to have the Faculty Senate recommend that there be a proportional representation of faculty from each college on the task forces and that the task force members be selected by the colleges. Is that correct? So for your vote, press 1 or A for yes and approve the motion; 2 or B for no, and 3 to abstain. Are we all set, Pat? So go ahead and vote now. Are we all set? Do we want to close the vote yet or do you need a second? Okay so we're all set to close the vote. Motion passes 25 to 10 and 4 abstains. So it passes and I will draw this up and forward a letter of this motion to the provost and president and we'll go from there. Any other comments, questions from the floor?

1 – Yes – 25

2 – No – 10

3 – Abstain – 4

**F. Bryan:** Bill, can I just clarify something? I don't usually say this but this is a learning moment perhaps. Any time anyone makes a motion, they have the right to indicate how they wish the vote: I move by rising vote or by a roll call vote. Typically, the form of voting needs to be incorporated into the motion unless it's not and then we would typically go to a default function which is what many of you were objecting to. And in the future, if that comes up, simply rise to make a point of order: Why are we voting this way when this has been our tradition or there was no indication of a roll call vote incorporated in the motion?

**W. Pitney:** In the motion, okay very good.

**F. Bryan:** That's how that should be done.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you sir, I appreciate it.

**F. Bryan:** Just a point of clarification.

**W. Pitney:** You got it.

## **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

## **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**W. Pitney:** Seeing no other comments questions from the floor a motion to adjourn.

**Unidentified:** So moved.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Seconded, all in favor say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.**