

MINUTES

Faculty Senate-University Council Rules, Governance and Elections Committee
Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 10 a.m.
Holmes Student Center, Room 306
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Chomentowski (for Johnston-Rodriguez), Gilson (for Elish-Piper), Johnson, Meyer (for Doederlein) Millis, Mooney, Pearson, Scherer, Schraufnagel, Sharp, Siegesmund, Tatara

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Doederlein, Elish-Piper, Johnston-Rodriguez

OTHERS PRESENT: Thu

I. CALL TO ORDER

FS-UC RGE Chair, **R. Siegesmund** called the meeting to order at 10 a.m.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

A quorum was established.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

I. Pearson moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by **K. Millis**. Motion passed.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 8, 2018 MINUTES – Pages 2-3

R. Tatara moved to approve the minutes, seconded by **K. Millis**. Motion passed.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Compensation of the University Council Executive Secretary/Faculty Senate President (ESP)

R. Siegesmund stated that consideration of the proposal regarding the compensation of the University Council Executive Secretary/Faculty Senate President (ESP) continues to be tabled until further clarification by legal counsel as to how this proposal relates to the faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Discuss proposed shared governance changes to establish Faculty Senate as the body responsible for academic affairs – separate packet

K. Thu summarized the goal of the proposed amendments, which is to transfer academic authority from University Council (UC) to Faculty Senate (FS).

R. Siegesmund led the members through a discussion of the proposed amendments, in which the following points were raised:

- The proposed amendments are intended to address the main goal of transferring academic authority from UC to FS, but in doing so, other issues have been raised.
- Concern was expressed regarding the collateral impact of the proposed amendments on staff, such as UC representation, codification of staff personnel advisers, staff sabbaticals, and the need for clarification with regard to academic misconduct.
- Some members expressed a preference that these various related issues and impacts be addressed, and included in the proposed amendments, before the proposal goes forward to FS and/or UC.
- Some expressed a preference that the main faculty-related proposal not be combined with the other related issues and impacts, but that those other related issues and impacts be addressed as a next step following approval of the current proposal.
- It was suggested that an addendum of identified concerns for future review and action be developed.
- A concern was expressed that institutional memory, as well as commitment to this project, could be lost from one year to the next, thereby putting future action on these related issues and impacts at risk.
- It was noted that the proposal, in its current form, lacks the support of students and staff. Is this the opportunity to invest the time to craft a proposal that addresses all concerns?
- The point was reinforced that Faculty Senate, in its current form, lacks credibility, and this proposal is meant to address only that academic issue.

S. Sharp moved to move the proposal forward, seconded by **R. Scherer**.

S. Schraufnagel offered a friendly amendment that, if substantive changes are made by University Council, after changes are approved by Faculty Senate, that this revised document be brought back to Faculty Senate for consideration by the RGE committee and the full Faculty Senate, even if it means sacrificing a year, so that this vetting process is a genuine one. The friendly amendment was accepted by **S. Sharp**. The friendly amendment was accepted by **S. Sharp**.

I. Pearson offered a friendly amendment that the committee meet a second time in order to make an effort to address all the submitted comments before the January 22

Faculty Senate meeting. It was further noted that the committee could continue its review, even while the proposal is shared with Faculty Senate members. The friendly amendment was accepted by **S. Sharp**.

Motion, as friendly amended, passed by voice vote.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

N. Johnson moved to adjourn, seconded by **I. Pearson**. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.