

4-21-2010

## FS Minutes 2010-04-21

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate>

---

### Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "FS Minutes 2010-04-21" (2010). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 3.  
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate/3>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact [jschumacher@niu.edu](mailto:jschumacher@niu.edu).

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES / [AGENDA](#) / [TRANSCRIPT](#)  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21 2010, 3 P.M.  
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM**

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

**PRESENT:** Allori, Armstrong, Azad, Baker, Bennardo, Bisplinghoff, Brubaker, Burell, Cappell, Collins, Deng, Feurer, Fisher, Garcia, Goldblum, Gupta, Haliczzer, Hansen, Henry, Hillery, Hurych, Jaffee, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kostic, Kowalski, Latham, for Cesarek, Lenczewski, Martin, Mirman, Monteiro, Moraga, Newman, Nicolosi, Novak, Rintala, Rosenbaum, Zahay-Blatz, R. Schneider, Slotsve, Smith, Staikidis, Thompson, Thu, Tonks, Valentiner, Wade, Zittle.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

**ABSENT:** Arriola, Bishop, Blecksmith, Boughton, Brandt, Bujarski, Butler, Cripe, Elish-Piper, Freedman, Greene, Gough, Lash, Lin, Liu, Lukacher, Lusk, Marchewka, Matousek, Mogren, Morris, Parks, Ridnour, D. Schneider, Shortridge, Stravers, Stephen, Sweet, Unger, Yamagata-Lynch.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The motion to accept the agenda with the addition of one walk-in report was made by **D.Wade** and seconded by **C.Garcia**. It passed without dissent.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES](#) OF THE MARCH 31, 2010 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (sent electronically)**

The motion to accept the minutes was made by **W.Baker** and seconded by **C. Garcia**. It passed without dissent.

**IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The motion to go into executive session was made by **A.Rosenbaum** and seconded by **J.Novak**. **S.Armstrong** conducted the session in place of **M.Morris** and also served as secretary.

- A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of the University Council.
- B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor.

Executive session ended and the Senate meeting reconvened at 3:31 p.m.

## V. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Recognition of Faculty Senate members

**A.Rosenbaum** thanked retiring members of the Senate for their service, announced the names of those members who have been re-elected, and introduced the newly elected members.

**A.Rosenbaum** updated the Senate on the library resolution. The Library Advisory Committee has met several times. Provost Alden charged the committee with addressing the concerns of the Faculty Senate. They have, in my opinion, taken this charge very seriously. We now have a full list of the items that were removed in the JSTOR debacle. But we do not have a list of other items that were removed, and the Library Advisory Committee is aware of this. There is also a mechanism in place for those departments that want to try to get their paper media back. Departments can have a hearing with the Library Advisory Committee, and they will listen to why you want them back, what is involved in getting them back and whether it is feasible. They will have the first meeting on April 28 at which time two departments will present their arguments. It is not too late for departments to ask for their materials back. There is a form on the library website that you can file with concerns or to ask questions and the Library Advisory Committee will respond.

In the fall, the Library Advisory Committee will decide how to incorporate faculty feedback into the process of removing materials. My hope is that we can convince them of the idea of posting the titles of everything that is scheduled to be removed at least a month in advance so faculty can express their concerns and participate in generating solutions.

Provost Alden has taken this very seriously; the Library Advisory Committee has taken this seriously, and as far as I can tell the response is a positive one.

**A.Rosenbaum:** I attended a meeting of the Committee of Illinois University Senates. The Committee is trying to find ways of connecting all of the public universities. The committee is hoping that the public universities can unite for the purposes of exchanging credits, making decisions about dividing up courses, and ordering supplies. CIUS is putting together a subcommittee and I will be looking for a faculty member who is interested in participating on that committee where you will be meeting with representatives of all the other public universities for purposes of seeing if we can act more like a single group rather than nine different organizations. So the potential here is

good considering the economic climate and the way the state is dealing with higher education. I think that there will be greater safety in banding together with all of the other public universities. We will be talking more about that as that develops. If you are interested in doing this, or you know of someone who is, the first meeting of this sub-group is going to take place at the beginning of the summer and it will be held at Urbana. Anyone who is interested can email me or come and talk to me and I will tell you more about it.

**A.Rosenbaum:** Regarding the Raise Equity Committee, we have to say that we are disappointed that we do not have a report for you at this point. We do not have the data that was promised to us. The university is in the process of putting that data together so they are not refusing. Neither is it possible for them to get the data together for us quickly enough.

**R. Feurer:** We do have data. It is really difficult to compile it. It is data that we entered while waiting on the university data. Our hope is to get a report fairly soon.

**A.Rosenbaum:** I didn't mean that we did not have any data, I meant that we do not have a complete data set and we have not received the data that we have requested from the university. That does not mean that we are not going to get some answers. The best we can promise at this point is that we wanted to have this at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate but we have failed to do that. We will keep you posted. We are going to keep working on this through the summer and the committee is determined to answer the questions. We will send out e-mails and we will find ways of notifying the faculty of the results of our efforts. So, again, we are sorry that we do not have that for you, but we are continuing to work on it.

**P.Henry:** It is really amazing that this started in the fall, and I don't know if I speak for many people, but I feel very disappointed that the data was not made forthcoming by the administration. I think they really let us down.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I agree with you and we are all pretty upset about that. I think at least part of that is the way that data is stored at this university. I don't want to get into this again. I know people have suspicions about this.

**R.Feurer:** I want to say that I think the positive thing is that our willingness to act is the reason that we are going to get the data. I don't think that we would have it otherwise. It is going to have a lot more transparency and that is what we need. So no matter what the data actually tell us, I don't know if it is going to prove what we suspect at all. It makes a lot of information available for the first time.

**A.Rosenbaum:** Yes, I think that is true. This is a good lead-in for my last comment. One of the points I was trying to make in my letter accepting the nomination is that for a long time we have heard faculty complaining about the erosion of shared governance at this university. And I think to a certain extent this is true but I think to a certain extent the faculty also has some responsibility for that. If we are going to ask for shared

governance we are going to have to step up to the plate and go after it. We have to work on these committees. I think a lot of the chairs of the committees have been disappointed with member participation. Members fail to attend meetings and often don't even respond to emails. In the next few weeks you are going to get a form from us that asks you what committees you want to serve on next year and whether you are willing to serve as chairs of those committees. In the past, Senators have failed to return the forms and few have volunteered to serve as committee chairs. If we are going to have an impact, we have to assert ourselves through our committees to the administration and that is why Research Space and Budget is now meeting with the president and the provost, that's why we have the Raise Equity Committee and we have the president's attention on this. I think we are going to get a concession that things are going to be done differently if, in fact, there is something there. And that's because we are pursuing it and we are asserting ourselves. So, I am asking you to please look over those committee assignments and be prepared to roll up our sleeves and let's do our part in shared governance. Complete those forms, send them back to us, and please volunteer to be a chair. And once you are a chair, hold meetings and let's push to get our voice heard on the issues of concern to the faculty. Keep in mind, the financial crisis is not ending because the semester ends, so going forward we are going to have to fight for what the faculty wants. We want to be in on this process before that happens. I think we should be prepared and that means that we are going to have to do some work. So I urge you to please take these committee assignments seriously.

The last thing is that I promise shorter minutes next year. I will work on that.

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

## **VII. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

### **A. FAC to IBHE - Earl Hansen – [report](#) (pp. 3-5).**

The general discussion of the impact of the state budget crisis on our institutions has basically been a thread that has run through our meetings for months and months and it has not changed. I need to go back and talk to these people next month with some idea of what we as faculty members are going to do. You cannot represent yourself to your legislature as a faculty person. You can represent yourself as an individual and as a tax payer. That basically has been drilled into our heads. The basic question is, "how do we get the information to the general taxpayer that we have to have funding in higher education and education in the State of Illinois?" That is the whole thing in a nut shell.

- A. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report.
- B. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – no report.
- C. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek — no report.
- D. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

**IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report.
- B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonia Armstrong, Chair – no report.
- C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair – report.

**M.Morris** was absent and **B.Jaffee** presented the report in his place.

**B.Jaffee:** The Resource, Space and Budget Committee met with President Peters and Provost Alden on April 15. I am the University Council chair of the committee and I am reporting for my co-chair from Faculty Senate, Michael Morris. At that meeting, President Peters and Provost Alden identified three general principles that guide the budgeting process and they were, maybe not necessarily in this order, but certainly first was the need to serve our students well. An imperative to enhance the university’s impact and reputation, and finally an imperative to diversify our income streams. And as you can tell from that list, they are qualitative goals with which we could all agree in principle. The thorny issue is how these things are done in practice and how they translate to allocations to various units across the university.

This is a committee that has not functioned according to its constitutional mandate for a number of years, so we took the year to reboot the committee. But, having gotten to this point, we do not want to lose this momentum. So, a number of very productive things came out of that meeting. First of all, at President Peters’ recommendation, the committee will begin this fall to follow along with the budget building process. Dr. Williams is an ex-officio member of the committee to begin with, but the idea is that we will meet with him and his staff as they begin the process of building the budget for fiscal year 2012. And so the committee will have regular meetings to track that process.

Among the other items that were discussed was collecting and analyzing financial audits, the annual audits that are done of the university as a way to better

understand, not just the way that money is proposed to be spent, but how it is actually spent. And finally, to create a more standardized mechanism through which to gather faculty input and to get a sense of faculty priorities in terms of budgeting, resources and spaces.

And what the committee is recommending is that we put together a survey or questionnaire and circulate this in faculty to get a sense of shared priorities across the various colleges and then to be able to communicate this to the upper administration in our subsequent meetings. And this may happen more than once. Maybe each semester. Circulate a questionnaire and gather information.

**A.Rosenbaum:** This sounds like a positive development. Any of you who want to participate in this should volunteer to be on Resource, Space and Budget.

**B. Jaffee:** I want to give the committee a plug in part because I am not going to be here next year. I am on sabbatical and this is the end of my term on the University Council. I am going to document everything we did very well and I am also going to create a sample survey or questionnaire based on the discussions we had this year and what I think would really solicit the kinds of information that would be useful for the committee. So I hope that people will step up and be involved with this committee because it seems like there is going to be real opportunity here to have some effect.

**A.Rosenbaum:** Thank you Barbara and we appreciate the committee's efforts to get involved with the budget.

- D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report.
- E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report.
- E. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair – report.
  - 1. Election of the President of the Faculty Senate 2010-2011.

**D.Wade:** We have a number of things we have to do today. The first is the election of the President of the Faculty Senate. Historically, this has been done by a voice vote. Apparently the constitution requires that this be a secret ballot. I am willing to make a motion to suspend the secret ballot.

**D.Wade** made the motion to suspend the secret ballot. The motion was seconded by **W.Baker**. The motion carried.

Then I am going to move to accept the nomination of Alan Rosenbaum as executive secretary. **D.Wade** made the motion to accept the nomination

of Alan Rosenbaum for the position of executive secretary. The motion was seconded by **A.Gupta**. The motion passed without dissent.

2. Election of UCPC representatives for 2010-2012

**D.Wade:** Distributed the ballots by college and asked Senators to return the completed ballots to the UC office.

3. Committees of the University 2010-2011 vacancies for Faculty Senate vote.

**D.Wade:** Stated that most of the vacancies have only one candidate. Votes were conducted on those elections with more than one candidate. The first vote was for the position on the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee. Earl Hansen was elected. The second is the University Press Board. Heidi Fehrenbach was elected. In the third contested election Douglas Bowman outpolled Sue Willis for a seat on the Library Advisory Committee.

The other committee positions were uncontested and the Senate approved the candidates in a single, bloc vote

**A.Rosenbaum:** Thanked the Senate for its support.

## X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### A. Academic Misconduct Policy

**A.Rosenbaum:** You received something from me during the week that summarized the details of this issue. We have a motion on the table to accept Option Two. Does anybody have any further discussion of Option Two since you have all read it, discussed it, and thought about it.

**P. Henry:** Asked for clarification.

**A.Rosenbaum:** The difference between them is Options One and Two have the Judicial Board being advisory only with regards to the penalty.

Whereas **Option Three** has it being advisory with respect not only to the penalty, but also with respect to guilt or innocence. That is the main difference between them. I have met with Brian Hemphill. He is very much in agreement with the idea that the Judicial Board should no longer be involved in anything related to the penalty. They will maintain though, that the Judicial Board should be involved in decisions of guilt or innocence when the student is contesting that because that is due process and they are adamantly in favor of that.



**C.Cappell:** I want to speak out in favor of Option Three. Option Two says that the Judicial Board will have only reversal rights on the guilt or innocence, but it would be hard to enforce a penalty if the Judicial Board found, contrary to the professor and the department chair, that a student was innocent rather than guilty. This is an instance of nullification where in a sense the faculty-imposed penalty and original jurisdiction is nullified by reversing a finding, quite removed from the original jurisdiction. I think that, as a Faculty Senate, we should protect our faculty prerogatives and our faculty professionalism and let penalties that involve only a course grade or less be adjudicated by the faculty and the student and the chair. There is due process in that the student can appeal for an advisory review to the Judicial Board under Option Three and there are some instances where some other due process could take place through the normal grade appeal process. For example, the Judicial Board found a finding contrary to the department level, then the student could say that this grade was capricious and there would be pressure again on the professor to address that. And then again, there are peer pressures and professional norms that are enforced at the department level. Again, we are not writing the policy, we are presenting a series of recommendations to the people who will be writing the policy. And I think our recommendation should be a strong case for faculty prerogative and autonomy.

**C.Thompson:** I am not in favor of Option Two or Three so I would probably be voting against it. Particularly, we have a duty to protect the student's due process. If I accuse a student of cheating, they have a right to go before some board to determine the guilt or innocence; they need an independent board to do that. If they are found innocent, well, then I was wrong. I mean, it just boggles my mind to think that we would not give the students due process. I do believe that we must give students due process if we are accusing them of cheating. That is different than our assessment of them as a grade; we are saying that they are, that they have done something wrong and we should not be the judge and the jury.

An extensive discussion followed in which the question of due process was either endorsed or contested by various Senators. An attempt was made to introduce a friendly amendment to remove the last sentence which gives a student the right to appeal the penalty to the College Council. It was rejected by the original maker of the motion (**C.Cappell**). Anyone interested in the complete details of the discussion is referred to the full transcript which is available on the Faculty Senate website.

**A.Rosenbaum:** Called for an end to the discussion and a vote on the motion. Option Two as written is on the table. If you don't like the way Option Two is written, you vote "no." If you like the way Option Two is written, vote "yes." If we vote Option Two down, we can then entertain either Option One or a variation of Option Two, or Option Three. Option Two was defeated by a voice vote.

**A.Gupta:** Moved Option One as written. **J.Jeffrey** seconded. Option One was passed by a vote of 14 in favor, 9 opposed, and three abstentions. The text of Option One follows:

**Proposed language for the Academic Dishonesty Policy - Approved by Faculty Senate- 4/21/10**

**“A faculty member has original jurisdiction over any instances of academic misconduct that occur in a course which the faculty member is teaching. The student shall be given the opportunity to resolve the matter in meetings with the faculty member and the department chair. If the facts of the incident are not disputed by the student, the faculty member may elect to resolve the matter at that level by levying a sanction no greater than an F for that course. The faculty member shall notify the student in writing whenever such action is taken, and the [University Judicial Office](#) shall receive a copy of the *Academic Misconduct Incident Report* indicating final disposition of the case, which will be placed in the student’s judicial file. In all matters where the charge of academic misconduct is disputed by the student or if the faculty member feels a sanction greater than an F in the course is appropriate (such as repeated offenses or flagrant violations), the faculty member shall refer the matter to the University Judicial Office making use of the *Academic Misconduct Incident Report*. Additional sanctions greater than an F in a course can be levied only through the University Judicial System.”**With regards to the finding of guilt or innocence, the ruling of the Judicial Hearing Board shall be binding. In cases where there is either a finding of guilt or an admission of guilt by the student, any recommendations by the hearing board regarding the course grade are non-binding on the instructor, who remains solely responsible for assigning a course grade, consistent with the policies set forth in the course syllabus. In cases where the student feels the penalty is inappropriate, an appeal of the penalty only, may be made to the college council.

It will be passed along to The Undergraduate Coordinating Council and the Vice-President for Student Affairs as the Senate’s recommendation.

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

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

**XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. [Academic Planning Council Meeting Minutes, March 22, 2010](#)
- B. [Undergraduate Coordinating Council Meeting Minutes, September 3, 2009](#)
- C. [Undergraduate Coordinating Council Meeting Minutes, October 1, 2009](#)
- D. [Undergraduate Coordinating Council Meeting Minutes, February 4, 2010](#)

E. [Undergraduate Coordinating Council Meeting Minutes, March 4, 2010](#)

#### **XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Before I entertain a motion to adjourn, I would like to wish you a good summer and hope to see you all again at our first meeting in September. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

**E.Hansen** made the motion to adjourn which was seconded by **D. Zahay-Blatz**. The meeting was adjourned at 4:28 p.m.