

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

October 11, 2011 LL Library Classroom

Present: Kim Ambriz, Sandra Beyda, Loretta Capeheart, Denise Cloonan, Nont Dhiensiri, Lidia Filus, Ana Fraiman, Richard Grossman, Joyce Jennings, Mary Kimble, Mark McKernin, Mark Melton (for Dario Villa) Linda Nidelkoff, Roger Reinsch, Zachary Schiffman, Marcelo Sztainberg, Brett Stockdill, Mary Thill

Excused: Greg Anderson, Sundaram Dorai, Judy Kaplan-Weinger, Phyllis Le Dosquet, Dario Villa

Absent: John Bernbom

Ex Officio: Allen Shub, Jon Hageman

Chair M. McKernin called the meeting to order at 3:05

1) Minutes

Discussion included questioning the quoting/paraphrasing of member input without attributing authorship, the non-inclusion of context, suggesting that reference to Robert's Rules regarding minutes recording and that the members consider audio recording, and commenting that editorializing may have occurred in the recording of the minutes.

It was suggested that we keep the minutes to motions, topics and resolutions, suggesting that the omission of content and context could be risky. A more formal method would free up discussion as people would not be afraid of how they would come off in the minutes and that this approach would be more oriented towards action, commenting that minutes might not be the best means to inform the constituency.

One member stated they found the level of detail useful in making the issues clearer and wondered if audio recording was doable. Another agreed that the minutes should reflect who said what and mentioned that the minutes are a matter of public record and should reflect the different perspectives within the senate.

It was also stated that a lot more people spoke than who were recorded in the minutes but that making the minutes more accurate would be time consuming.

Was commented that audio recording was problematic.

Motion (M. Sztainberg, S. Beyda): the approval of minutes for September 27th be tabled and re-presented by the Steering Committee at the next meeting in a form to reflect the concerns expressed above passed (one opposed, one abstention).

Motion (A. Fraiman, Z. Schiffman) that the Steering Committee present guidelines for minutes recording after researching Robert's Rules of Order passed.

2) Chair's Report

M. McKernin reported that he met with representatives from other constituencies to elect the next chair for the University Planning and Budget Committee to start next year. After recommendations and interviews the group decided on Marcelo Sztainberg. He will observe this year and begin as chair next year, serving for three years. In two years the next chair will be selected to start a year later.

3) President's Report

A. Shub reported that the Ombuds Working Group met today, the University Council Working Group will meet on Friday and the president looks forward to continued work with the senate.

4) Subcommittees

D. Cloonan self nominated and was elected by the membership to serve on the Academic Freedom Subcommittee. Marcelo Sztainberg self nominated and was elected by the membership to serve on the Parking Appeals Subcommittee.

5) Old Business: Nomination and election of a representative for the University Council Working Group

Motion to table the nomination until after the discussion of "On Enhancing Shared Governance at Northeastern Illinois University: Report and Recommendations" by Kenneth Andersen (Z. Schiffman, L. Capeheart) passed (yes: 8, no: 5, abstain: 2).

It was stated that it is the president's prerogative to create university working groups, in particular the University Council Working Group, created in response to the shared governance report by Ken Andersen, including choosing the membership and, in one case, choosing the chair. However, the formation of this working group was not done in the spirit of shared governance because it forces the senate to endorse the president's response to the shared governance report by sending a representative to the University Council Working Group without itself having reviewed the report, discussed it and determined a proper response. If the senate does not send a representative, it will miss out on the important opportunity to give input on a working group. There was concern that the formation of the working group was not done to the letter of shared governance.

It was further mentioned that last year senate worked hard on the issue as well as on Ken Andersen's visits to campus, that the historical reason for senate's interest in a faculty voice in the policy on policies working group was the senate's objections to the proposed Policy & Procedures Concerning Demonstrations on Campus, Distribution and Display of Visual Communications, and Solicitation of Signatures on Campus (DDS) in 2009, and that the senate should be promoting faculty governance bodies' participation in university wide decision making.

A member agreed with some of the preceding statements, adding that the ombuds program extends beyond simply the senate's purview to all the constituencies and that, although she has reservations as to how the work is being done, she does not want the faculty to miss the boat.

Several members stated that they agreed that the senate and other constituencies should have been consulted before the formation of the university working groups, that, having reviewed the shared governance report carefully, more should be done to empower the chairs and enhance communication but that the senate should move forward, suggesting that the senate focus on more tangible issues including the problem of instructor voice.

The senate should discuss its role and vision in the working groups so that its representatives would have guidance.

It would have been appreciated to have more understanding of the senate's role and vision for the senate representatives to the Ombuds Working Group.

The senate needs to look at process to avoid the trap of being ineffective refusers.

We need to communicate the discomfort of the senate with the present process.

Motion (A. Fraiman, S. Beyda) to communicate to the president that the Faculty Senate will decide on the election of a representative to the University Council Working Group after it discusses "On Enhancing Shared Governance at Northeastern Illinois University: Report and Recommendations" by Kenneth Andersen passed (1 opposed).

Such a communication would dispel the idea that the senate is apathetic and provide a notification of a delay.

There was concern that such a communication would deny that the senate does not want to play and the senate had fought to allow a representative to the working group and now that the request is granted, the senate has found it problematic.

6) New Business

“On Enhancing Shared Governance at Northeastern Illinois University: Report and Recommendations” by Kenneth Andersen

Chair M. McKernin suggested that the Steering Committee collect senate member responses on three topics from the report for senate action and then elicit faculty responses. These are not so much the most important topics as the ones that senate should handle this year.

Ares of concern expressed by senators included

- revision of Faculty Constitution and senate bylaws
- violation of academic decision structures
- instructors need a voice
- clarifying role of the department, college and provost
- need for a sense of participation
- communication problems
- disregard of faculty subject-matter expertise
- valuing NEIU as a community

Motion that each senate member email their top three topics from “On Enhancing Shared Governance at Northeastern Illinois University: Report and Recommendations” by Kenneth Andersen to be addressed by the Faculty Senate during the 2011-2012 academic year to Brett Stockdill for a tally by the Steering Committee by Monday (J. Jennings, R. Grossman) passed unanimously.

a) Commencement Convocation December 18, at 2 PM, UIC Pavilion marshals:
Brett Stockdill, Denise Cloonan

b) Faculty Senate Website

Motion to survey the senate members on priorities in improving the website (M. Thill, J. Jennings) passed.

Motion to adjourn (R. Grossman, B. Stockdill) passed at 4:06