

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

September 11, 2007

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Release of Minutes of Executive Session of August 28, 2007
2. Approval of Minutes
 - August 28, 2007
3. Report from the Chair
4. Report from the President's Office
5. Election of Faculty Senate Officers
 - Chair
 - Vice Chair
 - Secretary
6. Formation of Faculty Senate Committees
 - Steering Committee (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, plus two additional Faculty Senators)
 - Faculty Council on Technology
 - Elections Committee
 - By-Laws Committee
 - Committee on Administrator Evaluation Instrument
 - Academic Freedom Committee
 - Parking Appeals Committee
 - Dean of Students Judicial Affairs Committee
7. Report on Justice Studies Issue
8. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
9. New Business
10. Adjournment

EDITED/REWRITEN BY ALLEN SHUB

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting September 11, 2007

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Sue Mungre, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Steve Riess, Allen Shub, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Dennis Grammenos

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Audie Brewton, Dragan Milovanovic

Outgoing Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:50 P.M.

1. Release of Minutes of Executive Session of August 28, 2007

Riess (Villa 2nd) moved for approval of the release of the Executive Session minutes. Unanimous.

2. Approval of Minutes of August 28, 2007

Over (Olson 2nd) moved for approval of the minutes of August 28, 2007 as corrected. Unanimous.

3. Report from the Chair

Chair Shub reported on some of the major accomplishments of the Faculty Senate this past year (2006-07):

- The Faculty Constitution has been amended after working on it for three years.

The amended Faculty Constitution adds three non-tenure track faculty members to the Faculty Senate, one each from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business and Management, and the College of Education. When the self-nomination ballots go out soon to fill vacancies in the various councils and committees, the Faculty Senate non-tenure track positions will be included.

The amended Faculty Constitution reaffirms that only tenured/tenure track faculty have a vote in department matters and in chair elections, though all faculty have voice.

- The Faculty Senate has become an issues-oriented body in recent years.
- Faculty Senate recognizes that there are at least two sides to any issue brought before it.

This year (2007-08) Shub hopes the Senate will:

- Improve the Faculty Senate website, which is in need of overhaul and updating of information. Information presently on the website is not current. Shub reported that he has asked the Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant to learn how to place documents onto the website.
- Improve the election process, ensuring that only eligible faculty members vote and appear on ballots. In addition, Shub noted that the staggering of terms has gotten off cycle. In some councils, terms of nearly all members have ended simultaneously. To correct this situation, the Elections Committee, with the assistance of the Administrative Assistant, should establish some one-time-only one-year terms during the Spring elections.
- Improve the Senate agenda process by screening issues, possibly by the Steering Committee, before they get to Senate. There are some issues that have reached Senate that are not governance issues; some of them are intra-departmental issues which should be resolved within the department.
- Have the meeting minutes done with more collaboration between the elected Faculty Senate Secretary and the Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant.
- Remember that an important role of Faculty Senate is to serve as an advisor to the University President.

Shub announced that because of term limits (Article VIII.B of the Faculty Constitution), he was off Senate after 2006-07. However, Article VIII.C of the Faculty Constitution allows an individual to stay on a council, despite term limits, if a vacancy exists. With two Faculty Senate vacancies from the College of Business and Management, Shub has chosen to stay on Senate for another term.

4. Report from the President's Office

Provost Lawrence Frank distributed a handout showing the enrollment planning structure and its intended accomplishments. The planning structure is composed of five groups: the Enrollment Management Council, the Undergraduate Admissions/Recruitment Team, the Undergraduate Retention Team, the Graduate Recruitment and Retention Team, and the Student Enrollment Services Advisory

Group. Each group has a charge in this process. The Provost our enrollment is below 12,000 students; more apply but fewer come to the University. Polyashuk commented that graduate advisors should be part of the Graduate Recruitment and Retention Team.

The Provost told us that President Hahs plans to attend some Faculty Senate meetings when she can.

Questions were asked regarding

- The increases in tuition and its effect on the budget
- The total number of students attending the University (head count)
- The FTE (full-time equivalent) – how many students and how many courses they take
- Different tuitions

The Provost told us there is difficulty in booking classrooms. The new Education Building is in the governor's budget as a capital expenditure, but the budget has not yet passed. The Building A renovation will help in the shortage of classrooms; it will have 40 offices and five classrooms.

There will be two Sunday courses this year in addition to the Saturday classes.

5. Election of Faculty Senate Officers

Chair Shub called for nominations for officers:

- Perino nominated Shub for Chair of the Faculty Senate. There were no other nominations. **Shub was unanimously re-elected Chair of the Faculty Senate.**
- Villa nominated Capeheart for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. There were no other nominations. **Capeheart was unanimously re-elected Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.**
- Villa nominated Libretti for Secretary of the Faculty Senate. There were no other nominations. **Libretti was unanimously elected Secretary of the Faculty Senate.**

6. Formation of Faculty Senate Committees

Chair Shub called for nominations for two Senators to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is composed of the Faculty Senate Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary plus two additional Senators.

- Mahootian, Olson, and Over were nominated. Ballots were distributed. **Olson and Over were elected to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.**

Chair Shub called for volunteers to Faculty Senate Committees. The responses were:

- Elections Committee
Colon, Mungre and Polyashuk
- By-Laws Committee
Libretti, Mahootian, Villa
- Academic Freedom Committee
Capeheart, Libretti, Mahootian, Perino, Polyashuk, Riess
- Parking Appeals Committee
Xu
- Dean of Students Judicial Affairs Committee
Colon, Over, Villa
- The Faculty Council on Technology was deferred due to lack of nominations and lack of information about the precise function of the Council.

7. Report on Justice Studies Issue

Provost Frank presented his perspective on continuing developments in Justice Studies, beginning with a brief history. Frank recapitulated in brief the events following the resignation of Shelley Bannister as chair of Justice Studies last summer. From his perspective, the failure of the department in completing both a major program review mandated by the Illinois Board of Higher Education and an outcome and assessment plan mandated also by the state indicated a department in disarray. He reviewed how he met with the group after an election resulted in a vote of 4-1-1 in favor of Loretta Capeheart's assuming the chairship and decided the program was in such a state of disarray that it required the program be put in "receivership." At this point, the Provost explained, he decided to appoint Edmund Hansen, from the Center for Teaching and Learning, to chair Justice Studies and to offer the position of coordinator to Capeheart.

After learning at the previous Senate meeting that his appointment violated the Faculty Constitution in that a chair must be a tenured/tenure-track faculty member, Frank took this information under consideration and changed his mind. He then decided to appoint Wamucii Njogu, currently associate provost, to chair the program and Hansen would be assigned to assist the program in completing the very important program review and developing an assessment plan, while Capeheart was still considered for the coordinatorship.

Dragan Milovanovic then spoke, validating much of what Frank had said. He validated that much robust discussion in the highest academic spirit had taken place among the various parties. His main point of contention and disappointment was that there was not in evidence from his perspective the spirit of collaboration called for by the constitution. In his view, the Justice Studies program had been willing to compromise and was very willing to welcome Hansen into the department to assist with the reviews, but the department will as expressed in the vote needed to be respected.

Tim Libretti then commented that he had many concerns about the series of decisions regarding this issue. He stated that while he understands that program votes are recommendations and that the administration finally appoints a chair, the real question both administration and faculty need to collectively ask is what kind of culture do we want at this University. He suggested that if we want a University that operates with a sense of shared governance and mutual respect, then recommendations such as a vote of 4-1-1 should carry tremendous weight, that such a vote indicates a program's faith and trust in that colleague's leadership and ought to be respected. He raised questions about whether the problems were really in the program or in the previous leadership in the program, pointing out that if a chair had been having difficulty getting a program review done and there were problems in the program, a sign of good leadership would have been to call for help and alert the administration well before passing the deadline for submitting this review, as the failure of a program to complete such a review does not just harm the program but the University as a whole.

Libretti concluded expressing concern about what seemed to be the targeting of Capeheart for special persecution at this University, given that her treatment at the University had been a topic of discussion last spring in the Senate when a University vice-president had publicly announced that a student had brought a serious charge against her and yet never produced the charge.

Before adjourning and while still discussing the business of Loretta Capeheart's chairship/coordinatorship, Mahootian asked the Provost if he had offered the coordinatorship to Capeheart and if the offer was still open. He said that he had done so and would be open to discussing it with her. It was decided at that moment that Capeheart would call him to set up a meeting.

8. Adjournment

Nyadroh (Over 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

DO NOT USE

DRAFT

DRAFT

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
September 11, 2007**

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Sue Mungre, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Steve Riess, Allen Shub, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Dennis Grammenos

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Audie Brewton, Dragan Milovanovic

Outgoing Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:50 P.M.

1. Release of Minutes of Executive Session of August 28, 2007

Riess (Villa 2nd) moved for approval of the release of the Executive Session minutes. Unanimous.

2. Approval of Minutes of August 28, 2007

Over (Olson 2nd) moved for approval of the minutes of August 28, 2007 as corrected. Unanimous.

3. Report from the President's Office

Provost Lawrence Frank distributed a handout showing the enrollment planning structure and its intended accomplishments. The planning structure is composed of five groups: the Enrollment Management Council, the Undergraduate Admissions/Recruitment Team, the Undergraduate Retention Team, the Graduate Recruitment and Retention Team, and the Student Enrollment Services Advisory Group. Each group has a charge in this process. The Provost our enrollment is below 12,000 students; more apply but fewer come to the University. Polyashuk commented that graduate advisors should be part of the Graduate Recruitment and Retention Team.

The Provost told us that President Hahs plans to attend some Faculty Senate meetings when she can.

Questions were asked regarding

- The increases in tuition and its effect on the budget
- The total number of students attending the University (head count)
- The FTE (full-time equivalent) – how many students and how many courses they take
- Different tuitions

The Provost told us there is difficulty in booking classrooms. The new Education Building is in the governor's budget as a capital expenditure, but the budget has not yet passed. The Building A renovation will help in the shortage of classrooms; it will have five offices and some classrooms.

There will be two Sunday courses this year in addition to the Saturday classes.

4. Report from the Chair

Chair Shub reported on the major accomplishments of the Faculty Senate this year.

- The Faculty Constitution has been amended after working on it for three years .
- In addition to the tenure/tenure track faculty being able to participate in faculty governance, three non-tenure track (one from each college) will be able to do so as well.

Next year he hopes the Senate will

- Have the website available and updated to publish information.
- Have elections with some staggered terms.
- Have the meeting minutes done with more collaboration between the Senate secretary and the administrative assistant.
- Work on issues that should be handled by the Faculty Senate. (Intra-department issues do not belong in the Senate.)

5. Election of Faculty Senate Officers

Chair Shub called for nominations for officers:

- Perino nominated Shub for Chair of the Faculty Senate. There were no other nominations. **Shub was unanimously re-elected Chair of the Faculty Senate.**
- Villa nominated Capeheart for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. There were no other nominations. **Capeheart was unanimously re-elected Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.**
- Villa nominated Libretti for Secretary of the Faculty Senate. There were no other nominations. **Libretti was unanimously elected Secretary of the Faculty Senate.**

6. Formation of Faculty Senate Committees

Chair Shub called for nominations for two Senators to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is composed of the Faculty Senate Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary plus two additional Senators.

- Mahootian, Olson, and Over were nominated. Ballots were distributed. **Olson and Over were elected to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.**

Chair Shub called for volunteers to Faculty Senate Committees. The responses were:

- Elections Committee
Colon, Mungre and Polyashuk
- By-Laws Committee
Libretti, Mahootian, Villa
- Academic Freedom Committee
Capeheart, Libretti, Mahootian, Perino, Polyashuk, Riess
- Parking Appeals Committee
Xu
- Dean of Students Judicial Affairs Committee
Colon, Over, Villa
- The Faculty Council on Technology was deferred due to lack of nominations and lack of information about the precise function of the Council.

7. Report on Justice Studies Issue

Provost Frank presented his perspective on continuing developments in Justice Studies, beginning with a brief history. Frank recapitulated in brief the events following the resignation of Shelley Bannister as chair of Justice Studies last summer. From his perspective, the failure of the chair to lead the department in completing both a major program review mandated by the Illinois Board of Higher Education and an outcome and assessment plan mandated also by the state indicated a department in disarray. He reviewed how he met with the department after a department election resulted in a vote of 4-1-1 in favor of Loretta Capeheart's assuming the chairship and decided the department was in such a state of disarray that it required the department be put in "receivership." At this point, the Provost explained, he decided to appoint Edmund Hansen, from the Center for Teaching and Learning, to chair Justice Studies and to offer the position of coordinator to Capeheart.

After learning at the previous Senate meeting that his appointment violated the faculty constitution in that a chair must be tenured or a tenure-track faculty member, Frank took this information under consideration and changed his mind. He then decided to appoint Wamucii Njogu, currently associate provost, to chair the department and Hansen would be assigned to assist the department in completing the very important program review and developing an assessment plan, while Capeheart was still considered for the coordinatorship.

Dragan Milovanovic then spoke, validating much of what Frank had said. He validated that much robust discussion in the highest academic spirit had taken place among the various parties. His main point of contention and disappointment was that there was not in evidence from his perspective the spirit of collaboration called for by the constitution. In his view, the Justice Studies department had been willing to compromise and was very willing to welcome Hansen into the department to assist with the reviews, but the department will as expressed in the vote needed to be respected.

Tim Libretti then commented that he had many concerns about the series of decisions regarding this issue. He stated that while he understands that departmental votes are recommendations and that the administration finally appoints a chair, the real question both administration and faculty need to collectively ask is what kind of culture do we want at this University. He suggested that if we want a University that operates with a sense of shared governance and mutual respect, then recommendations such as a vote of 4-1-1 should carry tremendous weight, that such a vote indicates a department's faith and trust in that colleague's leadership and ought to be respected. He raised questions about whether the problems were really in the department or in the previous leadership in the department, pointing out that if a chair had been having difficulty getting a program review done and there were problems in the department, a sign of good leadership would have been to call for help and alert the administration well before passing the deadline for submitting this review, as the failure of a department to complete such a review does not just harm the department but the University as a whole.

Libretti concluded expressing concern about what seemed to be the targeting of Capeheart for special persecution at this University, given that her treatment at the University had been a topic of discussion last spring in the Senate when a University vice-president had publicly announced that a student had brought a serious charge against her and yet never produced the charge.

8. Communications and Faculty to be Heard

There were none.

9. New Business

There was none.

10. Adjournment

Nyadroh (Over 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

Denise Wilson
Faculty Senate Office

Denise's Notes

Outgoing Chair Shub began meeting at 1:50 PM. The minutes of August 28th were approved as corrected.

The Provost distributed an enrollment management handout. It is composed of five groups who have a charge in this process. The Provost told us our enrollment is below 12,000 students; more apply but fewer come to the University. Polyashuk commented that graduate advisors should be part of the Graduate Recruitment and Retention Team.

President Hahs plans to attend Faculty Senate meetings when she can.

Questions were asked regarding

- The increases in tuition and its effect on the budget
- The total number of students attending the University (head count)
- The FTE (full-time equivalent) – how many students and how many courses they take
- Different tuitions

The Provost told us there is difficulty in booking classrooms. Renovation of Building A will help in the shortage of classrooms; it will have five offices and some classrooms.

There will be two Sunday courses this year in addition to the Saturday classes.

Chair Shub reported on the major accomplishments of the Faculty Senate this year.

- The Faculty Constitution has been amended after working on it for three years .
- In addition to the tenure/tenure track faculty being able to participate in faculty governance, three non-tenure track (one from each college) will be able to do so as well.

Next year he hopes the Senate will

- Have the website available and updated to publish information.
- Have elections with some staggered terms.
- Have the meeting minutes done with more collaboration between the Senate secretary and the administrative assistant.
- Work on issues that should be handled by the Faculty Senate. (Intra-department issues do not belong in the Senate.)

Shub announced that he has decided to apply Faculty Constitution Article VIII.C and remain on the Faculty Senate for another two-year term.

Shub then called for nominations for officers. The results were

- Shub, Chair
- Capeheart, Vice Chair
- Libretti, Secretary

He continued with

- Steering Committee – Olson, Over, and Senate officers
- Elections Committee – Colon, Mungre and Polyashuk

- By-Laws Committee – Libretti, Mahootian, Villa
- Academic Freedom Committee – Capeheart, Libretti, Mahootian, Perino, Polyashuk, Riess
- Parking Appeals Committee – Xu
- Dean of Students Judicial Affairs Committee – Colon, Over, Villa

The Justice Studies issues were discussed.

- The chair resigned; both groups (Justice Studies and Social Work) experienced resignations.
- Capeheart was elected new chair of Justice Studies; Administration assigned Ed Hansen to be chair.

The departments will not be separated. Wamucii will be chair; Jade Stanley will be program director of Social Work, and Ed Hansen will be program administrator of Justice Studies.

The Provost read a letter from the IBHE

Dragan Milovanovic spoke about

- The 4-1-1 vote and stated that “we get along!”
- An outside chair
- Ask Hansen to help out as a collaborator.

Shub asked how coordinators are selected. The answer – it varies unit to unit.

The Provost stated both he and Capeheart are unhappy about the outcome. He feels the department could not resolve this on their own. The Dean, the President, and the Provost made the decision to do this; they need help in fulfilling responsibilities.

Over asked

- One year to take care of the work that wasn’t done?
- Is Ed Hansen being a consultant?
- How are responsibilities being divided up?

Milovanovic stated that there is no contract language in the Faculty Constitution for a Program Administrator.

Shub -- “coordinator.”

Frank said “Loretta be chair” is all Capeheart and Milovanovic will accept. Frank and Capeheart will talk about a coordinator position.

Nyadroh – Need to talk to the 1-1 people to get both sides of the issue.

Frank –

- New position created
- Things did not happen overnight
- Work on things before they get to this point

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 9, 2007

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - September 11, 2007
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Report on IBHE-FAC Meetings – Tim Scherman (15 minutes)
5. Department Bylaws – Audie Brewton (20 minutes)
6. Academic Integrity – Richard Hallett (20 minutes)
7. Update on Justice Studies Issue – Loretta Capeheart (10 minutes)
8. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
9. New Business
10. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting October 9, 2007

Present: Barry Birnbaum, Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Dennis Grammenos, Tim Libretti, Sue Mungre, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Steve Riess, Allen Shub, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Shahrzad Mahootian

Ex-Officio: President Sharon Hahs, Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Teddy Bofman, Linguistics; Audie Brewton, Economics; Richard Hallett, Linguistics; Jeanine Ntahirageza, ELP/Linguistics; Marit Vamarasi, Linguistics

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:43 P.M.

1. Approval of Minutes of September 11, 2007

The minutes of the September 11th meeting were approved as corrected.

2. Report from the Chair

The Chair reported that the revised Faculty Constitution is now available on NEIUport on the Faculty tab in the Faculty Resources section. The Chair also reported that faculty marshals are still needed for commencement and also reminded all to complete the ethics training and to spend an appropriate amount of time completing it. He reported additionally that the new search and screen manual being developed is nearing completion. Finally, he announced Steve Riess's Brommel Award Lecture on October 16th.

3. Report from the President's Office

The Provost gave the President's Report and told us two pieces of felicitous news. First, the University received a Title V grant for the project of improving retention through literacy, which will revamp the instruction of writing at the University. The grant is in the amount of 2.8 million dollars over five years. Second, the Provost announced the refunding of the McNair program.

4. Department Bylaws – Audie Brewton

Audie Brewton brought to the Faculty Senate his concerns over a violation of bylaws in the Economics unit. His particular concern centered on his exclusion from the departmental search and screen committee despite an article in the bylaws which reads, “The Departmental Personnel Committee shall consist of the committee of the whole with the Department Chairperson serving as a chairperson of the committee.” Citing Article 7, Section C:1 of the Faculty Constitution which asserts each department’s responsibility to develop bylaws, Brewton argued that unit bylaws are part of the Faculty Constitution and thus are endowed with the same governing authority. He pointed out that he had brought this issue to Santos Rivera who told him the unit bylaws did not need to be upheld, that a search and screen committee could be composed of a segment of the unit.

Chair Shub stressed that the key issue raised by Brewton’s complaint was exactly what status department bylaws had at the University. Filus questioned the legitimacy of the Economics unit’s bylaws given the Article VII.A contradicted University policy by assigning the departmental chairperson to be the chair of the departmental search and screen committee. Provost Frank here indicated that such inconsistencies were tolerated in bylaws precisely because bylaws had typically been considered to have no authority outside departments but merely functioned to govern departmental operations.

Riess refocused the discussion on the issue at hand, which was whether a person could be excluded from the search and screen committee in the unit of Economics.

Over wondered what authority the Senate actually had in this matter other than to recommend a department or unit follows its bylaws.

Libretti underlined the seriousness of this issue given the widespread disregard at all levels of the University for procedures and policies as spelled out in governing documents such as the Faculty Constitution and the contract.

Capeheart (Birnbaum 2nd) moved that the Economics unit will allow the whole of the unit to be included in the search and screen committee. The motion was approved.

Capeheart (Birnbaum 2nd) moved that the Senate Bylaws Committee rate the bylaws for consistency with other University documents. The motion was approved.

While Filus stated that typically the Senate invites the other sides to be heard on issues, it was pointed out that in any case the unit should still have to abide by its bylaws.

Nyadroh suggested that the bylaws be revised to be consistent with principles of University governance before the Senate recommends the unit abide by them. Riess and others argued this would allow the unit to revise them such that Brewton could be excluded from the search and screen committee.

5. Academic Integrity – Richard Hallett

Richard Hallett of Linguistics appeared before the Senate to raise an issue of academic integrity at the University. The issue stemmed from his chairperson's denial of his request to teach Linguistics 322: Sociolinguistics, and her subsequent assignment of that course to an instructor while assigning a 100-level course to Hallett instead. Hallett, a tenured professor with research specialization in socio-linguistics (he has a book under contract in this field), brought this issue to the Senate to seek the reasoning behind the preference given to an instructor, whose Ph.D. was twenty years-old and who showed no evidence of current research in the field, in the case. He believed this failure to recognize tenure and rank in this regard seriously compromised the academic integrity of the University.

Marit Vamarasi, Chair of Linguistics, stated that Hallett had rejected the Form D that included the assignment of Linguistics 322 for Fall 2007 and he did not request to teach 322 for Spring 2008. Vamarasi also pointed out that the instructor in this case (Dr. Dreyfuss) is well-qualified to teach Sociolinguistics, contrary to Hallett's memo to the Senate of September 19, 2007.

Provost Frank added that while in his view tenured and tenure-track faculty are the heart of the University, chairs are often in difficult position of negotiating many considerations in making out schedules. He suggested that the collective bargaining agreement also presented constraints in this regard as it somehow granted instructors the same rights to courses as tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Capeheart pointed out that the collective bargaining agreement made clear distinctions between the roles of teaching professionals (tenured and tenure-track faculty) and instructors at the University. The agreement states that instructors are to be assigned courses that otherwise can't be filled by tenured and tenure-track faculty. She also stressed that the practice about which Hallett complained was an issue beyond Linguistics and also a broader issue for the profession.

Over expressed grave concern regarding the practice of giving preference to an instructor over a tenured faculty member with specific research expertise to teach a course; she wondered why the University wouldn't want the most qualified people, who had been chosen through a national search, to teach its students.

Libretti seconded Over's position, stressing that teaching professionals are expected to do research, whereas instructors are not, such that it was counter-intuitive to assign upper-level courses to instructors. Such practice constitutes such a defiance of common sense that it seemed bizarre, he said, to have to even articulate the many reasons why this practice was indicative of a world turned upside down. Of particular concern to him was the chair's apparent rationale in the particular case under consideration which, according to Hallett, was that she needed to give the instructor a class. This rationale raised the question of why she didn't give the instructor the 100-level course offering. Capeheart (Over 2nd) moved that the issue of academic integrity be referred to the Academic Freedom Committee for discussion and brought back to the Senate. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. Update on Justice Studies Issue – Loretta Capeheart

Capeheart presented an update on the Justice Studies issue. She was offered the position of associate chair by the Provost, but could not accept it as it was offered due to the faculty contract. In a discussion with UPI representatives, she was told that it would not be appropriate to be associate chair and that the coordinator position was the contractually appropriate position. A lively discussion followed.

7. Adjournment

Birbaum (Nyadroh 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

THE REVISED MINUTES WERE APPROVED

DRAFT

DRAFT

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
October 9, 2007**

Present: Barry Birnbaum, Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Dennis Grammenos, Tim Libretti, Sue Mungre, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Steve Riess, Allen Shub, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Shahrzad Mahootian

Ex-Officio: President Sharon Hahs, Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Teddy Bofman, Linguistics; Audie Brewton, Economics; Richard Hallett, Linguistics; Jeanine Ntahirageza, ELP/Linguistics; Marit Vamarasi, Linguistics

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:43 P.M.

1. Approval of Minutes of September 11, 2007

The minutes of the September 11th meeting were approved as corrected.

2. Report from the Chair

The Chair reported that marshals are still needed for commencement and also reminded all to complete the ethics training and to spend an appropriate amount of time completing it. He reported additionally that the new search and screen manual being developed is nearing completion. Finally, he announced Steve Riess's Brommel Award Lecture on October 16.

3. Report from the President's Office

The Provost gave the President's Report and told us two pieces of felicitous news. First, the University received a Title V grant for the project of improving retention through literacy, which will revamp the instruction of writing at the University. The grant is in the amount of 2.8 million dollars over five years. Second, the Provost announced the refunding of the McNair program.

4. Department Bylaws – Audie Brewton

Audie Brewton brought to the Faculty Senate his concerns over a violation of bylaws in the Economics unit. His particular concern centered on his exclusion from the departmental search and screen committee despite an article in the bylaws which reads, “The Departmental Personnel Committee shall consist of the committee of the whole with the Department Chairperson serving as a chairperson of the committee.” Citing Article 7, Section C:1 of the Faculty Constitution which asserts each department’s responsibility to develop bylaws, Brewton argued that unit bylaws are part of the Faculty Constitution and thus are endowed with the same governing authority. He pointed out that he had brought this issue to Santos Rivera who told him the unit bylaws did not need to be upheld, that a search and screen committee could be composed of a segment of the unit.

Chair Shub stressed that the key issue raised by Brewton’s complaint was exactly what status department bylaws had at the University. Filus questioned the legitimacy of the Economics unit’s bylaws given the Article VII.A contradicted University policy by assigning the departmental chairperson to be the chair of the departmental search and screen committee. Provost Frank here indicated that such inconsistencies were tolerated in bylaws precisely because bylaws had typically been considered to have no authority outside departments but merely functioned to govern departmental operations.

Riess refocused the discussion on the issue at hand, which was whether a person could be excluded from the search and screen committee in the unit of Economics.

Over wondered what authority the Senate actually had in this matter other than to recommend a department or unit follows its bylaws.

Libretti underlined the seriousness of this issue given the widespread disregard at all levels of the University for procedures and policies as spelled out in governing documents such as the Faculty Constitution and the contract.

Capeheart (Birnbaum 2nd) moved that the Economics unit will allow the whole of the unit to be included in the search and screen committee. The motion was approved.

Capeheart (Birnbaum 2nd) moved that the Senate Bylaws Committee rate the bylaws for consistency with other University documents. The motion was approved.

While Filus stated that typically the Senate invites the other sides to be heard on issues, it was pointed out that in any case the unit should still have to abide by its bylaws.

Nyadroh suggested that the bylaws be revised to be consistent with principles of University governance before the Senate recommends the unit abide by them. Riess and others argued this would allow the unit to revise them such that Brewton could be excluded from the search and screen committee.

5. Academic Integrity – Richard Hallett

Richard Hallett of Linguistics appeared before the Senate to raise an issue of academic integrity at the University. The issue stemmed from his chairperson's denial of his request to teach Linguistics 322: Sociolinguistics, and her subsequent assignment of that course to an instructor while assigning a 100-level course to Hallett instead. Hallett, a tenured professor with research specialization in socio-linguistics (he has a book under contract in this field), brought this issue to the Senate to seek the reasoning behind the preference given to an instructor, whose Ph.D. was twenty years-old and who showed no evidence of current research in the field, in the case. He believed this failure to recognize tenure and rank in this regard seriously compromised the academic integrity of the University.

Marit Vamarasi, Chair of Linguistics, while pointing to a stack of papers before her, claimed Hallett had rejected Form Ds that included the assignment of Linguistics 322.

Provost Frank added that while in his view tenured and tenure-track faculty are the heart of the University, chairs are often in difficult position of negotiating many considerations in making out schedules. He suggested that the collective bargaining agreement also presented constraints in this regard as it somehow granted instructors the same rights to courses as tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Capeheart pointed out that the collective bargaining agreement made clear distinctions between the roles of teaching professionals (tenured and tenure-track faculty) and instructors at the University. The agreement states that instructors are to be assigned courses that otherwise can't be filled by tenured and tenure-track faculty. She also stressed that the practice about which Hallett complained was an issue beyond Linguistics and also a broader issue for the profession.

Over expressed grave concern regarding the practice of giving preference to an instructor over a tenured faculty member with specific research expertise to teach a course; she wondered why the University wouldn't want the most qualified people, who had been chosen through a national search, to teach its students.

Libretti seconded Over's position, stressing that teaching professionals are expected to do research, whereas instructors are not, such that it was counter-intuitive to assign upper-level courses to instructors. Such practice constitutes such a defiance of common sense that it seemed bizarre, he said, to have to even articulate the many reasons why this practice was indicative of a world turned upside down. Of particular concern to him was the chair's apparent rationale in the particular case under consideration which, according to Hallett, was that she needed to give the instructor a class. This rationale raised the question of why she didn't give the instructor the 100-level course offering. Capeheart (Over 2nd) moved that the issue of academic integrity be referred to the Academic Freedom Committee for discussion and brought back to the Senate. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. Update on Justice Studies Issue – Loretta Capeheart

Capeheart presented an update on the Justice Studies issue. She was offered the position of associate chair by the Provost, but could not accept it as it was offered due to the faculty contract. In a discussion with UPI representatives, she was told that it would not be appropriate to be coordinator. A lively discussion followed.

7. Adjournment

Birbaum (Nyadroh 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

Denise's Notes

Faculty Senate 10-9-07

Meeting convened at 1:43 PM. President Hahs attended. Chair asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Over/Filus moved that the minutes be approved with additions (Shahzrad's) and corrections. Unanimous.

Chair reported

- Website is undergoing change.
- We need marshals for graduation on Saturday, 12-15; there were no volunteers
- There will be another ethics testing
- Search and screen manual ...

He also announced that Senator Riess will give the 2007 Bernard Brommel Research Professor Lecture, "The Sport of Kings and the Kings of Crime: Horse Racing, Machine Politics, and Organized Crime in Metropolitan New York, 1894-1913, on Tuesday October 16th, in the NEIU Recital Hall.

Although President Hahs was present, Provost Frank gave the President's report. He informed us that

- We have received a new Title V grant which authorizes money for Hispanic-serving institutions.
- The McNair reapplication was funded for five years.
- The old Title V grant has authorized task forces to work on writing intensive courses. There is \$1-million over a 5-year period which will improve graduation rates. It will (a) have a series of writing intensive courses in all disciplines; (b) strengthen the regime of teaching English 101, and (c) provide a center to support teachers and students.

Audie Brewton spoke about department bylaws. There is no approval mechanism for them, and they need to be reviewed. Capeheart/Birnbaum moved that the Bylaws Committee rate(??) bylaws for constituencies with other University documents.

Richard Hallett spoke about academic integrity with regard to scheduling. He discussed a problem with the chair of the department who allowed a non-tenure track faculty member to teach courses in which Hallett was a specialist. The chair responded that the other faculty member was qualified to teach the courses. His discussion included comments on how scheduling should reflect student need—what do they need, when do they need to take a course. A grievance regarding a Form D has also been filed.

He continued . . . Tenured and non-tenured faculty have the same contract rights once they are in the unit. Tenured are usually highly trained specialists in their fields.

Capeheart commented that faculty is hired to teach their specialty, they have expertise, and they usually have seniority. Hallett commented that he was hired to teach certain courses, but these courses were given to a non-tenure track faculty member who was hired after he was hired. Capeheart/Over moved that the issue of academic integrity be referred to the Academic Freedom Committee for discussion and brought back to the Senate. Unanimous.

Capeheart presented an update on the Justice Studies issue. She was offered the position of associate chair by the Provost, but could not accept it as it was offered due to the contract. In a discussion with UPI representatives she was told that it would not be appropriate to be coordinator. A lively discussion followed.

Birnbaum/Nyadroh moved for adjournment at 3:05 PM.

* * * * *

MOTIONS:

- Capeheart/Over That the issue of academic integrity be referred to the Academic Freedom Committee for discussion and brought back to the Senate. Unanimous
- Capeheart/Birnbaum That the Bylaws Committee rate the bylaws for constituency with other University documents.
- The economics unit will allow the whole of the unit to be included in the search and screen committee.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 23, 2007

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - October 9, 2007
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Report on IBHE-FAC Meetings – Tim Scherman
5. Economics Search and Screen Committee Issue
6. Status of Elections
7. Charge to the Bylaws Committee
8. Charge to the Academic Freedom Committee
9. New Business
10. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting October 23, 2007

Present: Barry Birnbaum, Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Ana Gil-Garcia, Dennis Grammenos, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Sue Mungre, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Steve Riess, Allen Shub

Absent: Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Audie Brewton, Erick Howenstine, Tim Scherman

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

1. Approval of the Minutes of October 9, 2007

The approval of the minutes was deferred until Marit Vamarasi, a guest at the October 11th meeting, had an opportunity to review the representation of her comments.

2. Report from the Chair

Allen Shub announced again the need for faculty marshals at the Spring commencement. Dennis Grammenos graciously volunteered.

3. Report from the President's Office

Provost Frank reported that the University received an outstanding service award from the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) at an event the previous weekend. He also mentioned, relatedly, that Metropolitan State University in Denver was at the time visiting Northeastern to get some sense of what we did as a Hispanic serving institution.

Mahootian asked if we, as a University, were trying to define what it means to be a Hispanic serving institution.

Provost Frank answered that there was no specific definition regarding what a Hispanic serving institution was supposed to do, but there were some basic features such an institution should possess: First, the institution should have a clear focus on graduation rates for all students, but especially Latino students. Second, the institution should provide an array of programs designed to support and assist Latino

students. Again, there was no specific mandate. He gave as an example the case of the Chicano Studies program at Cal State-Northridge where faculty had made it their own mission to work with entry-level students by providing advising and counseling, helping students cultivate skills necessary to succeed and college, and the like. He stressed it is our choice to decide how we wanted to serve our Hispanic student population and stressed that this decision is important to the University's strategic planning.

4. Report on IBHE-FAC Meetings – Tim Scherman

Professor Tim Scherman of the English Department began by giving some highlights from the September meeting at Northern Illinois University. He reported the following:

- Higher education received a 2% increase in funding in the latest state budget.
- The committee voted to endorse a position paper on mental health issues on campuses motivated in part by the Virginia Tech episode. The paper effectively argued that while the state tends to think about these issues exclusively in terms of security and seeks to cut funding for psychological counseling in the budget, what needs to be stressed and where funding needs to be directed is to prevention and treatment.

At the most recent October meeting in Urbana, Scherman reported that Representative Naomi Jacobson as well as Rich Shell, the legislative relations liaison for Urbana spoke. In terms of the budget, he reported that the 2% increase was not much debated and that revenues were the primary focus in the legislature. He pointed out, though, that the 2% increase just isn't enough.

One of the main notes struck was that the advocacy for education in the state needed to consolidate the many voices involved to be better heard and heeded. These voices included university presidents, faculty unions, businesses, students, and the K-12 constituencies. In this vein, Scherman underscored the emphasis being put on getting K-12 involved in discussions regarding issues in and funding of higher education. He reported that the governor had approved a P-20 council that would be concerned with accountability issues but which would also direct energy to aligning standards by taking an overall view of the educational system. Thus, there would be clarity about what students needed to know or what skills they needed to possess to move from junior high school to high school and from high school to college. Scherman said that the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences joint committee at Northeastern provided an example at the micro-level of what was happening at the state level. Such initiatives might entail, for example, professors from the English department observing high schools to review content.

Mahootian expressed skepticism about the University's willingness to support such practical initiatives, given that she had sought to undertake just such a project only to be prohibited by the administration which reasoned it was more important that she be in the college classroom than the high school classroom.

Scherman predicted support for such initiatives would have to be forthcoming because the new N'CATE system requires the College of Arts and Sciences to be part of clinical observations.

Chair Shub asked, regarding campus security, what we do if someone starts shooting up the place?

Scherman reiterated that the committee dealt with other dimensions of mental health issues, given the state's focus on security.

Provost Frank pointed out that the University was developing an emergency plan.

5. Economics Search and Screen Committee Issue

Erick Howenstine was invited to give his version of the issue Audie Brewton had presented to the Senate at the October 9th meeting.

Howenstine verified that indeed the Economics unit had passed a motion excluding one member (the aforementioned Professor Brewton, to be clear). He offered that it was a good thing that the Senate was dealing with the issue of bylaws because, based on what he had heard, bylaws are only guidelines and don't really have any authority. He pointed out that neither the University search and screen manual nor the bylaws of the Economics unit provided any assistance in determining whether or not the motion passed by the Economics unit was appropriate. He did suggest, though, that the Economics bylaws contained many outdated policies that would be ridiculous to follow, suggesting that the bylaws as a whole need not be obeyed. Moreover, he shared with the Senate that Brewton was, he understood, retiring in December.

Marina Polyashuk wondered if minutes were available from the meeting at which the now notorious motion in question passed. Howenstine indicated there were minutes. Brewton countered they had not passed. Howenstine rejoined that they had passed, that he had sent them on e-mail and nobody questioned them. Polyashuk pointed out that by Roberts' Rules of Order minutes cannot be approved in that manner.

Libretti wondered what exactly was the Senate's role in this issue. Polyashuk reviewed the two motions regarding this issue passed at the previous Senate meeting.

Loretta Capeheart asserted that we don't want to be a part of silencing voices at the University. In response to Howenstine's query as to whether the Senate would vote

the same way hearing his position, Capeheart averred that she would. A minority can be outvoted, she stated, but shouldn't be excluded at the outset of any process. She reminded all that the Faculty Constitution dictates that departments have bylaws, which suggests that bylaws are to have authority and are to be followed.

Kristen Over apologized for what might come off as a wishy-washy response, as she expressed discomfort in entering into a department's governance. She stated that we all certainly have an ideal of what bylaws should be, but there are problems of bylaws being outdated and woefully out of touch with how departments do business. Because of that, she is uncomfortable mandating that a department who did or does business in a democratic way follow outdated bylaws.

Sue Mungre wondered if in fact the bylaws, particularly in terms of the policies on search or screen or DPC matters, were in fact outdated.

Howenstine raised the question of what a unit is to do if one voice tries to sabotage the process.

Capeheart rejoined that the search and screen committee is then responsible for dealing with that issue.

Brewton then spoke, indicating he was flabbergasted that Howenstine would say he was retiring, characterizing that statement as malicious rumor.

The Provost then, indicating he hadn't intended to say anything on this matter, chimed in at this moment that it was his understanding as well that Brewton is to be retiring on December 31st.

After this episode died down, Steve Riess opined that if a unit has rules, they need to be followed. A unit can change them; but until they are changed through legitimate process, they must be followed. In the meantime, the unit must proceed based on criteria of what is reasonable, what is equitable, and what is decent.

Mahootian questioned whether the behavior of the Economics unit is inline with the search and screen manual. The unit, she said, must be following some procedural guidelines, as a motion was passed. At a minimum, the unit needs to follow University guidelines in constructing a search committee and to act in line with the affirmative action law.

This discussion dovetailed into item #6 on the agenda.

6. Charge to the Bylaws Committee

Polyashuk reminded the Senate of the motion passed last meeting that all bylaws, insofar as they do not contradict the Faculty Constitution or other governing documents, need to be respected.

Grammenos asked what teeth bylaws really have.

Shub indicated that the Senate can make recommendations to the President after it has worked through the issue for itself.

7. Status of Elections

Denise Wilson reported that the Fall election ballots went out on October 19th and the deadline for return is October 26th. On October 30th the constituency results, the at-large and non-tenure track ballots are scheduled to go out.

8. Adjournment

Nyadroh (Shahrzad 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

Denise's Notes
Faculty Senate
10-23-07

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 PM. Approval of the minutes of October 9th was deferred until Marit Vamarasi can review the minutes.

The Chair reported that

- One faculty marshal was still needed. Grammenos volunteered.
- The position of faculty marshal was not for tenure.

The Provost gave the report from the President's office. He discussed the HACU award and

- Told us NEIU received an award from the HACU convention
- The Metropolitan State University of Denver wants to become designated as a Hispanic-serving institution and came to NEIU to look at our program.

To be designated a Hispanic-serving institution, a university must

- Have 25% of the student body Hispanic
- Have a clear focus on graduation rates for all
- Provide an array of programs to assist Latino students.

Tim Scherman reported on the September meeting of the IBHE and distributed a handout.

- There is only 2% in the budget for higher education.
- They voted on position papers on student mental health centers on campuses. The state focuses on security; the paper is about prevention, understanding and reaching out to students before violence occurs.

At the October meeting Naomi Jacobsen (representative) and Rich Schell formed a P20 Council (pre-K to grade? 20); they have not met yet.

For emergencies on the NEIU campus, we have security and a psychologist – John Hoepfel of the Counseling Office.

Audie Brewton and Erick Howenstine discussed the Economics Search and Screen Committee issue. Howenstine stated that

- On September 22nd the unit met. A motion was made to exclude one faculty member who was to retire in December (Audie Brewton). The motion passed. (The primary issue was “retirement”, which Brewton has not announced, for not allowing him to participate.)
- The search and screen manual was no help.
- The Economics department bylaws are no help; they are “guidelines.”
- The department chair is the chair of the search and screen committee.

The unapproved minutes of the Economics department will be sent to Allen Shub.

Brewton stated that he was “flabbergasted.”

Polyashuk – consider all parts of the bylaws valid (they are rules that cannot be suspended) and to be respected.

The bylaws need work to improve them in order to be fair to the department.

The decision on the search and screen committee composition – committee is already set to be improved.

The Senate said it was not fair to exclude a faculty member from department business.

The Provost asked if the Faculty Senate created bylaws for everyone? No. The dean should be in communication with the unit; they should discuss the content of the bylaws, submit the bylaws to the Senate, then the Senate votes on them.

The charge to the Senate Bylaws and Academic Freedom committees is to meet and establish officers.

Denise reported that the Fall elections ballots went out on October 19th and the deadline to return them is October 26th. On October 30th the constituency results and the at-large and NTT ballots are scheduled to go out. The winners' letters should go out around November 15th.

Nyadroh/Shahrzad moved for adjournment at 3:00 PM.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 13, 2007

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

REVISED AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - October 23, 2007
 - October 9, 2007
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Report on Steering Committee Meeting with President Hahs
5. State of the University Address
6. Town Hall Meetings with the President
7. Charge to the Bylaws Committee
8. Charge to the Academic Freedom Committee
9. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
10. New Business
11. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
12. Adjournment

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 13, 2007

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - October 23, 2007
 - October 9, 2007
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Charge to the Bylaws Committee
5. Charge to the Academic Freedom Committee
6. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
7. New Business
8. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
9. Adjournment

DRAFT

DRAFT

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
November 13, 2007**

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Dennis Grammenos, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Steve Riess, Allen Shub, Dario Villa

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Ana Gil-Garcia, Sue Mungre, Shencheng Xu

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

1. Approval of the Minutes of October 23, 2007

The minutes of October 23, 2007 meeting were approved. Then, by voice vote, a motion passed to re-open the minutes. Amendments were agreed upon, and the revised minutes were approved.

2. Report from Chair

Allen Shub stressed the importance of listening to both—or all—sides on any particular issue the Senate hears and considers. He expressed embarrassment that the Senate passed a motion regarding the recent issue in Economics before listening to Eric Howenstine. He reminded the Senate to be more careful and avoid rushing to judgment.

Relatedly, he then distributed a response from Gail Dreyfuss, the instructor in Linguistics referenced recently in an issue Rick Hallett brought before the Senate. She responded to her qualifications being impugned, and her letter asserted her academic qualifications to teach sociolinguistics.

Overall, Shub underscored the need for greater civility at the University and raised the prospect of having an ombudsman at the University to help resolve some of our squabbles.

3. Report from the President's Office

Provost Frank reported that the University is in the process of searching for a Vice President of Advancement as the University is placing greater emphasis on

fundraising and development. Simply put, the University needs more money and alternative revenue sources because of shrinking state funding and limitations on raising tuition.

He also reported on a daylong event held by the Political Science Department on political science and careers. The event featured outside speakers, including alumni, and was very successful and worthy of serving as a model for other departments, as our students are often interested, naturally, in parlaying their degrees into careers.

4. Report from Steering Committee

Members of the Steering Committee reported on the following issues it discussed with the President:

A. Departure from Procedure at the University

As witnessed in issues brought before the Senate, conflicts have arisen and been unduly difficult to resolve at all levels in part because of a lack of clearly formulated procedures and protocols or a failure to adhere to those already in place, particularly as they exist in governing documents—or perceived governing documents—such as the Faculty Constitution, department bylaws, the contract, search and screen manuals, etc. The conversation with the President focused on the need to define what our governing documents are. She was amenable to departments having bylaws that matter and to having a process at the University to approve bylaws, if faculty were interested in this initiative. It was pointed out that the Faculty Constitution requires departments to have bylaws.

B. Academic Integrity

Motivated in part by the Hallett issue raised at the October 9, 2007 meeting, the committee discussed with the President what it understood to be an issue of academic integrity, the assigning of courses to instructors over tenured or tenure-track professors. The committee presented the concern as involving issues of rank, seniority, academic excellence, and academic freedom. As tenured and tenure-track faculty are hired through national searches and expected to do research and service in their fields (unlike instructors, tenured and tenure-track faculty are evaluated for retention, tenure, and promotion based in part on their research), the committee asserted that these faculty, it would stand to reason, are the most qualified to teach the courses in their specialties. Additionally, as tenure is the institution developed to protect academic freedom, it was suggested that

giving priority to tenured or tenure-track faculty in assigning courses was important for maintaining and honoring academic freedom at the University, particularly given the tendency at NEIU and nationwide to increase the percentages of instructors at universities, which trend, arguably, threatens to erode academic freedom.

The President did not see the issue so much as one of academic integrity but rather of scheduling and staffing, although in cases where scheduling and staffing were not issues, she did see an argument for giving priority to tenured and tenure-track faculty in course assignments. On the issue of academic freedom and the increased use of instructors at the expense of tenure-track lines, the President thought that somehow academic freedom needed to be revisited to provide instructors with a greater sense of protection. She did not see foresee the possibility of an extreme reversal in the trend to use increasing percentages of instructors but did suggest the possibility of holding the line and perhaps even some countervailing of the trend.

C. Evaluation of the Deans

The Steering Committee first reported to the Senate its own internal discussion regarding this matter previous to visiting the President. Members discussed the purpose of the evaluations, reviewed the rationale and effectiveness of the past practice of making raw data public, and considered the expectations engendered by the process for some faculty that results would be made known. The committee considered that in most universities standard practice was for the Senate to undertake evaluation of administrators and to give the results to the administration in hope that faculty input will be taken seriously. For the process to work effectively, it was argued, and to garner administrators' agreements to participate, confidentiality needed to be ensured. There was some discussion of the usefulness of the information for faculty. Might it not be worthwhile to know how others perceived a dean's performance to get a greater sense of context for one's own limited perceptions? There was an understanding of this position as well as an understanding that, because of past practice, the decision not to release the data raised suspicions; but because this evaluation process was different and new and because of a desire to encourage administrative participation, the committee felt confidentiality was in order and that faculty concerns needed to be addressed through the issuing of a rationale for and explanation of the Senate's decision, which might include a clarification of the experimental process.

The committee shared this discussion with the President, who underscored the importance of considering the issue of privacy. Overall she encouraged the process of evaluating administrators and hoped it would continue.

D. Shared Governance

The committee discussed worries over an apparent top-down governance practice at the University and a desire to put a greater emphasis on shared governance. The President indicated a willingness to meet with faculty on a regular basis, perhaps in a town hall meeting forum. She was very open to prospects for shared governance.

5. State of the University Address

Shub reported that the President will be giving a State of the University address early next term.

6. Town Hall Meetings

Shub reported on the plan to schedule town hall meetings with the President.

7. Charge to Bylaws Committee

It was suggested the Bylaws Committee begin researching bylaws by requesting existing bylaws from departments and coming up with a template of what bylaws should include, as a way of initiating this process.

8. Charge to the Academic Freedom Committee

The Committee gave a brief review of its initial meeting and directions it would be taking. Having looked at documents from UNESCO, Canadian institutions of higher education, and others, the committee was considering the many facets of what academic freedom means and entails. It will be looking into crafting some general principles and thinking about how those principles fit with specific situations on this campus that have already arisen.

9. New Business

- A lively discussion took place about the lack of classroom space for teaching classes. There will be more classrooms once the new Education Building is built; also a few more classrooms will become available when the new Business and Management area is completed.
- Nyadroh said that he would like to see clocks in all classrooms.

10. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils

- Grammenos reported that the Faculty Council on Marketing and Communications met. They are working on having the University purchase a large electronic, flashing sign for the Foster Avenue entrance. The cost is \$35 to \$40,000. The Provost told us that once the new Vice President for Advancement is hired, he could be of help to the Council.
- Riess reported that FCAA met and they are working on The Writing Intensive Faculty Advisory Committee (WI-FAC) activities and Global Studies. A discussion was held about the faculty being spread too thin; the University needs to do more for existing courses before we take on additional programs. The Provost stated that at least three new programs have begun in the five years that he has been at the University.
- Grammenos reported that the Graduate College Advisory Committee has been working on the “Global Studies” name.

11. Adjournment

Nyadroh (Mahootian 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

**Denise's Notes
Faculty Senate
November 13, 2007**

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

Approval of the Minutes

- October 23, 2007
 - Capeheart/Mahootian moved for approval of the minutes of October 23rd as corrected. Unanimous
 - Filus/Perino moved to reopen the minutes. Unanimous.
 - Libretti/Mahootian moved to table the minutes to revise the language. Unanimous
- October 9, 2007
 - Filus/Perino moved for approval of the minutes of October 9th as corrected. Unanimous.

The Chair reported

- Graduation is Saturday, December 15th. Morning faculty marshals are Grammenos, Moran, Shub, and Xu.. Afternoon marshals are Perino and Shub; two more are needed.

New business:

- A lively discussion took place about the lack of classroom space for teaching classes. There will be more classrooms once the new Education Building is built; also be a few more classrooms will become available when the new Business and Management area is completed.
- Nydroh said that he would like to see clocks in all classrooms.

Reports from Faculty Senate Councils:

- Grammenos reported that the Faculty Council on Marketing and Communications met. They are working on having the University purchase a large electronic, flashing sign for the Forster Avenue entrance. The cost is \$35 to \$40,000. The Provost told us that once the new Vice President for Advancement is hired, he could be of help to the Council.
- Riess reported that FCAA met and they are working The Writing Intensive Faculty Advisory Committee (WI-FAC) activities and Global Studies. A discussion was held about the faculty being spread too thin; the University needs to do more for existing courses before we take on additional programs. The Provost stated that at least three new programs have begun in the five years that he has been at the University.
- Grammenos reported that the Graduate College Advisory Committee has been working on the "Global Studies" name.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 27, 2007

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - November 13, 2007
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. State of the University Address
5. Town Hall Meetings with the President
6. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
7. New Business
8. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
9. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting November 27, 2007

Present: Barry Birnbaum, Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Marina Polyashuk, Allen Shub, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Ana Gil-Garcia, Dennis Grammenos, Sue Mungre, Frank Perino, Steve Riess, Dario Villa

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

1. Approval of the Minutes of November 13, 2007

The approval of the November 13th minutes was deferred pending review by President Hahs.

2. Report from the Chair

Chair Shub renewed his call for senators to volunteer as marshals for the December commencement and also alerted the Senate of the need to nominate faculty to serve on the Brommel Award Committee.

3. President's Report

No representative of the President's office attended the meeting.

4. State of the University Address

Chair Shub reported that President Hahs says we should have a state of the university address because the faculty constitution requires it. The Senate then discussed various possibilities for the formats of both the state of the university address and town hall meetings.

5. Adjournment

Birnbaum (Over 2nd) moved to adjourn at 2:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

Denise's Notes
Faculty Senate – 11-27-07

Approval of the minutes of November 13, 2007 was postponed.

The chair requested

- an afternoon marshal for commencement.
- Suggestions for the Brommel Award Committee. Sudha Srinivas (Physics), Barry Birnbaum (Special Education), and Nancy Wrinkle (Mathematics) were given.

The chair also suggested that minutes be taken at steering committee meetings (for the President and the Faculty Senate). He stated the steering committee meeting is a formal meeting, not just a conversation.

President Hahs has requested a format for the State of the University Address – a meeting, questions & answers, ??

President Hahs wants a Town Hall Meeting in December. Questions were asked – when (day/evening)?; how often (three times a year) – different days and times? (Friday afternoon 1-3 or 2-4 PM.

Birnbaum/Over moved for adjournment at 2:45 PM.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

January 8, 2008

**Room SU-216
1:40 P.M.**

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - November 13, 2007
 - November 27, 2007
2. Report from the Chair
3. Brommel Award Committee
4. Town Hall Meeting
5. State of the University Address
6. Status of Bylaws Committee
7. Status of Academic Integrity Committee
8. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
9. New Business
10. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
11. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting January 8, 2008

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Ana Gil-Garcia, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Terrence Puryear, Allen Shub, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Dennis Grammenos, Marina Polyashuk

On Sabbatical: Sue Mungre, Steve Riess

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

1. Approval of the Minutes of November 13, 2007

Over (Perino 2nd) moved to approve the minutes of November 13, 2007.

2. Report from the Chair

Chair Shub reported that President Hahs wants to be evaluated and wants the Faculty Senate to take part. Other groups, he reported, will evaluate her as well.

3. Brommel Award Committee

The Senate will invite the following people to serve on the Brommel Award Committee and will verify their willingness:

Effie Kritikos, Special Education
Christopher Schroeder, English
Sudha Srinivas, Physics
Brett Stockdill, Sociology

4. Town Hall Meeting

Chair Shub reminded the Senate that President Hahs will hold the first town hall meeting on Friday, January 11th, in Alumni Hall.

5. State of the University Address

The State of the University Address will be given on February 21, 2008 when President Hahs can give an update on planning.

6. Status of Bylaws Committee

It was decided the Bylaws committee would collect bylaws from as many departments as possible and recommend a set of common elements to be in all bylaws. Chair Shub said he would contact deans to see what bylaws they might have on file. Gil-Garcia volunteered to serve on the committee. Over volunteered to work on establishing a template that would outline common elements for bylaws.

7. Status of the Academic Freedom Committee (Academic Integrity Committee)

The Committee discussed their work plan.

8. Adjournment

Perino (Mahootian 2nd) moved for adjournment at 2:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

Denise's Notes
Faculty Senate – 1-8-08

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M. Over/Perino moved to approve the minutes of November 13, 2007 as corrected subject to the President's review.

The chair reported that in his meeting with President Hahs has expressed a desire to be evaluated this year, perhaps in the spring, as other administrators.

The following four people will be invited to serve on the Brommel Award Committee:

Effie Kritikos – Special Education

Christopher Schroeder – English

Sudha Srinivas – Physics

Brett Stockdill – Sociology

Ruth (Breckie) Church of Psychology and Nancy Wrinkle of Mathematics will be asked to serve if needed.

President Hahs will hold the first town hall meeting on Friday, January 11, in Alumni Hall at 2:00 PM. She plans to hold two town hall meetings each semester.

The President's State of the University Address will be held soon. Details will be circulated at a later date.

The Bylaws Committee reported that they are beginning the task. They would like help in getting current bylaws of all departments. With this information they plan to develop a template from which to work. Chair Shub said he would email deans for bylaws from each department. Ana Gil-Garcia volunteered to work on the Bylaws Committee.

The Academic Freedom Committee (Academic Integrity Committee) reported on the work they plan to do.

Perino suggested that we have a Faculty Senate "Wish List" this year for things we would like to accomplish. Over would like to develop a template for bylaws.

Perino/Mahootian moved for adjournment at 2:30 PM.

January 22, 2008

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

REVISED AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - January 8, 2008
 - November 27, 2008
2. Report from the Chair
3. Debriefing of Town Hall Meeting
4. State of the University Address
5. Bernard J. Brommel Distinguished Research Professor Award
6. University Process for Evaluation of President Hahs
7. Status of Academic Integrity Issue
8. Status of Bylaws Committee
9. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
10. New Business
11. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
12. Adjournment

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

January 22, 2008

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of January 8, 2008
2. Report from the Chair
3. Debriefing of Town Hall Meeting
4. State of the University Address
5. Bernard J. Brommel Distinguished Research Professor Award
6. University Process for Evaluation of President Hahs
7. Status of Academic Integrity Issue
8. Status of Bylaws Committee
9. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
10. New Business
11. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
12. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting January 22, 2008

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Ana Gil-Garcia, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Terrence Puryear, Allen Shub

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Dennis Grammenos, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

On Sabbatical: Sue Mungre, Steve Riess

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Guest: Edward Odisho

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

1. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes from the November 27, 2007 meeting were approved as were the minutes, with revisions, of the January 8, 2008 meeting.

2. The Bernard J. Brommel Distinguished Research Professor Award

Edward Odisho brought the issue of an alleged change in eligibility requirements before the Senate charging that the change, particularly as it only applied to him this year, constituted a discriminatory practice. The alleged change Odisho referenced was the addition in this year's call for nominations of the stipulation that to qualify one must be a member of the faculty for the year of the appointment, meaning that the candidate who is selected this year in Spring 2008 is appointed for the 2008-2009 academic year and must be a faculty member for that year. As Odisho three years ago signed an irrevocable letter of intent to retire in December 2008, by this stipulation, which had not appeared in writing in the two previous calls for nominations, Odisho would not be eligible for nomination.

Odisho testified that he had dealt with discrimination at Northeastern in earlier years and is committed to challenging this monster wherever it raises his head. He expressed his strong belief that his exclusion from consideration for this award qualified as such an occasion.

While there was discussion as to whether the Brommel Award had been understood as an appointment or as simply an award, Provost Frank maintained that from its inception the award was developed as an appointment, carrying the stipulation that the recipient must be present on campus the following year. He acknowledged that this stipulation had not appeared in writing on the call for nominations in the previous two years.

In hopes of resolving the issue Capeheart (Libretti 2nd) moved that the Senate recommend a one-year transition in the Brommel Award process so that eligibility requirements, particularly regarding the language of appointment, can be clarified. All submitted nominations should be granted consideration while the language of eligibility is clarified. The motion passed.

3. University Process for Evaluation of President Hahs

Initial discussion focused on explaining the nuts and bolts of the process itself, though discussion quickly shifted to the question of whether or not and in what capacity the Senate ought to participate in the evaluation without review and discussion of the efficacy of the process itself given reports of concerns from faculty regarding the handling of the evaluations of the deans the previous year.

Capeheart expressed shock at hearing the President announce at the Town Hall meeting that the Senate had agreed to participate in her evaluation, stressing that the Senate had not discussed the matter and needed to discuss it before endorsing or agreeing to participate in the process. While she expressed her willingness to submit to the majority, she urged the Senate to get clear on the process and its role in it as a governing body on campus and not just to be used to rubber stamp the President's agenda but to take part in shaping the process to serve the faculty it represents.

Over reminded the Senate that, in fact, the Senate was unanimous in its decision to conduct the evaluations of the deans as it did and stated that the concerns of faculty were the result of miscommunication about or misunderstanding of the process outside the Senate. Capeheart responded that the Senate made decisions after the fact of the evaluations having been administered.

Libretti suggested that the issue of how the evaluations are conducted may involve an issue of academic freedom. Given that academic freedom grants faculty the right to criticize the institution, it might follow that faculty have the right to see the results of the evaluation.

Chair Shub opined that since the President requested this evaluation, it's not our role to say how it is done.

Over indicated that the issue of administrative evaluations was not discussed in detail in the steering committee, although it seemed some agreement had been reached regarding the efficacy of not revealing the raw data. She expressed nervousness about jumping back into the discussion. Nonetheless, she offered that the clear splinter in the Senate may very well reflect a splinter in the faculty we represent.

4. Adjournment

Nyadroh (Mahootian 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

Denise's Notes
Faculty Senate Meeting
1-22-08

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 PM.

- Loretta/Kris moved to approve the minutes of January 8, 2008 as corrected.
- Kris /Ana moved to approve the minutes of November 27, 2007.

Ed Odisho, a potential candidate for the Bernard J. Brommel Distinguished Research Professor Award, discussed the guidelines for applying for the BJBDRPAward. The winner must be available for the 2008-2009 academic year. All the nominees who submitted applications should be considered for 2007-2008 year the award is for the 2008-2009 year), but the language for the BJBDRPAward should be clarified.

Loretta/Tim moved that there be a one-year transition for this year to clarify the language for next year's award. The motion carried.

The University evaluation of President Hahs will be done soon (hopefully in April) by (1) full-time tenure track faculty and (2) civil service and A&P staff. The evaluations will then go a committee of vice presidents, then to the Board, and finally to the Library.

Emmanuel/Shahrzad moved for adjournment at 3:30 PM.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

February 5, 2008

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of January 22, 2008
2. Report from the Chair
3. Requested Involvement of Faculty Senate in Evaluation of President Hahs
4. Status of Academic Freedom Issue (if time permits)
5. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
6. New Business
7. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
8. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting February 5, 2008

Present: Barry Birnbaum, Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Ana Gil-Garcia, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Terrence Puryear, Allen Shub, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Dennis Grammenos, Dario Villa

On Sabbatical: Sue Mungre, Steve Riess

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Patrick Miller and Susan Rosa

1. Approval of Minutes of January 22, 2008

The minutes from the previous meeting were not yet available.

2. Report from the Chair

Shub announced that the President's State of the University Address would be February 21st and that the next Town Hall was scheduled for May 2nd.

3. Requested Involvement of Faculty Senate in Evaluation of President Hahs

Susan Rosa expressed concern about the previous year's evaluations of deans and was troubled the process would set a precedent. She indicated that all documents that were supposed to be in the Library were not present, that only the Dean's response is in the Library, not the faculty reps report or the report of the three-member subcommittee. She urged that the Senate not move forward in administrative evaluations without clarity, asserting that it's not enough for the Senate to provide a rationality to faculty for how last year's evaluations were handled; it must decide if they were handled properly.

A number of Senators shared the sense that the pilot needs to be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness. It was suggested that faculty be surveyed as to their perceptions of the usefulness, purpose, and effectiveness of the process. Rosa wondered why the

precedent of releasing results to the faculty was ignored and why suddenly the evaluations are considered performance reviews as a rationale for cloaking the results in secrecy, when this hadn't been the case in the past. Capeheart reiterated that in the past the evaluations were done by faculty for faculty. She asserted that the pilot program was done without faculty input and that that was a problem. She suggested also, following Rosa, that it is not fair to compare these evaluations to student evaluations, a justification for secreting the results. A number of Senators reiterated this concern over what is perceived as a growing secrecy on the part of the administration. One Senator pointed out that the faculty body is not equivalent to "the public," such that results are not really being released to the public, prompting speculation as to why there is so much cover-up on the administration's behalf.

Over pointed out that the promise of confidentiality was what ensured administrative participation in the process and increased the possibility that they would be taken seriously by those who were evaluated. Puryear elaborated that the strength of the evaluation is in the recommendation for change from the sub-committee.

Patrick Miller suggested that simply putting the appropriate documents in the Library, as according to the stipulated protocol, might go a long way toward resolving these issues and concerns over secrecy.

Provost Frank at this point offered the information that the evaluation of the President is the board's project, and that the faculty and administration are asked to participate. He offered his sense that the evaluations are taken seriously by administrators.

Libretti at this point chimed in that when the steering committee had met last fall, Shub presented compelling reasons as to why the results should not be made public. He pointed out that most faculty senates conducted evaluations the same way in hopes that the administration would participate and take the faculty feedback seriously. This information was provided, in fact, by the evaluation service. The confidentiality, for one, assured greater willingness on behalf of administrators to participate. Libretti said that while he was aware of faculty concerns that the data was not made public, he had not really heard a rationale for why it should be. As he reflected on the matter, he suggested that one reason for making data available to the faculty would be that there is great value in faculty having a sense of shared consciousness and that this development of shared consciousness is curtailed if faculty can't see how their brothers and sisters feel about the campus and its administration. He stated that the administration had a right to do its own evaluations for its own reasons and that perhaps the Senate might contemplate doing its own evaluation for its own purposes. Some Senators reiterated the value of a shared consciousness among faculty and suggested that somehow the Senate might facilitate that.

Colon wondered if the purpose and process of the evaluations had been communicated to faculty, pointing out that when the purpose is ambiguous or unstated, controversy will certainly ensue. There needs to be clarification of what will be done with evaluations in order to properly set expectations.

A motion was forwarded that the Senate participate in the process with public clarification of the process and with the recommendation that the subcommittee provide substantial reports of the results of the evaluation.

In discussing the motion, Filus urged that that the Senate must hold the trust of the faculty, expressing her view that the Senate is losing this trust. Capeheart asserted that it is too soon to recreate what we did in the past. Polyashuk wondered why the Senate needed to bless this process. Over reminded the Senate that the President chose this process because it was the process the Senate used in the past.

Gil-Garcia suggested it was healthy that the President wants to be evaluated and opined that any such evaluation might have more meaning if it were accompanied by a school climate and culture survey.

The motion did not carry. The vote was 7-7-1.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

February 26, 2008

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Status of the Academic Freedom Issue
5. Old Business
6. New Business
7. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
8. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
9. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting February 26, 2008

Present: Barry Birnbaum, Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Ana Gil-Garcia, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Allen Shub

Absent: Dennis Grammenos, Emmanuel Nyadroh, Marina Polyashuk, Terrence Puryear, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

On Sabbatical: Sue Mungre, Steve Riess

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

1. Report from the Chair

Chair Shub shared the letter that had been sent to President Hahs regarding the Senate's decision not to participate in her evaluation. He reported that she respected the decision but was nonetheless disappointed.

Shub sought Senate input on sending a letter to the Senate at Northern Illinois University expressing condolences for the tragedy. He was supported in doing so.

2. Status of the Academic Freedom Issue

Libretti spoke on behalf of the Academic Freedom Committee, raising some issues for the Senate to consider and asking for the Senate's direction as the Committee pursues its work. Some of the comments reference a policy statement from the Canadian Association of University Teachers the Committee circulated.

Libretti explained that the Committee began its work with basic questions that tended to focus on academic freedom in the context of teaching, such as the following: What is academic freedom? What is its relationship to academic responsibility and employee obligations? How do we define and protect academic freedom for instructors who never receive tenure? Given that tenure is the institution designed to ensure and protect academic freedom, should the University have a policy or stance on the importance of tenure and a commitment to minimizing the use of instructors and maintaining a certain percentage of tenure and tenure-track faculty?

As the Committee started looking for models of defining and discussing academic freedom, Libretti explained, it began to see that academic freedom really involves an entire culture at the University and extends well beyond what we do in our classrooms. The Committee was also reminded that we need to ensure the academic freedom of students as well. Even a cursory look at the document Libretti distributed highlights that academic freedom must infuse the whole system of University governance and that a University culture characterized by academic freedom is one that empowers the self-determination of faculty and units in the governance process, and recognizes faculty expertise.

In its meeting, the Committee gradually shifted towards raising questions that revisited some old issues that the Senate might rather avoid but which the Committee believes might merit some revisiting, including chair elections, changing of grades, shared governance, the Rick Hallett situation, and the evaluation of administrators (given that academic freedom entails the right to criticize the institution).

The Committee began to feel that many issues at the University might be addressed through a healthy discussion of what academic freedom is and how we cultivate a culture of academic freedom at the University. For example, the perception of growing top-down governance, a divide between administration and faculty, might be addressed by thinking about how we define academic freedom and how we imagine a university culture characterized by academic freedom at all levels. An environment of shared governance--and more properly one of academic freedom--might remedy some of that lack of understanding on both sides.

While we are a collective bargaining institution where faculty has representation, this does not need to mean that union is the sole or primary means of resolving conflict. Collective bargaining is one piece of our larger academic environment, one defining piece of our relationships here. The Committee thinks that we can consciously craft and work toward a culture that relieves antagonisms and that taking the time now to really reflect on the cornerstone concept of university life--academic freedom--can direct us on a healthy trajectory toward a better culture at NEIU.

Over worried that the mantra of academic freedom might be used as an excuse not to do anything and stressed the importance of tying freedoms to responsibilities as outlined in our employee obligations and in the contract.

Capeheart suggested we bring a speaker to campus from the AAUP as a way of perhaps initiating a campus-wide discussion.

Gil-Garcia suggested we take baby steps in motivating this discussion, perhaps starting at the department level.

It was also suggested that the development of academic freedom ought to be a prominent element of strategic planning.

Libretti suggested that a concerted attempt to foster academic freedom ought to entail a scrutiny of processes in place already, no matter how messy that might become. Olson reflected that such a process might lead to a rediscovery of our core values. Filus added that the process needs administrative support if there is going to be a genuine re-assessment of structures.

Provost Frank pointed out the complication that often academic freedom might entail conflicting rights of students, faculty, and administrators.

4. Adjournment

Perino moved to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 11, 2008

**Room SU-216
1:40 P.M.**

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Procedure for Filling Vacant Council and Committee Positions
5. Academic Integrity Issue: Research Publication
6. Continuation of Academic Freedom Discussion
7. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
8. New Business
9. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
10. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting March 11, 2008

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Ana Gil-Garcia, Dennis Grammenos, Timothy Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Emmanuel Nyadroh, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Marina Polyashuk, Allen Shub, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Lidia Filus, James Olson, Terrence Puryear

On Sabbatical: Sue Mungre, Steve Riess

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Patrick Miller and Susan Rosa

Chair Shub opened the meeting at 1:50 P.M.

1. Approval of Minutes of January 22, 2008

The minutes were not available.

2. Report from the Chair

Shub notified faculty that lobby day is April 9, invoking Tim Scherman in identifying the importance of faculty attendance.

3. Report from the President's Office

The Provost reported on an event at the Freedom Museum to welcome Carla Knorowski. The goal of the event was advancement and development.

4. Procedure for Filling Vacant Council and Committee Positions

Shub informed the Senate that there are councils and committees with vacancies and raised the question of whether it was appropriate to fill vacancies by appointment or whether there ought to be elections. One suggestion was to take the next highest vote-getter in the election.

Libretti opined that he saw appointments as suspect and a threat to the democratic operations of the University, as typically members of these councils are supposed to represent faculty. Appointments threatened this spirit of representation.

5. Academic Integrity Issue: Research Publication

Shub brought before the Senate a possible instance in which a faculty member published student research as his/her own. The Senate had only hearsay evidence, and the consensus seemed to be that without the student coming forward or evidence being presented, the Senate could not really act. Members speculated uncertainly about what the Senate could do anyway. Some wondered if flogging, drawing and quartering, or burning at the stake might be appropriate. This issue was not resolved.

6. Continuation of Academic Freedom Discussion

Continuation of Academic Freedom Issue: A potential speaker did not show up. There was discussion of Carol Simpson Stern's visit regarding time, date, and whether the event was for faculty only or ought to include faculty and administration. The Senate approved the latter.

7. Communications and Faculty to be Heard

Nyadroh made a formal motion to give an ENORMOUS THANKS to Denise Wilson who will be retiring at the end of May.

9. Adjournment

Over (Grammenos 2nd) moved for adjournment at 2:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

**Denise's Notes
Faculty Senate
March 11, 2008**

Chair Shub opened the meeting at 1:50 PM. There were no minutes for approval.

The Chair discussed his concern about Senate Councils and Committees not having a complete roster. There was a lengthy discussion about filling vacancies and the possible use of alternative members.

The Provost reported that there was a reception this morning at the Tribune Tower's Freedom Museum to honor Carla _____, our new vice president of _____, and also President Sharon Hahs.

A possible academic integrity issue was discussed regarding a research publication. The incident could be hearsay: A teacher sponsored a student to do some research, then published the student's paper without the student's permission or name. After a review of the alleged facts, the Senators decided - if true - it was possibly an ethics issue; at any rate the student has to make a complaint and then the academic dean should be able to handle it or it could go to the Dean of Students.

An issue about academic freedom was brought to the Senate's attention. A faculty member said something in class to a student; the student stormed out of the classroom saying "you bigot." It was reported that something happened to the faculty member (untrueP. The student felt unsafe about going back to class and is now being tutored.

Capeheart presented information for a Faculty Senate special event. She contacted Carol Simpson Stern who is willing to speak about academic freedom. Invitees will be faculty, chairs, deans, VPs, the Provost, and the President. The desired dates are April 8th or 15th; the Golden Eagles and SU-214 are preferred rooms; and the time will be 1:40 to 3:00 P.M. There is an honorarium for the speech. Capeheart and other Senators will take her to lunch before the event. There is a possibility of prepared questions for her to answer.

Senator Shencheng told us that the Parking Service is looking for a full-time employee to work in their department.

Denise Wilson announced her retirement from the University on May 31, 2008. Nydroh (unanimous 2nd) moved to thank Wilson for her work.

Over/Grammenos moved for adjournment at 2:45 P.M.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 25, 2008

**Room SU-216
1:40 P.M.**

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Continuation of Academic Freedom Discussion
5. Preparation for AAUP Speaker
6. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
7. New Business
8. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
9. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting March 25, 2008

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Dennis Grammenos, Shahrzad Mahootian, James Olson, Kristen Over, Marina Polyashuk, Terrence Puryear, Allen Shub

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Ana Gil-Garcia, Timothy Libretti, Emmanuel Nyadroh, Frank Perino, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

On Sabbatical: Sue Mungre, Steve Riess

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

1. Approval of the Minutes

There were no minutes for approval.

2. Report from the Chair

- Chair Shub reminded the group that Lobby Day will be held in Springfield on Wednesday, April 9th. Buses will leave the University at 6:00 A.M.
- Faculty Marshalls are needed for graduation on Saturday, May 3rd, at 9:00 A.M. Capeheart and Shub will serve and, possibly, Mahootian.
- The faculty member involved with the issue of a student research project being published has stated he/she will meet with the dean with the original research material; this issue was discussed at an earlier Faculty Senate meeting.
- A discussion on advertising semester offerings in public newspapers was held. It was suggested that Janice Haring-Hendon in Enrollment Services or Ericka Krehbiel in Public Relations be contacted.

3. Report from the President's Office

Provost Frank reported that Dean Varkey Titus of the College of Business and Management is leaving the University at the end of June and will relocate in Georgia. During his tenure as dean, the college has done very well.

4. Continuation of Academic Freedom Discussion

A lengthy discussion of academic freedom continued and included possible topics for the guest speaker who will present her speech on April 8th.

5. Preparation for AAUP Speaker

Carol Simpson Stern will speak on Tuesday, April 8th, at 1:40 P.M. in room 101 of the Science Building. Capeheart will introduce the speaker and hopefully obtain a written biography of Ms. Stern. A sample of questions for Ms. Stern are

- What is academic freedom?
- What are the controversies, if any?
- How does it apply to students?
- What is happening in state vs. public education now?

6. New Business

Faculty Senate Elections: Denise Wilson announced that the self-nomination material will be distributed to the Elections Committee and should be distributed to the faculty by March 27th. Chair Shub will substitute for Sue Mungre who is on sabbatical.

7. Adjournment

Capeheart (Over 2nd) moved for adjournment at 2:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise Wilson
Faculty Senate Office

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 22, 2008

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Report from the Chair
3. Report from the President's Office
4. Report from IBHE-FAC Meeting
Tim Scherman
5. Report from SURSMAC
Henry Owen, III
6. Filling the IBHE-FAC Representative Position
7. Debriefing of Academic Freedom Speaker Event
8. Communications and Faculty to be Heard
9. New Business
10. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils
11. Adjournment

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting April 22, 2008

Present: Loretta Capeheart, Susan Colon, Lidia Filus, Timothy Libretti, Emmanuel Nyadroh, Frank Perino, James Olson, Kristen Over, Marina Polyashuk, Terrence Puryear, Allen Shub, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Ana Gil-Garcia, Dennis Grammenos, Shahrzad Mahootian, Dario Villa

On Sabbatical: Sue Mungre, Steve Riess

Ex-Officio: Provost Lawrence Frank

Guests: Tim Scherman – IBHE-FAC
Henry Owen, III – SURSMAC

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:45 P.M.

1. Report from the IBHE-FAC Meeting

Professor Tim Scherman of the English Department, the University's representative on the IBHE-FAC, reported on the Faculty Advisory Council's presentation to the IBHE at the April 1st meeting. The report had two main components:

- A) The council reiterated its focus in its previous position paper that instead of focusing simply on heightening security to deal with episodes like the Virginia Tech incident that preventive measures, including providing adequate counseling and mental health services to students, need primary attention. The council pointed out that the reductions in funding to state universities hinder universities' abilities to support students in this regard and to avoid another Virginia Tech tragedy.

- B) The council presented a re-definition of economic efficiency in higher education, pointing out the deficiencies in thinking and shortsightedness informing the traditional business model. Basically, the presentation underscored that education is not simply a private benefit to individuals but, as studies show, an educated populace bears fruit for communities in economic terms, cultural terms, social terms, etc.

Scherman also reported that legislators expressed support for the capital bill in the budget that would bring NEIU a new education building. Of course, he mentioned, the persistent countervailing reality of the state's structural deficit still promised to make that support moot. The Provost added here that he did note a change in attitude in the legislature toward higher education which was no longer hostile but sympathetic to the underfunded condition of higher education. Still, he agreed with Scherman that the structural deficit overrode any optimism.

2. Report from SURSMAC

Henry Owen, III reported on the state of our pension system, the State University Retirement System. The pension system is underfunded to the tune of some 40 billion dollars. While pensions are currently contractually guaranteed and upheld by the state constitution, Owen reported that the threat to the system lay in the possibility of a constitutional convention that could alter the constitution and reconfigure the state's obligation to pensions.

The biggest hope to fund pensions, he reported, is a proposed bill SB2288, which would set up a trust fund for higher education.

Owen also discussed some of the funding and investments of pensions.

3. President's Report

The Provost reported that Nancy Masterson resigned as Chair of the Board of Trustees and was replaced by Walter Dudycz, who was elected.

He also reported that Lobby Day was effective in terms of NEIU receiving a friendly hearing, but pointed out that the budgetary problems don't offer hope for the friendship bearing material fruit.

He reported additionally that Pappas Consulting had started work in a major way, undertaking focus groups with students, faculty, and University officers.

He announced the call for research communities.

4. Filling the IBHE-FAC Representative Position

It was decided to fill this position by election. A call for nominations would be issued. If only one nomination is received, that person will be appointed.

5. Debriefing on Academic Freedom Speaker Event

There was some frustration at the format, such as the long introduction by the speaker and the many interruptions which prevented the speaker from working through her agenda. There as a general sense that it is beneficial to be refreshed on these issues and that in the future we might have a more directed format or agenda.

6. ROTC Courses

The agenda item was forwarded to us from FCAA, who had been asked to approve the ROTC courses. This Council felt the presence of ROTC on campus needed a larger discussion. It was pointed out to us that ROTC, according to particular implementations of the Solomon Act, has the right to come to campus or schools; if they are denied that right, schools are subject to lose federal funding (Pell Grants, etc). Also, it was pointed out that some of our students (about three) are already taking these courses, and they need to take them at DePaul (and pay tuition there).

There was some sentiment expressing worry over the homophobic attitudes of the military as well as the over the military's alleged dishonesty in recruiting students. The question was raised as to the appropriateness of these attitudes and ethics on our campus. The issue was also raised as to whether they are coming on campus to educate or recruit, as one voice argued that the Solomon Act applies to the right to recruit, not the right to teach classes. The Provost pointed out that major universities had already fought this legal battle and lost.

Issues were raised about what it means to be a diverse community and to recognize diversity. Several voices said that honoring diversity means we honor students' rights to choose the military and to allow this option to them on our campus.

There was some suggestion that now might be the time to craft a larger policy to deal with these situations and to articulate how our University values dictate how we handle these situations and also set guidelines for the behavior of other presences on our campus.

7. Adjournment

Nyadroh (Perino 2nd) moved for adjournment at 3:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Libretti
Secretary

Denise's Notes
Faculty Senate Meeting
April 22, 2008

Chair Shub called the meeting to order at 1:47 P.M. No minutes were approved.

Provost Frank reported for the President's office that

- At the last Board of Trustees meeting Chair Nancy Masterson resigned. Walter Dudycz was elected as chair; Jin Lee is vice chair, and Carlos Azcoitia is Secretary.
- The lobby day was good. Dudycz and Omar Duque went down to Springfield with the NEIU group.
- Pappas Consulting and others are working with us already through debriefings and focus groups throughout May; they hope to have a draft plan by September.
- Sarah Hoaglund is the winner of the Brommel Award.
- The call for research is due in May.

Tim Scherman reported on the IBHE-FAC meeting.

Filling the IBHE-FAC representative position has always been by election.