

Spring 2-18-2015

Senate Meeting, February 18, 2015

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 18, 2015" (2015). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 886.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/886>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, February 18, 2015
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senate Secretary Ed Stewart called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2015

Motion XLV-135: By Senator Dallas, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to approve the minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: Good evening!...

I just wanted to let everyone know: if the room seems a little thinner tonight it is because Dr. Dietz is hosting a reception for the honorary degree recipients, the Maitlands, at the University Residence this evening, because Founder's Day is tomorrow.

A few other comments: First, please remember to set aside time on your calendars to come to the meetings of the candidates for Provost with shared governance groups and to the open forums. The small meetings will take place from 9:45-10:30 a.m. in the First Floor West Lounge of the Bone Student Center and the open forums from 2-3 p.m. (which are in two different locations). On Tuesday, February 24, Michael Licari will be our guest. On Thursday, February 26, Jim Jawahar. On Friday, February 27, Matthew Shaftel. On Monday, March 2, Janet Krejci. I can read their biographies if anyone is interested.

Our voices and perspectives are important to the search committee and the President as they make decisions about the next leader of Academic Affairs. Please make every effort to attend at least one of these two events for each candidate. The morning sessions are a great opportunity to interact with the candidates in a smaller setting, which is often helpful in getting to know them better.

I also wish to take this opportunity to voice my support for our non-tenure-track faculty as their union continues their negotiations with Human Resources for a new contract, negotiations that have apparently entered federal mediation. These faculty members shoulder an enormous amount of the instruction at this university, are dedicated to excellence in teaching and learning, and work for much less compensation than their tenure-line peers in their departments, who carry research and service responsibilities. They did not receive a pay increase this year and yet are only asking for the very minimal 2% raise that other faculty received. If the figures that I have received regarding their overall pay are reliable, this amounts to only about \$200,000 to \$250,000 total in increased personnel services expenditures. Despite the budget climate in the state and the pressure on tuition dollars, that is an affordable and indeed a morally necessary expenditure. If necessary, we should reallocate from other areas to meet this need. Our highest priority as an institution should be provision of just and equitable salaries for all our faculty and other instructors who facilitate student success here. Particularly those full-time faculty who have dedicated a significant portion of their career to ISU. Universities across the nation are actually a long way away from such an ideal, so it behooves us all to look squarely at the inequities facing a large majority of the profession—yes we are still a profession and not merely a workforce—and address those inequities.

Finally, I'd like to express my disappointment in Governor Rauner's proposed budget, which appears not to recognize the crucial continuity between the K-12 education he wants to promote and the next steps *necessary* for many of our high school graduates and their futures.

With the continuation of our discussion of the proposed revisions to the Student Code of Conduct tonight, we have a full agenda, so I will hold further comments until we get to our action and information items.

I will take questions if anyone has questions.

Senator Winger: Is there a way to get the first half of your remarks turned into a resolution for the Senate?

Senator Holland: You could submit a resolution; anybody can do that at any time.

Senator Kalter: Our Sense of the Senate Resolutions usually come under Communications and do not have to go through a committee.

Senator Holland: No, they do not.

Senator Winger: Does that go on the next agenda?

Senator Holland: That would be the easiest way to do it, but if you have it ready by the time we get to Communications, you could read it and we could vote on it this evening.

Senator Winger: Since I assume Senator Kalter has her remarks written, can we do that?

Senator Kalter: I would be happy to provide my remarks to Senator Winger.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Joyce: Hello Everybody. We are going to host the town hall meeting that I briefly touched upon that will host the president and the four vice presidents. That is going to be here on March 3 from 5:30 to 7:30. Please let your students know. We are trying to get a good student population to come out. Also, we are going to be having a table at the Founders Day Showcase tomorrow in the Brown Ballroom from 11:00 to 1:00. So stop by and say hi.

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Larry Dietz – Absent***

- ***Provost Janet Krejci***

Provost Krejci: I want to offer my congratulations to Senator and Joanne Maitland. They are being honored tonight. I went there, but I thought that I would be the one representative here at Senate tonight. The application for the CFA dean candidates closes on February 20. They are looking to do airport interviews the first week in March. I want to give an update on enrollments. We remain about 4% behind in admits and 15% behind in applications, but we are up 3% in enrollment deposits. We have had some glitches with LEAP and we are working them out and we have made lots of good progress this week. Thank you for the Cedric Johnson Black History Presentation last night. The History Department was out in full force last night. Also, thank you to everyone who participated in the Pink Game to raise money for cancer last Sunday and they were very successful.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Brent Paterson – Absent***

- *Vice President of Finance and Planning Greg Alt - Absent*

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee:

Senator Crowley: On March 19, an edTPA showcase will occur from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. at the alumni center in room 118. Please spread the word. We reviewed the Academic Affairs tasks and we are doing very well. We continue to work on each of our items including the Pass/Fail-Credit/No Credit updating on that policy. We also initiated an in depth discussion of our process involving the data set on Monday/Wednesday classes. Very diligent attention from Senator Alt, Senator Paterson and Provost Krejci on the Sale of Instructional Materials, which is something we are working on.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:

Senator Lessoff: We approved a draft tonight of the Academic Impact Fund Report, which we will submit to the Executive Committee. We will request a presentation later in the semester. We also discussed procedures for finalizing the commentary on the president. It should go to the Executive Committee and the president in a relatively timely fashion.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Senator Holland: The committee is currently comparing the University and Distinguished Professors Policies.

Planning and Finance Committee:

Senator Rich: We have been doing an awful lot of homework. Members submitted comments on the Institutional Priorities Report and also proposed revisions. We had an excellent discussion, but a great deal of work remains, so we are going to have an extra meeting next week. Hopefully in two weeks, we will be voting and get on agenda for your consideration in the spring.

Rules Committee:

Senator Bushell: We approved a cleaned up version of the Protection of Minors Policy, so we will send that to Exec and hopefully the full Senate will see that soon. We also worked on the AFEGC Policy. It has essentially been rewritten. We are very proud of the two members of our committee that essentially became the authors of it. We will see if we can iron that out at the next couple of meetings and hopefully the Senate can see it before the end of the semester.

Second Information Session:

02.05.15.02 *Code of Student Conduct Rationale for Revisions (Art Munin, Dean of Students)*

01.16.15.04 *Code of Student Conduct Draft Approved by SGA (Previously distributed to Senate 2/4/15) (Art Munin, Dean of Students/Rick Olshak, Associate Dean of Students)*

Senator Kalter: I would like to invite Dr. Art Munin and Mr. Rick Olshak to the table. Thank you both for being here. You have in your original packets the Code and some other items that Cynthia sent out. We have the proposed draft. You should have from last time the sheet that I created that shows sections corresponding to which (changes were made in the revised Code). There is a rationale that was asked for at the last meeting and also an Executive Summary and a very detailed list of the number of cases, types of sanctions and those kinds of things. Last time, we went through sections 1-7. The hope tonight is that we will go through sections 8-12. Section 13 is in Rules Committee because it involves a change in Senate Blue Book structure. Section 14 is the references section. Although we will be looking at it, we probably won't do much with that section. After we get through section 12, I will ask if there are any further questions about sections 1-7.

Dr. Munin: For section 8, some of the major revisions really center on the respondents, complaining parties, aggrieved parties and student organizations. Really separating out the complaining parties and the aggrieved parties is perhaps of interest. In bringing forward conduct charges, there is a difference between an RA and a

police officer in the scope of their duties filing a report and a student judicial charge coming from that. That comprises the complaining party. Whereas for an aggrieved party, it is someone who reports being a victim in some way and being afforded different sets of rights, especially as it pertains to appeal. Within the conduct process, it is not good practice for RAs or police officers to be appealing cases on the outcome because they were performing their duties in filing that report.

Senator Sanden: I have a concern that I am raising on behalf of a colleague in TCH. He would like to talk about item 3 in part 8, Student Rights and Responsibilities. He requests that this item be amended to provide the student with the right to a hearing by a university hearing panel because this amendment would remove the clause of an unbiased administrative hearing officer. He says that the rationale for this is that current policies do not obligate the university to honor a student's choice to hearings by the university hearing panel. The panel hearing occurs as a scheduling convenience to the university. He recognizes that the university has an obligation to process cases in a timely manner, but he believes that the university should take steps to broaden the hearing panel availability in response to student needs.

Dr. Munin: I can understand the comments and this is where also having some of the data to see how that would actually be realized in the process with last year having 2,200 cases, we honestly don't have the staff if every student went to a hearing panel. Another aspect is that the vast majority of conduct cases are fairly simple in nature. They are sit-down conversations with a student and university hearing panels are fantastic for parceling out cases that are complex and have contested issues. For those other cases, a conversation with an administrative hearing officer really meets the need of addressing the behavior and also providing an educational opportunity.

Senator Sanden: He follows up with in addition to that; he believes if a student doesn't choose a hearing panel, and you are saying that isn't feasible, that the student has a right to a hearing by an unbiased administrative hearing officer, who is unaffiliated with SCCR and the Dean of Students Office. His rationale for this is that SCCR, by its nature, represents an office that deals with the resolution of complaints and accusations towards students in the ISU community. While it is recognized that officer training does occur, an administrator governed by an office affiliated with SCCR and the Dean of Students involves inherent bias given the number and patterns of cases processed by this department. This volume of cases prompts an instinctive judgment influenced by experience with prior cases that may affect individual student's rights to have their situations interpreted on their own individual merits. So he is looking for a hearing by an officer that is less affiliated with SCCR.

Dr. Munin: I can understand the concern. In my experience, we have very highly trained and competent staff, who have dedicated their life to providing educational opportunities for students who potentially make mistakes. I would contest that staff in SCCR and the Dean of Students represent an unbiased conduct body for the students. I would say that the staff represent advocates for students and also trying our hardest to create educational opportunities.

Senator Thornton: To your point about having a panel, I understand the vision behind that and how very important it is to protect the rights of students. However, if the situation is not conducive to having that kind of panel or hearing, it doesn't quite make sense to pursue that avenue if we don't have the means to do that.

Senator Porter: I completely agree with Senator Sanden's comments, but I think the changing nature of the Code itself to be much less accusatory toward students and more understanding is enough that it protects us without having a separate, unbiased committee.

Senator Sanden: Again, I am presenting this on behalf of a colleague in TCH. This colleague would request that this item be amended to provide the student with a mandatory resource from an entity that is housed in a

separate and distinct manner from SCCR and the Dean of Students. He is referring to item 5. As written, this does not provide student respondents with sufficient resources for a response. Student respondents are at a disadvantage in the current system because they face an unfamiliar adversary that forces their research for protocols for which administrations are fully versed. Providing mandatory resources outside of SCCR ensures that students receive this information from a source of advocacy that could inform their rights as well as their responsibilities.

Dr. Munin: I would absolutely agree with that and that is what the implementation of these conduct consults is meant to do. Those will be individuals who are outside of SCCR and the Dean of Students Office. It will not be mandatory. I believe that students in the process have the right to choose. It will be highly recommended to them that they utilize all of their best resources, but these individuals will exist outside of DOS and SCCR.

Senator Kalter: Are there further comments about section 8? I did have something that I wanted you to address. On pages 15 and 16, there are comments about advisors and some changes from the old Code. When the last Code went through, there was some discussion about how many advisors a student is allowed to have and looks like we are reducing that from 3 to 1. There was also something about what is the role of advisors. There is a line on page 16 that says something to the effect that they cannot take direction from them.

Dr. Munin: We have proposed reducing the number of advisors from 3 to 1. Bringing it up to 3 was a good idea with good intentions, but then you see the unintended consequences of it. One unintended consequence of bringing 3 advisors is confusion for the student. I have heard a student trying to pay attention to a hearing while having three people trying to provide them information at the same time. More primary is that if you have three people, there can be up to 12 advisors. It creates an intimidating environment for the students going through it. Advisors are there to offer advice, support and wisdom. Some of this language, as far as accepting direction, what that is really meant to say is we want students to speak with their voice. This is an educational process and we want to be able to have that educational dialogue. We want to try to hold off as much as possible asking a question of a student, a student turning to their advisor or the advisor giving them the answer and the student giving the answer and doing that every single time. It takes away from the educational nature of the conversation.

Senator Kalter: The only question I had on section 8 had to do on page 18, lines 21 and 22. This is under aggrieved party's rights and responsibilities. Aggrieved party status shall be limited to cases involving physical and sexual misconduct, sexual exploitation, etc. Can you explain the rationale for those particular choices? Is this all of the things that could be considered crimes?

Dr. Munin: Not directly referencing to crimes, but all of these in some form or fashion reflect victimization.

Mr. Olshak: The committee first looked at Title 9 violations, but we also looked toward other areas where it would be personal victimization where the person had been physically or emotionally abused or had property taken.

Senator Kalter: Are there any further questions on section 8? Let's move on to section 9. This one is forms of resolutions.

Dr. Munin: This is where we get into how the Code is different. While we try to make every conduct process educational in nature, we know it can have a certain adversarial feel. We have changed the charge letter to a first contact letter asking students to come in to start a dialogue. It gives students an opportunity to own up to mistakes they make and say what can we together design as a fit outcome to this. It helps us create a more individualized outcome for the student. Restorative conferences is a best practice in the field, which gives us the opportunity to bring responding students together who have been affected and facilitate a conversation between

them. Restorative conferences are predicated on the idea that the person who caused the harm is taking responsibility for it and is willing to have an open dialogue.

Senator Kalter: I forgot at the top to thank Dr. Munin and the other people who worked with him on this. In terms of the feedback we got last time, Dr. Munin had already done the revisions the next morning. We did not give you the revisions that we had suggested last time because we thought it would be confusing. The stuff we are talking about in 8 through 12 will also be in the revised version. The Executive Committee saw some stuff from 2012 when there were some out of cycle revisions made to the Code because of some changes in legal circumstances. Instead of talking about those tonight, we will wait and send those out for the next time when we talk about section 13. Any comments about section 9? Let's move on to section 10, sanctions.

Dr. Munin: Outlining the major changes is articulating the difference between an active and an inactive sanction. Eliminating the deferred suspension sanction. A deferred suspension is not something I have seen in other codes. The reason why we are eliminating it is it has a certain double secret probation feel to it—we are going to suspend you, but we are going to hold it off. I have heard things from students. It's like this heavy thing being placed above their head. That is what probation is supposed to be. Also, we articulate why we have a restrictive disciplinary probation and a non-restrictive as well.

Senator Sanden: Again, relaying concerns of a colleague in the School of Teaching and Learning, he has concerns about that removal of the deferred suspension. His concern is that deferred suspension allows for remorseful and well-intended students the opportunity to continue efforts to remedy the conditions that caused the behavior and provides a motivator for pursuing positive behavioral change. I took note of what you said because that makes sense to me, but I want to make sure that I put his concerns on the record.

Senator Kalter: Any further questions. Let's move on to section 11, conduct records.

Dr. Munin: The only notable change is changing record compliance time from five years to seven years. That is something done from a conversation with General Counsel.

Senator McHale: I wanted to ask a question about the compliance time from five to seven years. Why that change?

Dr. Munin: It is reflective of best practices in the field. There is always a concern for significant cases of wanting to make sure we maintain records if students do come back to the institution. It is becoming much more common for students to take long breaks and be able to come back. We want to maintain those histories in order to protect our community.

Senator Huxford: Why seven; why not ten? It sounds like longer is better.

Dr. Munin: It can be. It all depends on where you are starting the conversation from. I believe seven is adequate.

Senator Trujillo: In regard to RSOs having their records retained permanently, is there any information regarding the students that were a part of that RSO at that time?

Dr. Munin: The students' names could be in the RSO conduct file, but that is not a conduct file for the student. It would not come up on an individual's conduct record.

Senator Powers: What is the reason that the RSO records are maintained permanently?

Dr. Munin: These organizations do have a continued life and legacy. Looking back on that history doesn't mean you having a case five years ago is something that is going to worsen your sanction now, but we do want to be noticeable of patterns that occur with RSOs.

Senator Kalter: Further questions? I want to do a final call for questions on 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. And then going back to the stuff we did two weeks ago?

Senator Sanden: I have a question in general. Again, I am relaying a concern from a colleague in the School of Teaching and Learning. He has a concern that there has not been enough transparency as we go along with the revisions to the Student Code. He wonders why the university can't make public online interim versions of the Student Code as it goes through this revision process. He received a response that the university doesn't have the technological capability to accomplish that and he questions that.

Dr. Munin: I can't speak to the technological aspect of that. I am unfamiliar. There was a strong committee devised in order to bring this together. I would absolutely take in the feedback that would be provided by this group about how this process can be better next time. I see how having the document that shows the changes is helpful and would want to make that available when we come back around on this down the road.

Mr. Olshak: The committee worked very hard to try to be transparent with the community. We began this process by surveying every student, faculty and staff member. We received many hundreds of usable responses. We then conducted focus groups among each of the groups and collected more data. Then it went into writing mode. As chair of the committee, I was never asked to produce interim documents. I was never asked to see progress. We treated it simply as a writing session and understood that our product had to meet first with the acceptance of the Vice President for Student Affairs. Once that was done, the document would then proceed through the shared governance process so again the community could have another opportunity to review the document.

Senator Kalter: The Senate Office also received the concern from that particular faculty member. When the Code came to the Executive Committee, it became a public document under the Open Meetings Act and so as we received that concern, I asked Cynthia to place the Code that we are looking at onto the Senate website. So it is in the Documents section of the Senate website. Any of your faculty can look at that. They can give you feedback; they can give feedback either to the Dean of Students Office or the Senate Office. So there is an open and transparent process going on. We decided not to post the subsequent draft that I alluded to earlier. Posting every draft would be confusing. For the moment, the one that is out is the one that has gone to the full Senate. Eventually, we will replace that copy with the one that has the edits.

Alright, are there any further questions?

Senator McHale: My first question has to do with RSO involvement, academic teams. Is it specified at what point you are going to tell my coach?

Mr. Olshak: We would not automatically contact a coach. If we are talking about an individual situation, we might not automatically contact a department staff member. If it is organizational behavior, certainly the department or advisor would immediately be made aware of that.

Senator McHale: So there is no point at which you do tell the coach?

Mr. Olshak: There are mechanisms for doing that, but with the Athletics Department, those are formalized. So that goes through the athletics director's staff. There is a determination by the athletics director's staff of who to include.

Senator McHale: The range of possibilities is disciplinary probation and restrictive disciplinary probation, but both of those are going to appear on a student's record. Is that correct?

Mr. Olshak: You also have censure which is a reprimand; that is the lowest level.

Senator McHale: Is that on a student's record?

Mr. Olshak: It's on the disciplinary record. We do not affect the student's academic record with this disciplinary notation.

Senator McHale: Before when there was the deferred suspension, that wasn't listed on a disciplinary record at all?

Mr. Olshak: Yes, it would be. Any formal disciplinary action will result in a record being kept.

Senator Porter: At what point does it become organizational disciplinary behavior as opposed to individual disciplinary behavior?

Mr. Olshak: That is why we always do an investigation. When we have an organizational allegation that has been made, we have a pre-investigation protocol. So we will meet with the officers and advisors of the organization. Only by collecting as much fact as we can are we in a position to determine if it is organizational discipline that we are looking at. It is a completely contextual question.

Senator Crowley: The Student Code of Conduct is one set of concepts and procedures, but then Athletics have their own and I know that the Council for Teacher Education has its own. How does that work? How do students keep straight what they are being held responsible for procedurally?

Mr. Olshak: The simplest way to define it is an instructor in a department has authority over the grades, enrollment in a major, participation in a program. All of the academic decisions that need to be made are made by academic officials. It is the relationship between the student and the institution that is reviewed by the Dean of Students Office. Any corrective requirements that are made in order to repair the relationship between the student and the institution are done by our office. The results of a student conduct issue would not trump any decisions made within the department.

Senator Kalter: To say a couple of things about next steps, my understanding is we will probably take the Code to an Action Item only after the whole Code has been discussed. The Rules Committee is looking at section 13, the Blue Book structure. Last time, Senator Gizzi suggested that a committee should look at the academic dishonesty part of the Code. The Executive Committee discussed that and decided to send the Code to just one committee, so we have sent both those things to Rules. We will not move to action until we have discussed those parts.

Information Items:

***02.04.15.01 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Policy-Revised
(Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Crowley: Our committee did not have much to say about this policy because it is a federally-guided process. We did not have concerns due to that fact.

Senator Kalter: The changes were, on the first page, putting in a financial aid warning under cumulative grade point average. Credit hours attempted but not earned on the second page under completion rates. A sentence

was added saying that transfer student completion rate is calculated by counting transferred hours attempted and complete, etc. There are a couple of things that Jonathan Rosenthal suggested that we add or cross out.

12.18.14.06 *Sale/Solicitation of Academic Assignments Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)*

Senator Crowley: We had a very thorough discussion, but we did not make any changes to the policy. We talked about technology and how easy the sale of academic materials is; however, we felt that the policy captured what we needed to capture.

Senator Kalter: Senator Crowley, I think this is the one that is related to help sites.

Senator Crowley: That was a discussion, but I think it got blended in with the Student Code. So we kind of kept student help websites out of this. It is not that we are ignoring that issue and we are very concerned about informing students what might get them in to a very big punitive procedure.

Senator Kalter: My recollection of that discussion was that the person bringing it forward to the Senate was concerned that, yes, we have policy that is what happens if you violate it and you go through a student conduct process, but how do you prevent it.

Senator Croker: Our discussion from a couple of weeks ago was simply that that is something that is addressed in terms of student misconduct and plagiarism. Whether that needs to be addressed in light of the concern that was raised about how do we take a more educative rather than punitive stance falls well outside the purview of the sale and solicitation as there may not be any sale or solicitation. I also remember from our discussion that I thought our existing language about plagiarism pretty much covered it, but that is a conversation that is still ongoing.

Advisory Item:

02.06.15.01 *HLC Assurance Argument- Revised to Reflect Senate Recommendations*

Senator Kalter: Back in the fall, the Higher Learning Commission Argument document that is part of our accreditation process came to the Senate. We had a presentation from Jim Jawahar, Associate Provost. Both the Academic Affairs Committee and the Senate Chair gave feedback to the HLC committee. He is basically showing us here the edits that they made in response to our feedback. It is just an Advisory Item and does not require any action.

Communications

Senator Winger: I have a resolution for the Senate's consideration. The text is as follows: "Resolved that the Academic Senate hereby voices its support for our non-tenure-track faculty as their union continues its negotiations with Human Resources for a new contract, negotiations that have apparently entered federal mediation. These faculty members shoulder an enormous burden of instruction at this university, are dedicated to excellence in teaching and learning and work for much lower compensation than their tenure-line peers in their departments who carry research and service responsibilities. They did not receive a pay increase this year and yet are only asking for a very minimal 2% raise that other faculty have received. If our figures regarding their overall pay are reliable, this amounts to only \$200,000 to \$250,000 total in increased personal service expenditures. Despite the basic budget climate in the state and the pressure on tuition dollars, that is an affordable and, indeed, *morally necessary* expenditure. NTT faculty at ISU are among the lowest paid faculty in the state, lower than most public universities and almost all community colleges. Given our reliance on these faithful and self-sacrificing servants, ISU should rather be at the top of the comparative pay scale. For 21 years of experience, NTTs can expect only a \$3,000 increase in salary. Secondly, the Senate hereby resolves that this resolution be communicated forthwith to the president, Board of Trustees and to the union in question.

Motion XLV-136: By Senator Winger, seconded by Senator Crowley, to endorse the Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Provost Krejci: For clarification, and Sam (Catanzaro), you can help me out here, I think that the raise did not go into effect because there wasn't a contract, not that the raise won't be retroactive once that is assumed.

Sam Catanzaro, Asst. VP for Academic Administration: I am a member of the university's negotiating team and I am not sure what details I am at liberty to divulge. It is the case that the raise was not effective because the contract was out.

Provost Krejci: I just want to make sure that there is not an assumption that it was denied.

Senator Winger: I will change it to they are asking for a very minimal 2% raise.

Senator Lessoff: Could you read the first part of the resolution again?

Senator Winger: "Resolved that the Academic Senate hereby voices its support for our non-tenure-track faculty as their union continues its negotiations with Human Resources for a new contract, negotiations that have apparently entered federal mediation. These faculty members shoulder an enormous burden of instruction at this university, are dedicated to excellence in teaching and learning and work for much lower compensation than their tenure-line peers in their departments who carry research and service responsibilities."

Senator Lessoff: Wouldn't that be enough?

Senator Winger: Absolutely not. I think the rest of it has all the punch.

Senator McHale: The resolution says that the NTTs are paid less than at other public universities and community colleges. Is that correct?

Senator Winger: The notes I have on that here were handed to me by a colleague. Lower than most other public universities—the source there is the NEA Higher Education Advocate, March 2014. For lower than all community colleges, that's the same footnote.

Senator Fazel: Is it urgent for us to do this tonight? I would prefer to have a copy in front of me and verify the information in terms of numbers.

Senator Kalter: I believe that there are two dates right now in March where mediation is happening.

Dr. Catanzaro: That is correct. We were making progress in the first mediation session and there is more work to do.

Senator Hoelscher: I would rather see the resolution in writing and work on those facts and figures.

Motion XLV-137: By Senator Lessoff, seconded by Senator Bantham, to strike everything in the resolution between the third sentence and the last sentence.

Senator Bantham: I would agree with Senator Lessoff. This is a prime time to step up and support the NTTs. The first statements do a very good job of that.

Senator Cox: The timing is appropriate for the resolution. I am not quite clear if negotiations are underway now. Is urgency something that we need to consider?

Senator Winger: I believe it's urgent because they are in negotiations now.

Senator Cox: Is Dr. Catanzaro in a position to suggest the timing.

Dr. Catanzaro: I guess it's up to this body when you would like to communicate this. Our next scheduled meeting is Thursday, March 5th.

Senator Soeldner: The Campus Communications Committee does mention this issue in a statement to the board on Friday in support of raises and the contract negotiations.

Senator Hoelscher: How would you feel if we made it a lot more general?

Senator Winger: I would move to table that because we have got a couple of weeks and I will give you the language to discuss it more fully in two weeks. I would move to table the amendment to the motion.

Motion XLV-138: By Senator Winger, seconded by Senator Thurman, to table the amendment.

Senator Kalter: I don't think you can table an amendment and I am looking at some students who are nodding their heads.

Senator Hoelscher: We have to vote the amendment up or down.

Senator Kalter: We have to vote the amendment up or down and then go back and decide if we are going to table (the original motion).

Senator Hoelscher called the question.

By roll call vote, the amendment was defeated 21 to 18.

Senator Kalter: Now we go back to debate on the original motion:

Motion XLV-138: By Senator Winger, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to table the original motion. The Senate voted unanimously to table the resolution until the following meeting.

Senate Kalter: I abstained because there was something in my comments that was added that I am uncomfortable with. 'NTT faculty are the lowest paid in the state.' We have that from union sources, but it makes me uncomfortable to validate that statement without checking the facts first.

Senator McHale: It did pass a committee yesterday and it may be up for a vote in the legislature tomorrow to take away the 50% reduction that we get for our children. I just want to put that on the map. I just want everybody to be aware of that.

Adjournment

Motion XLV-139: By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Gallagher, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.