

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Fall 12-7-2011

## Senate Meeting, December 7, 2011

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

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



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

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, December 7, 2011" (2011). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 840.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/840>

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](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

**Academic Senate Minutes**  
**Wednesday, December 7, 2011**  
*(Approved)*

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Senate Secretary Susan Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of November 9, 2011***

**Motion XXXXIII-26:** By Sen. Woith, seconded by Sen. Collins, to approve the Senate minutes of November 9, 2011. The motion was unanimously approved.

***IBHE-FAC Report***

**Sen. Gizzi:** You got a report from Lane Crothers, who attended on my behalf. They spent the day talking about performance funding, and didn't really accomplish anything. There is an important update. The steering committee that is making recommendations on the metric for performance funding and they were supposed to submit those in December. At their last meeting, they voted not to submit any metrics because they did not feel that they had anything. They received an e-mail during the last 5 min. from the president of FAC, who is a member of the steering committee, that they have to have recommendations to them for the February IBHE meeting.

**Sen. Crowley:** Is there little support for this?

**Sen. Gizzi:** The legislature has mandated it; it's a law. They did not feel ready to make recommendations.

**President Bowman:** Most people don't think it will affect more than 2 to 5% of the general fund dollars. I can't imagine a situation where we wouldn't fair fairly well.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

**Sen. Holland:** I would like to thank everyone for the semester. We have made good progress in our committees. There are a couple of external working groups that you will be hearing from. The first is the Gen Ed Taskforce, which has been going about its business for close to a year now. Educating Illinois kicked off last Friday.

***Student Body President's Remarks***

**Sen. Owens:** There are two Information Items that I sent to general counsel and I got their feedback on Tuesday. I would like to honor those revisions, so I am postponing those until our next meeting. The revised documents will be sent out to the Senate.

***Administrators' Remarks***

• ***President Al Bowman***

**President Bowman:** The House held some hearings on higher education costs. There were lots of concerns about declining state support, the rising tuition rates. It's been disappointing to hear some of the comments out of the Department of Education. Arnie Duncan has come very close to criticizing universities for not being more aggressive in controlling costs. Rates have gone up because the state has moved money out of what we do. I suspect that we will hear more of that kind of rhetoric in the future.

The Congressional Super Committee that was charged with cutting \$1.2 trillion failed to reach a compromise. If those automatic spending cuts go into effect, the Department of Education will lose \$3.5 billion in FY 13. The Pell Grant would be exempted from cuts the first year; after that, it could be impacted.

Dan Layzell and I got an e-mail from a staffer in the governor's office of management and budget inviting us to talk about FY 13. We accepted the invitation. It's the first time they've scheduled this kind of meeting. Our state reimbursements are coming in in a more timely fashion than they have in the past. The last payment for FY 11 will be \$5.9 million.

The state's revenue picture looks a lot better. Personal income tax revenue is up over \$2 billion. Sales tax revenue is also strong.

The state's minimum pension contribution in the next fiscal year will increase another billion dollars. It will go from \$4.8 billion this year to \$5.9 billion next year. The largest increase will come to the State University Retirement System. Those large payments will likely gobble up any new state revenues that might have been available for university operations.

Fund raising is nearly equal to the record that we set last year. We have received over \$7 million in private dollars.

- *Provost Sheri Everts – Remarks Deferred*

**Sen. Kalter:** Do you have an update on where the Tenure Policy is, which the Faculty Affairs Committee forwarded a couple of weeks ago?

**Provost Everts:** I believe that is in legal and discussions at this point, so we will get back to the Academic Senate as soon as possible.

**Sen. Kalter:** Discussions with your office?

**Provost Everts:** Yes.

- *Vice President of Student Affairs Larry Dietz – No Report*

- *Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Layzell*

**VP Layzell:** Both the Provost and I will have more to say as we get into the Educating Illinois planning process and get more of our public consultations scheduled.

**Committee Reports:**

*Academic Affairs Committee*

**Senator Stewart:** We were tasked by Exec to engage in dialogue about the library situation. We had a conversation about encouraging a greater opportunity for communication and dialogue between the library and the rest of the campus, especially when major changes are being planned. Four members of our committee have agreed to work on language for the Blue Book to strengthen the library committee and its mission. Dane Ward, Wendy Woith, Mike Gizzi have all agreed to meet and work out language. Mike Carnahan was volunteered to be part of that committee.

*Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee*

**Senator Cedeño:** We continued our discussion of the administrative policies. We hope to get something to the Executive Committee in February.

### *Faculty Affairs Committee*

**Senator Kalter:** We met with Wendy Smith of legal and Cathy Young, who is sitting in for Darrell Kruger in Research and Sponsored Projects, and we discussed the new Export Control Policy. We are going to send our very small tweaks in language back to the committee that provided this to us. They will discuss how to word the policy because it is rather complicated. We should be getting that back and sending it to Exec fairly soon.

### *Planning and Finance Committee*

**Senator Rich:** We had a work session on our upcoming annual report. We approved topics for information sessions for spring. We reviewed the administration's responses to last year's report. We made very good progress on our upcoming priorities report.

### *Rules Committee*

**Senator Fazel:** Tonight, we have an Action Item. We also discussed the Smoking Policy and the Alcohol Policy.

### *Action Item:*

#### *11.28.11.03 Technology Policy–Appropriate Use (Rules Committee)*

**Sen. Fazel:** This is a policy that we presented to you as an Information Item a long time ago. There were a couple of issues. Sen. Bonnell had a concern about the word obscene as something that could be misinterpreted. She asked for some clarification of the language. We met with Mark Walbert and the University Counsel and we came up with the language that we all agreed would be acceptable.

There are four or five small changes that we made to the document. On page 2, B.1, Inappropriate Communication; there were statements that were repetitive so that statement has been crossed out. That paragraph reads now: Any communication which is defamatory, harassing, obscene, because that term has been constitutionally defined, or interrupting to other users of Information Technology Resources.

On page 3, there is similar language; item B.2, Inappropriate Use of Resources, we made similar changes. On page 5, item D, it used to be personal software and hardware. We changed that to non-University.

On page 6, Approval and Review, in the second sentence, the policy will be periodically reviewed... and changes will be recommended by the council to the president. This is what they have been doing, but to clarify it in the document that it would come to the Academic Senate and then to the president.

**Motion XXXXIII-27:** By Sen. Fazel to approve the Appropriate Use of Information Technology Policy. The motion was unanimously approved.

### *Information Item:*

~~*11.30.11.01 Medical Amnesty and Good Samaritan Procedures (Reference Document Only) (Student Government Association)*~~

~~*11.30.11.02 Medical Amnesty and Good Samaritan Policy (Student Government Association) Removed from the Agenda by the Student Body President.*~~

### *Advisory Item:*

#### *11.14.11.01 Best Practices for Search Committees Suggestions (Faculty Affairs Committee)*

**Sen. Kalter:** Originally, the Faculty Affairs Committee had intended to send this this to the Executive Committee and then on to the four offices that had originally created the document. We decided in the Executive Committee that it might be a good idea to gather any comment from this body regarding the suggested changes before it goes on to those four offices. In Executive Committee, there was some suggestion that we might want to include the office staff, who have to see the confidential documents, so it might be a good

idea to put that in the policy. The student senators on the Executive Committee were concerned about the bottom of page 1. It currently reads to preserve confidentiality in the hiring process, the inclusion of students on the search committee is not recommended. If students are on search committees, they should not be voting members. Other means of soliciting student input is encouraged. I believe this is a policy is for hiring tenure-track faculty only. It does not apply to other kinds of hires. At least two students on the Executive Committee expressed concerns about why we would not want to include students. If we are going to keep policy the way it is, to give more of a rationale as to why students would be excluded.

**Sen. Horst:** Perhaps you could make the language a little stronger by changing the shoulds to the musts.

**Sen. Rich:** What is the applicability to chair searches as opposed to faculty searches? In our college, it is our policy that students be included. I think there is value in having student input; I know that has to be weighed against the confidentiality issue. I would agree with Sen. Horst on must, but being best practices, I would advocate should.

**Sen. Holland:** This is a document that a lot of work is going to go into, but they are just recommendations, which you can completely ignore.

**Sen. Kalter:** Sen. Horst, point well taken. This is to differentiate chair searches, high-level AP searches for a variety of good reasons. My personal opinion, which I gave in Executive Committee to the students, is I don't agree with number three. Each department should be able to decide if they want students on their committees. I am in favor of sending that comment forward. The Provost provided some legal issues about who we can and cannot protect. There are policies for the chair searches and we think that the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee reviews them.

**Provost Everts:** You are correct in regard to the legal responsibilities. I know that that will be a particular issue that legal will look at. For administrative searches, the policy spells out who must be on administrative search committees. Students are named in those policies. It really is a difference in who we are talking about.

**Sen. Kalter:** Comments are welcome with regard to how we should communicate this non-policy.

**Sen. Stewart:** We write our objectives, the students will. Under general statements, use would instead of should or will.

**Sen. Kalter:** I will leave it to legal and the Provost's office to decide should, would, will.

**Sen. Rich:** I think it's very important that it be communicated when you have something that is out there. I think the training of chairs and committee members would incorporate this.

**Sen. Holland:** I think it might actually be inclined to send it to all faculty members. When there is a search going on, it will be sent to everybody on the search committee.

**Sen. Cedeño:** I suggest for the title that this is for tenure-track faculty search committees. Regarding the students, the fact that there already are policies that involve students for administrative positions, so it's debatable about confidentiality. They are allowed on deans and chairs. Why are they not allowed as a best practice for tenure-track faculty?

**Sen. Wood:** I have some concerns about the language on page 6, item 17, the first sentence, specifically, ranked recommendations. Are these ranked recommendations from the DFSC to the search committee?

**Sen. Kalter:** Those are ranked recommendations from the search committee to the DFSC.

**Sen. Wood:** My concern is with the ranked recommendations. My concern is that we have individuals who know the ranking of candidates and what the potential harm might be in that.

**Sen. Kalter:** The example that we discussed in committee was that the practice has been to rank rather than not to rank. If either the chairperson or the DFSC overturns that ranking, the ramifications for that kind of situation can be very unhealthy for a department. We tried to say if you disagree, come to the table and work it out, not one overturns the other. We are not leaving it that you must go with the ranking of the search committee. Your suggestion about the number of people who know, I think that goes to some of the comment here about whether students can be trusted to keep confidentiality, whether faculty members can. In order to have a good process all the way through, we have to accommodate the ranking practice as it has been. It's more weighty.

**Sen. Wood:** The potential for harm down the road to a department where you have candidates ranked, and if we don't get our first pick, and if a wide audience knows that the hire that we subsequently end up with was not the first pick, I think it could be a morale issue.

**President Bowman:** There might be some value in leaving it open so that departments could follow the practices that fit the culture of that department.

**Sen. Kalter:** One of the things we could say is that the DFSCs make a policy in their own departmental documents. Each DFSC could decide if the candidates are ranked or not ranked.

***Communications:***

***11.30.11.03 Civil Disobedience/Police Brutality (Susan Kalter, Senate Secretary)***

**Sen. Kalter:** I'm sending this to you because it got sent to me to distribute to my colleagues. The MLA is the Modern Language Association.

***Sense of the Senate Resolution: Occupy BloNo Organization***

**Motion XXXXIII-28:** By Sen. Horst, seconded by Sen. Liechty, to approve the following resolution.

Whereas recent video images of campus police brutalizing peaceful student protesters have alarmed and shocked many citizens around the nation;

And whereas the Occupy BloNo organization is expressing their constitutional right to raise issues of concern for society through conducting a peaceful protest;

And whereas the Occupy BloNo organization is conducting a protest which is following university guidelines;

Therefore, let it be resolved that the Academic Senate asserts the rights to peaceful protest for student organizations; the Academic Senate commends the University for pursuing appropriate actions thus far toward the Occupy BloNo organization; and the Academic Senate expresses its support for the continued policy of toleration toward Occupy BloNo action on campus.

Sen. Larson voted nay; Sen. Owens abstained. The remainder of the Senate voted in favor of the resolution; therefore, the resolution was approved.

***Adjournment***

**Motion XXXXIII-29:** By Sen. Hoelscher, seconded by Sen. Dawson, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.