The Senate was called to order at 10:07 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Thompson and seconded by Bogle to approve the day’s agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of October 23, 2009

A motion to approve the minutes of October 23, 2009 was made by Siddiquee and seconded by Thompson. There were no corrections, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Announcements

None

Reports:

Chair – T. Ting
Ting provided an update on the current budget and furlough situations. The budget remains in flux and Ting indicated she would let the Provost provide additional details in his report. University Administration has stated that there will be no furlough this calendar year; however the next calendar year remains uncertain. There remain questions about how furloughs would be implemented, including whether campuses will be allowed flexibility based on their specific circumstances.

Ting also reported that the Board of Trustees is to meet on the UIS campus next Thursday the 12th of November. The Board meets at UIS once per year. Traditionally the previous Senate Executive Committee prepares a report for the Board to describe their accomplishments over the last year. James Hall will prepare such a report, as the Vice Chair of the last SEC.

The search firm hired for the presidential search will be visiting all three campuses November 15-17. The purpose of these visits is to meet with representatives of administrators, faculty governance groups, and various university constituencies to get a better understanding of the campuses, their needs and their challenges.

Interim President Designate Ikenberry held a conference call with Senate Chairs of all three campuses this past Monday to discuss proposed changes to University Statutes, which we will discuss a little bit later today. Ikenberry is also working with the Board of Trustees and Board Chair Kennedy to review the faculty list for serving on the search committee, and will also decide on representatives for administration, academic professionals, etc. They intend to have the slate complete for the next Board meeting on November 12th. There was also discussion regarding the structure of the committee, which will have a Trustee serving as chair and a faculty member serving as vice-chair. Ting stated that this is a favorable arrangement for faculty.

During this call with Ikenberry the issue of positive time reporting was also raised. Ikenberry had a recent meeting with Bill Holland, the Illinois Auditor General, about this, but it is not yet certain how the auditors want to handle faculty positive time reporting. Whatever time reporting data is collected will go to a central repository in the CFO office, which will then be available whenever auditing is needed. Positive time reporting is required by the Ethics Act, primarily as a way to identify “ghost” employees who are political appointees that do no real work. It is also a way to ensure that employees are not participating in political activities during work hours. According to Ikenberry, nobody will certify that time reporting is “correct.” Much remains to be resolved on this issue.

Provost – H. Berman

Provost Berman began by discussing the budget situation, and noted that the student members of the Campus Senate may not have received the email sent earlier in the week to university employees by outgoing President White and Interim President Designate Ikenberry, and asked that K. Rutherford forward that email to them. Berman stated that he had previously reported a 5% holdback would likely be needed this Fiscal Year, but at the Policy Council (comprised of the Presidents and Chancellors) it was decided that we should sequester 6%. This would combine with centrally held funds
to protect against an anticipated 8.5% rescission from the state. The University of Illinois system has billed a total of $317 million to the state against a total Fiscal Year appropriation of about $700 million. We have thus far received $400,000. Consequently, the goal was to create a reserve pool of 8.5%. UIS has a reserve left over from last year’s exercise in budget rescissions that will cover most of that shortfall, but not all of it. There is also an ongoing collections issue with regard to MAP grants, as the state has yet to make any payments on MAP grants and has not identified any funding source for the MAP grants for the spring semester, though they have committed to pay it.

Looking to FY11, we will be losing Federal stimulus money and will likely continue to experience problems with the state being unrealistic in their budgeting. Berman has asked deans to begin planning for a 5% cut for operating budgets in FY11. Such a cut would be very, very problematic, as it is the equivalent as a 10% reduction in state appropriation. But this is a necessary planning exercise.

Tonight is the alumni awards dinner and Berman distributed invitations to the senators today. This event honors our extraordinary alumni who have made significant accomplishments and who have given back to the campus in very meaningful ways. These include Gordon Heddell, who is the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and Nancy Chapin who along with her husband Charles endowed the Outstanding Master’s Thesis award. These are all great people and it is wonderful to have such wonderful alumni.

Siddiquee asked about our responses to anticipated cuts. If we do so by planning publicly for future cuts, would that not be perceived by legislators as essentially giving them permission to continue cutting?

Wassenberg commented that a political scientist would argue that you would need to do this. In public organizations you want to articulate to the public just how much harm would be done by that cut. That informs the public about the damage and allows them to put pressure on elected officials. It is a standard political strategy.

Berman added that, when the truth of something hits you right between the eyes, one must respond to that. He stated that he understood Siddiquee’s concerns, but the fact is that the state is not providing money, and the AARA funds are going away which by itself will translate into a $1.5 million cut to UIS. That is the reality that we are facing.

Ting stated that there is a difference with this current practice, insofar as in the past we have addressed these shortfalls via rescissions but still budget normally for the future. A future reduction is different than a rescission. That means that we are not planning to have that money at all. Berman clarified that his request to the Deans is simply a planning exercise, asking how we might address the possibility of a 5% reduction. Ting asked if that planning exercise could be shared with the Senate, and Berman stated he would need to think about that. He stated that he was not concerned about secrecy so much as the effect on the institution of broadcasting that planning information via a report to the Senate.
Student Government – M. Van Vossen

No report.

Proposed Changes of University Statutes by Board of Trustees

Ting circulated the two changes regarding Statutes and General Rules being proposed by the Board. The Board proposes to change the description of Chancellors from being the CEO of the campus to the Chief Administrative Officer of the campus, and the President will be from the Chief Officer to the Chief Executive Officer of the entire University system. The process for making these changes includes disseminating the information from the Board (via the President) to the University Senates Conference, which then disseminates it to Campus Senates. The Campus Senates then provide feedback. During these discussions a USC member noted that the language pertaining to the President (i.e., chief officer) in the Statutes is not very clear, which was why the change to chief executive officer.

These changes are a response to the UIUC admissions scandals. During the hearings by the Admissions Review Commission, Chancellor Herman made it clear he was the CEO of the UIUC Campus and consequently he reported directly to the Board, which created a scenario in which the President was unaware of some of those interactions. The Board’s perspective is that these changes are meant to be clarifications of duties, not to substantially change the roles of President and Chancellors. Another reason is to make these respective responsibilities clear in light of the ongoing presidential search.

UIUC has their own Senate committee on the Statutes, while UIC and UIS do not. That committee wants to see further explanations as to what a Chief Administrative Officer does. UIUC and UIC Senate chairs conveyed that concern to Ikenberry, who said he would take it back to the Board to get clarification. As yet neither Ting nor Eisenhart (Chair of the USC) has received that clarification. Eisenhart added that the Board has not met since they requested these changes. The archivist at UIUC indicated that there is typically an accompanying document that explains proposed changes. These proposed changes were also never presented at a Board meeting, meaning that usual procedure was not being followed. Eisenhart indicated that she would be addressing this in the next day or two.

Ting stated that this item is not on the agenda for the November Board meeting. However, the Board does want to get this settled before bringing in a new president, yet when they will do so is not clear, maybe January.

Siddiquee asked if these changes would modify the powers of the Chancellor position, and Ting responded that Ikenberry indicated they would not. The intention is to ensure that Chancellors cannot bypass Presidents and deal directly with the Board. The problem, however, is how this change in name would be interpreted by those outside the institution.
Fisher stated that she would appreciate clarification about the terms “Executive” and “Administrative,” because her research of those terms suggests that they may in fact be different. She offered the opinion that resolving the relationship between those positions could be done in a more straightforward manner. Siddiquee indicated his agreement that those terms should be clarified, especially for the understanding of those we might be bringing in for future Chancellor or Presidential positions. It might be possible to clarify the relationship between those roles in other ways.

Sullivan-Stewart asked if there is a parallel between our statutes and the statutes of institutions with similar structures in other states. There is some potential to send the wrong message to prospective Chancellors and Presidents, if those terms mean different things in different states.

Headman added that it might be worth considering changing the “C” in CEO from Chief to Campus.

Ting stated that she will draft a letter to the USC summarizing our Senate’s feedback and will share it with the Senate.

Eisenhart asked if Provost Berman had an impression of the Chancellor’s view on these proposed changes. Berman deferred the question to Ting, whose impression was that he is concerned. He felt that the change from CEO to CAO would give many pause, and force them to ask what this title means with regard to their power and responsibilities. He shares the sentiments expressed by Fisher and Siddiquee. His feeling was that, if the goal is to prevent a future controversy as we had this past summer, then we could address that in other ways. Berman added that there is the potential for unintended consequences with this change. This may improve the recruitment of Presidents, but what might it mean with regard to recruitment of Chancellors?

Rutherford stated that in the past Statute changes had been submitted as Resolutions and we then approve them, and asked why that process was not being followed at this time. Ting responded that the process Rutherford described applies to changes in Statutes proposed by campuses. Because this change was initiated by the Board, not by UIS, the process is different.

**Old Business**

None.

**New Business**

**Resolution 39-15**

A motion to open discussion was offered by VanVossen and seconded by Fisher. Ting reminded the Senate that the senators have the privilege of the floor, as do those reporting from Senate committees. Audience members do not have that privilege, but she will provide opportunities for guests to comment. She requested that those who contribute to the discussion clearly and loudly state their names for assistance in crafting the minutes.
She added that she appreciated the lively email discussion amongst faculty, but was disappointed by the low turnout at today’s meeting. She commented that those expressing the desire for an open forum to discuss these issues miss the point of Senate meetings – that is what Senate meetings are for. Those who are concerned about this resolution need to attend and be present for the first-hand discussion of the resolution.

Kirkendall, Chair of the Personnel Policy Committee (PPC), presented the resolution and its background. This issue arose in the PPC several years ago and had been an issue on campus for years before that. It became a direct personnel issue in one department, which has led to the PPC’s direct involvement. This issue had been tabled in the past because the PPC did not feel they had a good handle on it, but has been brought off the table owing to some recent concerns that have clarified the issue. There has been considerable debate in the PPC and they have come to the conclusion that the impact of off-campus faculty is tremendous. The impacts of off-campus faculty include faculty being able to meet service requirements, the quality and confidentiality of personnel evaluations, course coverage, department morale, department leadership, faculty retention, and no means for tracking who is doing this. Many have asked for data on this issue, but we do not have any data on this because we do not have a policy. We have no policy stating that people need to do anything special to arrange for being off campus for long periods of time.

With regard to background research, UIS has been on the cutting edge of most online efforts and that includes our issues with off-campus faculty. Other institutions are looking to us for advice on handling this issue. So, there is not much information available to guide us, and we must do what is best for our institution at this time.

Kirkendall summarized the PPC’s rationale for this resolution. She stated that we are a very small campus. Many outsiders who have visited have said to us “how do you do everything you’re doing? This is going to catch up with you at some time.” Kirkendall expressed the concern that we are getting close to that time. We are all tired and overextended. This does not single out any particular department - we all need to be here on campus to support this institution. We do not have many resources. We are going in lots of different directions. We are going in the doctoral direction and we are going online and we are developing on ground. How do we get to the point where we can do it all? The PPC’s conclusion is that we need guidelines on campus presence. It does not matter where people live, there are many people who do not live here but who maintain a physical presence on the campus.

Eisenhart asked about language choices regarding full-time and tenure-track faculty. Both are mentioned, but just because a faculty member is full-time does not mean that they would have the same responsibilities as a tenure-track. Some visiting or clinical instructors could do their work entirely online. Kirkendall stated that this policy would only apply to full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Anybody with a modifier on their rank is on a year-to-year contract, and issues with residency can be address in that way. Those concerns can also be addressed in the initial letter of hire, after discussion between the department and the dean. Ting asked if Eisenhart would like to
make a friendly amendment – she indicated she would like to change the language on line 20 to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Eisenhart indicated her preference would be to use language that included “full-time” tenure-track faculty. Wassenberg indicated that it is possible for somebody to be tenured and less than full-time. Berman stated that they would investigate the technical possibilities of these various combinations, and there is also a difference between tenure-track and tenured faculty. Ting stated that modifying the language to include tenure-track and tenured faculty should address the concern, and Berman concurred. Eisenhart offered that language substitution as a friendly amendment.

Bogle noted that Kirkendall stated the issues are tremendous, and asked about the number in this situation. Kirkendall stated that she did not know. Bodenhorn stated that in CLAS he knows of eight such faculty, which translates into 8% of the college. Kirkendall stated that when this issue first arose in September everyone assumed there were just a handful of cases, and everyone has been surprised by the volume that has since been discovered.

Hall stated that there is an annual review process for faculty. The ways in which these arrangements might affect departments, described by Kirkendall, would be addressed in those annual performance reviews, wouldn’t they? Hall commented that his program is mostly online, and much of that work can be done online, but he still comes to campus for meetings. That is what we are supposed to do, and if those activities are not being done can that not be addressed in the review process? Kirkendall stated that six years ago this review process probably would have done so, but currently it does not.

Karuppaswamy stated that in small departments that are deliberating on personnel processes for tenured faculty who are absent, could a tenure-track faculty effectively address those concerns without putting themselves at risk? Wassenberg agreed. There are very few in the CPAA that would run afoul of this resolution, but those who are in violation are very toxic. Some of those faculty simply will not participate in basic things like advising, and that translates into a greater load for the more vulnerable tenure-track faculty. That produces retention issues for those disproportionately affected junior faculty. On a related issue, we have all seen junior faculty who take a job here just to take a job and are publishing like crazy to try to get out of here. Those people also frequently refuse to participate in service and advising activities so that they can get their scholarship in sufficient shape to get a job somewhere else. It is helpful to have this language, so that we can point to an explicit expectation when encountering problems. We assume that everyone will approach their work in good faith, but that sometimes does not happen.

Kline noted that if untenured junior faculty are the concern, why would line 24 not address the issue? Kline also observed that there do not appear to be any new powers granted to the Dean, but rather a clarification of procedure that requires consultation with departments regarding location of employees. Some have described this resolution as another tool, but I do not see a tool here. Am I wrong on that? And if so, why aren’t the departments and deans exercising their powers to address that now? Bodenhorn stated that the problematic faculty in his college never made any prior arrangements with their
departments or the dean. This policy ensures that people are informed and puts some mechanism in place between the options of either going along with off-campus arrangements, or assigning courses on-ground and, if they fail to show up firing them with cause (the “nuclear” option). This creates a process that allows for something other than those two options. Berman indicated that Bodenhorn’s response is indeed an affirmative answer to Kline’s question. Yes, heavy-handed responses can be done. The heart of this is not so much the procedures or the end, but rather an articulation of the expectation for presence on campus. This also is a statement from faculty to other faculty about this expectation, rather than administration telling or dictating this expectation to faculty.

Kline stated that he does not view the firing of faculty who do not do their jobs as a “nuclear” option. That is in his view entirely reasonable. Kirkendall responded that the “nuclear” option, dismissal with cause, is very painful and costly for all involved. She stated that she would rather see a proactive response. We never went into this with the intention to keep faculty from having options, but rather to address the impact of these decisions beforehand.

Siddiquee added that he felt this resolution would be empowering for faculty in making decisions about their colleagues in the review process. He noted that his appointment letter articulated the expectation that he would participate in university activities and service, which requires a presence on campus. Also, in the Campus Planning and Budget Committee there has been discussion regarding the use of space. Faculty who are entirely online would not need to use space, which has budget implications. There are already many complaints that our space is empty and not utilized fully. The fundamental question is that if we intend to be a fully online campus that’s one thing, but if not then we have this enormous physical infrastructure that we have invested in that is underutilized. If we do not have presence then we do not have activities.

VanVossen expressed his understanding that this resolution would give deans the authority to determine how much presence is required. Kirkendall stated that it allowed the dean to have a discussion with impacted parties and establish a process for reviewing the practice of being off campus.

DeBarr stated that if we are going to do this, then there should be an expectation of what is and is not an appropriate number of hours to be on campus. Different departments have different needs for on-ground presence. Current fiscal status notwithstanding, faculty already perceive that they are not appropriately compensated, and if there is no appropriate reward for those who invest considerable amounts of time learning new technologies and delivering those courses online, and if faculty feel they are being treated like children, they will leave and we may not get those lines back in times of budgetary crisis. She stated that she did some research on this topic and found an article entitled “Does Policy Make a Difference.” The article stated that “if faculty are suspicious of others’ motives to discuss the new policy, then an institution may be well served or well advised to stay its course and spend its valuable time and energy meeting its other challenges.”
Bogle stated that there are already mechanisms in place to deal with this problem. If we pass this, all we have done is move that nuclear option and given it a different name. Regarding presence on campus, there are many ways to be present (such as teleconferencing, chats, Eluminate) that do not involve physical presence. He stated that he fully understands the need for camaraderie and its importance, but the necessary mechanisms are already in place. The authority to stop this already exists for Deans and Provosts. This does not change that authority. The bottom line is that we cannot legislate professionalism. People will either be professional and add to this campus or they will not.

Headman recognized that there are some tools in place to deal with this problem, and feels this resolution is 90% good. We have a static issue and an evolutionary problem – things are going virtual, in 20 years universities may not look like they are today. The potential for hiring with certain expectations is not addressed. For example, we currently have different classification systems for students and that affects the rates they pay for tuition. If we want to have totally online faculty, even tenure-track, perhaps we could arrange differential pay scales that would account for those who do not engage in the service obligations. We should thus consider addressing these conditions at the moment of hire, spelling out what is and is not expected for those who might be hired to work at a distance. Ting stated that practice of special hiring conditions has been done already. This policy would apply to those who are not hired under special conditions. As situations evolve so do policies. If this is passed and it becomes part of personnel policy, that does not mean we cannot revisit it. Headman offered an addendum to his previous comment stating that if faculty are paid as faculty and are not serving on committees or contributing then that needs to be addressed, as it is not fair for those of us who are here and take a lot of work on our backs.

Borland expressed appreciation for what this resolution is trying to do, but fears that it is not addressing the real problems. Is requiring somebody to be in their office “regularly and consistently” going to make them participate and do advising and service? They could just sit in their office for 4 hrs with the door locked. Faculty can be here and participate, or they can be here and not participate. She offered the idea that a resolution establishing some additional standards requiring program participation would be a better way to address this. There are also faculty who are not present on campus, but they make significant service and advising contributions. If a faculty member is making those contributions already at a distance, why should we then require them to be on campus? She recognized that exceptions can be made under this resolution, but why do that if it does not really address the problem? Also, what are the ramifications for those who do not comply with the policy? Ting stated they would be fired, and Borland asked how that would be different from what we do presently? There is no specific enforcement provision in the resolution, and so its value is unclear.

Bodenhorn said in some ways this policy could be clearer. The issue for him is permanent absence. We have faculty in permanent residence in Boston and Washington DC, and the consequence of that without any prior arrangements is the key issue. We have had some
absent for six years, and one person has said they would be back ‘next year’ for several
consecutive years, stringing the department along. Perhaps we should have pursued the
nuclear option earlier, and we have allowed this to happen perhaps because our prior
dean was too humane, but even she was at the end of her rope. The specific number of
hours spent in the office is irrelevant. It is the contribution that is important. In one
department with 25% absentee faculty, those absent faculty are advising 50-60% fewer
advisees and are teaching anywhere from 30-50 fewer students. In that department three
junior faculty are on the market precisely because of the consequences of this practice.
He added that he was pleased to hear people supporting the idea of the dean firing people.

Karri expressed some concerns that the PPC did not address the real issue here. Some
faculty are shirking their responsibilities for service, which is the real problem. The better
solution is to address that via the extant personnel policy, rather than pandering to
administrators who are not courageous enough to carry out their duties. If such problems
have been going on for 6 years, then the administrators are not being courageous. The
administrators must have the will to do this. He expressed the feeling that he was insulted
by this resolution. He does research and he does close his door, but he also works with
students. We must not be passing judgment about how faculty spend their time as long as
they are effective. We need to be paying much better attention to how we review
ourselves, including teaching and service. If we do not, we end up looking weak and like
a group of faculty who shirk their duties. We are professionals, and this legislation is
harmful and I will begin looking for a job if this is how faculty are. I do not believe most
faculty are like this and we should not be doing this just because of the problems
generated by a few. Bodenhorn noted that it was 8% in his college, and Karri replied that
we cannot legislate on numbers like 8% - that’s a very small number. He expressed the
opinion that firing someone for cause is not a “nuclear” option – that is a reasonable
option. Another problem is that office hours are never posted. In other places this is a
written policy that allows students access to faculty at guaranteed times. In many places
office hours are so sacred that people skip meetings to stay for office hours. Perhaps we
should provide a resolution that expands on the evaluation of service or workload. Article
9 on workload does not mention service or advising, and if we believe service and
engagement is important, we need to work harder to address that issue.

Wassenberg requested privilege to speak as a senator and clarified that she did not in any
way criticize faculty for performing research. She criticized those who focus only on
research to the extent they fail to do their other duties. She felt that the previous speaker
mischaracterized her comments.

Kline expressed that he would, as a junior faculty, put himself at some risk to disagree
with his own college administration, but trusted that by disagreeing in a civil fashion that
should not be a problem. He did not feel we are powerless as junior faculty. He expressed
the feeling that there is unacceptable vagueness in the resolution requiring “regular and
consistent” presence on campus. There is no good behavioral definition for this
requirement, but the proponents of the resolution point out a couple of extreme examples
yet ignore the untold host of situations that are far less clear but would still fall under this
definition. Without such guidelines it is impossible for faculty to know when they should
apply for such exemptions. If the problem is with complete absence, then we should
address that specifically. This vagueness also provides an unacceptable level of discretion
to the administration in the evaluation, tenure, promotion and firing of faculty. Those
who support the AAUP philosophy would agree that no union would ever cede such
discretion to administrators. He stated that he was not sure how one avoids criticism
about the level of specificity, as criticism will come with vagueness or specificity, but the
current vagueness makes him uncomfortable due to the discretion it gives to
administration.

Thompson has heard concerns that those who are in a position of power might then
impose some minimum hour requirement for presence. Some faculty are concerned with
how that might be operationalized in particular departments, and removes time decisions
from individual professional discretion.

Garmil seconded much of what he has heard from Bogle, Borland and Karri. One
question is regarding the definition of service, and what constitutes a contribution – was
there any other effort to consider expanding the ways that service could be accomplished
when not physically present? Kirkendall stated that last spring there was a resolution to
address collegiality which attempted to address elements of that. It wound up being
essentially indistinguishable from what was already in the Personnel Policy appendix.
Garmil stated that he felt that resolution was broader and focused more on professional
behavior, but it did not set any minimum standards or how to achieve it. Kirkendall
stated that the criticisms about specificity would be very problematic – if the resolution
got that specific there would be additional complaints.

Fisher stated that she is struggling with the arguments being made, and the difficulties
being faced by departments in this situation. She understands, as someone who is on
campus a lot, the potential burdens that this imposes on the on-campus faculty. She notes
that many of the concerns are being expressed in the context of online education, but that
was not her understanding of the intent of the resolution. That likely derives from the
“Whereas” that addresses such technologies, and commented that if online is not the
issue, do we need to mention it at all? Also, can we include some language that would
indicate it is possible to satisfy service and contribution needs in other ways? Some
creative thought should be given to those possibilities, and acknowledgement should be
given in the resolution that we do work in ways that does not require everyone to be in
the same room at the same time. That may make those who do much of their work online
feel more welcome, as that is really not the heart of the issue. Also, she was pleased to
note that Kirkendall mentioned the collegiality resolution from last spring, and the
running theme here appears to be that we need to be clear about the departmental
expectations and the ways contributions are made. She stated that she would like us to
look quite compassionately at the situations of those who are trying innovative
arrangements, and perhaps give departments the ability to determine if that is working
without assuming that any part-or full-time arrangement off of campus would be
problematic.
Hall stated that, reading this, one would need to submit an exception request every year if
not on the campus. It is difficult to say with this language when one would need to do so.
Again, what is consistent and regularly on campus? What is regular? What is consistent?
What is on campus? He stated that he considers online discussions to be “on campus.”

Ermatinger asked what would happen if the Provost and he decided to telecommute?
Why couldn’t he come in 2 days every 2 weeks? How would the faculty feel about that?
Second, policies are written for the exceptions. The common good usually prevails,
except in those exceptional circumstances. We have laws that say you should not kill, and
most of us do not, but they are written for those rare few who do it. Also, if something is
not done to address this problem, and this policy will probably not solve it, the institution
of tenure will change dramatically. If I perceive that this is a problem, I will respond to
departments appropriately. If, for example, Keith Burton comes to me stating that he has
a retirement coming and wants the line returned, I might say no because his department
houses people who are off campus and who are not contributing. I might instead give
him a non-tenure track position. As time goes on we might thus see the deterioration of
tenure. My last point is that I have tried to engage my faculty to look at changes in how
we do business. Things that are not covered in personnel policy are debated as to whether
a dean can do it or whether faculty can do it. This is not an abstract issue. The issue of
having clinical instructors teach four courses is not allowed, but perhaps we should allow
it. Likewise, perhaps we should say that if someone is not going to be present on campus
that they should instead teach another class.

DeBarr wanted to comment on Bodenhorn’s data addressing the reduced advising loads
for off-campus faculty. The chair assigns advisees in her department, so that should be
addressed at that level. Bodenhorn responded that students can change advisors, and they
do. DeBarr added that there has been concern amongst junior faculty that they cannot get
onto committees and get the service they need. Service is also willingness – she stated
she has been willing to serve, but has not always been able to get on the committees.

Siddiquee stated that Kerri’s point about service expectations are good. He asked
Kirkendall if the PPC would be willing to examine that. Kirkendall said that would be at
least as big a discussion as we are having about our current resolution, as we would be
changing the standards for tenure and promotion.

Headman stated that there is an 8% Solution concept – 8% of the kids commit 90% of the
crime. The solution was to target those 8% of the kids, and the first step is to identify
those 8%. With our situation we have two problems – those who are not physically
present, and those who are present but disengaged. He stated that the “broad brush”
approach, which has a lot of good to it, but would target just one portion of the
problematic behavior. He wondered if we might need a more targeted approach, because
the impact is going to be according to department culture.

Bodenhorn responded that, if he were to pursue the nuclear option once or twice that
might address the larger issue. Headman stated that he would then be shouldering the
total load, when the larger community should be addressing this.
Williams stated that those who are familiar with criminal justice know that those who kill are not affected by legislation prohibiting it. He also opined that most in this room would not start killing if we got rid of those laws. Also commented on Ting’s disappointment at turnout – those who sent the emails did so largely because they knew they could not be here today.

Ting stated that this resolution has nothing to do with online education per se. Second, Dean Ermatinger’s point about tenure is something she has been thinking about. Administrators can make those decisions about tenure lines. As administrators they might see clearly when something is not working well. What would stop them from denying tenure-track lines, or only offering clinical instructors? What would that mean to the department as a whole? Faculty need to think about this. Remember, this resolution is coming from a senate committee, it is a grass-roots effort generated by faculty. We need to be able to work together to solve this, we need to be proactive and not allow administrators to deny us tenure lines based on these kinds of problems. Ting also added that she hopes senators will absorb this information and encourage colleagues to read the senate minutes. It has been very difficult to staff committees because of absentee faculty issues. Finally, Ting asked if there was any opposition to the friendly amendment that was offered earlier. As there was none, the amendment is adopted.

Fisher offered her thanks to K. Kirkendall.

A motion to adjourn was offered by Casinova, and seconded by Kline.

**Adjournment:**

A motion was made by Casinova and seconded by Kline to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm.