

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**(Approved)**

**October 11, 2000**

**Volume XXXII, No. 4**

***Call to Order***

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

***Roll Call***

Senator Crothers called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of September 27, 2000:***

**Motion XXXII-29:** By Senator Noyes, second by Senator Panfilio, to approve the minutes of September 27, 2000. Motion approved unanimously.

***Chairperson's Remarks:***

**Senator Landau:** Reported that Senator Len Schmaltz's condition was somewhat improved, but it remains extremely serious.

**Senator White:** Stated that he had lunch with the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Sulaski, and President Boschini about having a faculty member on the Board. He asked Mr. Sulaski for his support. Mr. Sulaski replied that he did not agree with having a faculty member on the Board because the Board's mission is to be a supervisory body overseeing the University, with a constituency outside of the University community.

**Senator Reid:** Asked how he could explain the presence of a student on the Board if the membership is outside of the University.

**Senator White:** Mr. Sulaski's only comment on that was that too was very controversial. President Boschini also did not agree that there should be a faculty member on the Board. Senator White stated that he asked President Boschini to articulate his reasons at the next Senate meeting he was able to attend.

**Senator Reid:** Asked if the lack of support by the Board and the President made the task of placing a faculty member on the Board of Trustees insurmountable.

**Senator White:** This does not mean that we should cease our efforts.

**Senator Noyes:** Asked if the Chairperson's response was after he had talked with other Board members.

**Senator White:** Stated that he believed that Mr. Sulaski had not discussed it, but that it was unlikely that other Board members would disagree. Senator White suggested having another faculty caucus on this issue. Faculty Affairs Committee is putting together a petition to go out to the faculty on this topic.

Senator White stated that the major action item this evening is the governance report. Because it implies changes to the Constitution and the bylaws of the Senate, it requires a two-thirds majority to pass. In addition to the minutes of the meeting, we will create an archive of statements made by Senate members on this issue. It is very important for the University to see that how we made the decision on the shared governance report.

***Vice Chairperson Remarks:***

**Senator Brown:** No report.

***Student Government Association President's Remarks:***

**Senator Biondillo:** Thanked everyone for supporting the homecoming events. He especially extended his thanks to Senator Mamarchev for her participation. The SGA is having an "Issues Meeting". The Issues Meeting began as a result as incident in which an African American student group attempted to hold an event and upon arriving to the event's location, they found the gates locked and chained. There was a note that there was a break in a water main. What apparently occurred was that the police department felt that it did not have enough security for the event and decided to say that the water main was broken. Students did not feel that they were welcome here. This was the impetus for students and administrators to talk about such problems. The Issues Meeting will be held October 23 in the Circus Room from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Senator Biondillo asked that Senate members urge their students to attend.

***Administrators' Remarks:***

- **President Vic Boschini:** Excused absence.
- **Provost Al Goldfarb:** Last Wednesday, an Illinois State University student was shot and killed in Chicago. The student was Marlon Wormley; he was a student of Senator Goldfarb's.

**Motion XXXII-30:** Senator Goldfarb proposed a Sense of the Senate Resolution, second by Senator Hampton. The resolution was unanimously approved.

**SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION**

The Senate sends its condolences and its sincere sympathy to the Wormley family.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs:***

**Senator Mamarchev:** Marlon Wormley's parents are Mark and Caroline Wormley. Not only is this incident such a tragedy in their lives, but sometimes people are not prepared financially to deal with something of this magnitude. Therefore, we are planning a benefit to raise money to help defray some of the costs that Mr. and Mrs. Wormley have incurred. It will be held on October 16 in the Bone Student Center ballroom from 7:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. There will be several musical acts. She encouraged that everyone try to attend.

The Commission for a Pluralistic University is regrouping. Senator Mamarchev and Senator Goldfarb are getting the Executive Committee together. Today, we celebrated National Coming Out Day sponsored by PRIDE. This was immediately followed by a rally by the Black Student Union.

We will be hosting the national Pan Hellenic conference, which is the governing body of all of the traditionally African-American sororities and fraternities November 10 through 12. We

are expecting attendance of about 500 students and advisors from all over the country. In light of what Senator Biondillo referenced earlier about some of the problems in our community, I am pulling together a meeting of every law enforcement agency that is represented on campus, the Town of Normal, City of Bloomington and McLean County to try to be proactive and to show that we know how to treat our guests and those who are on the campus with respect.

As part of the Trustee in Residence program, Student Affairs is hosting Trustee Nancy Froelich.

· ***Vice President of Finance and Planning:***

**Senator Bragg:** The Capital Development Board in Springfield released all of our capital funding for this year. We received 1.8 million. Those funds are earmarked for four capital projects, which include a utility distribution system across the south quad, mechanical improvements for Felmley Hall and finalizing some improvements in Edwards Hall.

**Senator Razaki:** Faculty members with nine-month contracts are paid over nine months. Faculty members want to have the option of either receiving those monies over a nine-month period or over a twelve-month period.

**Senator Bragg:** Unfortunately, we have the limitations of a very old software system, which cannot allow different pay periods for contracts. It will be a very expensive, comprehensive effort to replace the software, which would take a couple of years at a minimum. We are looking at some stopgap measures that might allow that, such as asking nine-month faculty to go on twelve-month contracts.

***Committee Reports***

· ***Academic Affairs Committee:***

**Senator Meckstroth:** The Academic Affairs Committee discussed the Constitution Exam and will bring this forth as an information item at the next Senate meeting.

· ***Administrative Affairs Committee:***

**Senator Kurtz:** No report.

· ***Budget Committee:*** No report.

· ***Faculty Affairs Committee:***

**Senator El-Zanati:** The committee again discussed the survey on the department chairs' use of non-tenure track faculty. We will have that ready soon. We are hoping to have the faculty caucus meet again regarding placing a faculty member on the Board of Trustees.

· ***Rules Committee:***

**Senator Weber:** The committee discussed the proposed changes in the Graduate School bylaws and the Entertainment Committee's constitution. We will bring those as information items at the next meeting. The committee continued its discussion on the proposed governance structure.

· ***Student Affairs Committee:***

**Senator Kowalski:** No report.

***IBHE-FAC Report***

**Senator Crothers:** The IBHE discussed the Results Report. The IBHE in trying to enhance graduation opportunities they discussed trying to strengthen P16 (preschool to college) linkages around the state so that they are preparing students better for college. IBHE is pushing to hard to have public universities provide on campus resources at community colleges to allow people who cannot get to four-year institutions to complete their baccalaureate degree. They have passed an incentive program to try to encourage universities to

reallocate funds to achieve this goal. The Prairie State Assessment Exam is a free exam going to all students in both elementary, junior and high school. It will give them something equivalent to an ACT score. There was discussion on the issue of funds to Roosevelt University, a private university, while the Board's position is that it only gives funds to private universities in the form of tuition assistance to students. Board members engaged in questions of assessment. The State is increasingly pressing some kind of assessment mechanism, but they do want to create a great deal of autonomy in this area. Senator Crothers' entire report can be found on the Senate web site at </committee.html>.

***Action Items:***

***Executive Committee Representative***

**Motion XXXII-31** by Senator Brown to elect a student representative to the Executive Committee. The Senate unanimously elected the nominee, Senator Paul Peterson.

***External Committee Elections:***

**Motion XXXII-32** by Senator Brown to elect the student nominees to several external committees of the Senate. The motion carried unanimously. The following students were elected to external committees of the Senate.

***2000 - 2001 Term***

**SCERB Student Grievance Committee**

Melissa Dunn  
Rebecca Goldstein  
Andrea Rinderle  
Christine Carr

**Student Code Enforcement and Review Board**

Valerie Uihlein  
Chris Maroules  
Scott Savidan

**Council on General Education**

**Honors Council**

Scott Kording  
Stacy Kelley

**University Curriculum Committee**

Chris Davis

**Athletic Council**

Non-Athlete: Jennifer Oliver

**Council for Teacher Education**

Melinda Nwoye

Steven Whitmore

**04.17.00.01 Governance Report of March 1, 2000**

**Senator Weber:** The Rules Committee members are unanimously not in favor of the proposed governance structure contained in the report of March 1, 2000.

**Motion XXXII-33:** Senator Weber moved to approve the report for the sake of discussion. Senator Goldfarb seconded the motion.

**Senator Reid:** This body of students and faculty work very well together on academic issues. The new body would have to prove that it had more advantages because it would involve giving up this interaction. To me there are two reasons why we would give up the present Senate for the proposed structure. One, which is less important to me, is a separate faculty senate. The most important would be the University Council, which would have a primary role in planning like that of the Distinctiveness and Excellence Committee. However, I am the only member of the governance committee who said that this planning role would be very important. All of the other members felt that the University Council would be primarily a coordinating body. If that is indeed the case, then we have been fighting about membership on a totally symbolic body that the whole committee has agreed that only in rare cases would coordination would take place--coordination to take place when the issue is not the primary responsibility of one of the proposed senates. Since the University Council would only be a symbolic body, I cannot support this proposal and I have changed my opinion on that since I signed the document as a member of the governance committee. We would be giving up too much to really only have a faculty senate. When you consider the other reasons for doing so, such as the civil service members saying they have a vague relationship with the President, that can be clarified without changing the current governance structure. The faculty would like to have their own body. We could have a faculty caucus and meet separately from the Senate and even as proposed two years ago, have a faculty body that would make recommendations to the Senate. Finally, the Senate itself could put together a central planning body (such as the University Council). The Chair of the Senate currently is involved in central planning issues. This is wonderful, but I could see a central body doing much of this and there is no reason that the Senate could not set up something like this and include civil service and Administrative/Professional personnel.

**Senator Goldfarb:** I am going to vote for this proposal for the following reasons. The most important elements are the principles in the report about shared governance of the University. I am supporting the report also to have a faculty senate in order to have a place for faculty to work with administration. I am going to vote for the report because I think that it empowers all groups. It will allow students to have more access to administrators. The report also focuses on the issue of representation--the fact that this group does not have representation from civil service. The report addresses issues that address the principles and structure that have university-wide implications. It addresses concerns that have been debated on campus for more than two decades.

**Senator Crothers:** I have two basic arguments for abstaining. Even if we pass this document, it is dead. The President has declared that if there are key constituencies that are not satisfied with this document, he will not allow it to go forward. There are key constituencies that are not satisfied. I am desperately afraid that we are going to send the message that the Senate will not vote itself out of existence. What I recommend instead is that we dismiss this document thanking

the many people that worked on it, and if there are key principles that this Senate thinks are viable in creating a stronger governance structure, then we ought to acknowledge them and in addition we ought to build such a

report ourselves. We are the central governing structure of this University and we ought to be the ones who work on the next central governance structure. Therefore, I recommend that we abstain.

**Senator Razaki:** I am going to partially support the document, but that is only in the principle section. I think that the principles embodied in the document are really crucial and essential for proper shared governance on campus. But overall, I am going to vote against the document and like Senator Crothers I believe that the Senate should charge the Rules Committee with looking at possible changes in the current Constitution regarding the Senate. I have been opposed to the structure right from the very beginning. I think that the last governance committee did not do its job properly in the sense that it just looked at two very different models, the current Academic Senate and the proposed structure. I have never seen any probability of the structure as proposed going forward on this campus, at least through the Academic Senate.

**Senator White:** Senator Weber, would you care to say something about the Rules Committees intention of incorporating parts of the proposed document into the current governance structure?

**Senator Weber:** That is one possibility. We have not really reached a decision on that at this point. If that were our charge, then we would glean positive aspects from the document to use in our current structure.

**Senator White:** The Executive Committee of the Senate can talk about this and consider such a charge. Personally, I would like to point out that the Rules Committee is free to make whatever recommendations to this body that it cares to make, so in my mind, it does not really require a charge from the Executive Committee, but we will talk about that in the next Executive Committee meeting.

**Senator El-Zanati:** I would like to speak in favor of maybe postponing this vote because some of have not been able to consult with our constituencies on how they feel about this document.

**Senator White:** Are you moving to postpone the vote?

**Senator El-Zanati:** No, I am speaking in favor of it. I did not want at this stage of the discussion to postpone the vote. I would like to see what other opinions there are.

**Senator Hampton:** I did consult with my constituency and two or three people read it and got back to me. They were all negative for a variety of reasons. I am going to put in a couple of their reasons and some of my own thinking on this matter. Again, I want to say that I have great respect for all of the work that went into the planning of this document. I personally know how it is to labor on committees for many years and then have the results ignored. I do want to say that the idea of four Senates explodes the whole term Senate. To me it sounds like four countries. That brings me to my second point. To me, this is not a system of shared governance, but of divided governance. The central constituents, the faculty and the students, are no longer talking to each other. Another level of bureaucracy is added and I think that both faculty and students feel short changed in that process. The faculty senate is farther down, below the University Council, which might have the ultimate power except that it too is only advisory to the administration. So in a certain sense, it is not only a divided government, it is a divide and conquer government in my opinion. I think that it seems hopelessly complicated to decide the referral of issues. This was something that was mentioned by one of my faculty members. I would favor adding the needed constituents to this table rather than dividing into four different bodies.

**Senator Panfilio:** I don't think that you have to tear something apart to fix it. I think what we need to do is focus on making this Senate better than what it is today. I remember my first meeting in which the

Constitution was discussed. It was the most ruthless meeting I had ever been in. The thing that I reflect on is how we have grown as a group. I think that we have taken the leadership in finding other charges that I think fit better with what we can do to help the University. So I think what we need to do is dismiss this document and work on creating our own document, taking the themes and ideas that are important in the proposed document. I think it is important that we bring in those principles of shared governance and adopt them ourselves. I think one of the most important things to iterate is that if you think that the faculty and students are the only constituencies that make this University what it is, then I don't think that we have any right to sit at this table under shared governance.

**Senator White:** Earlier in the year I sent to the Rules Committee my responses to the governance report. Basically, when I became chair of the Senate two years ago, my assumption was that I would be the last chair of the Senate, as we understood it. When I began sitting on the ad hoc committee and I begin to study the proposal, my doubts began to grow. As I began to talk to the ad hoc committee and express my reservations, I became an opponent to the document and I am still an opponent. I will list some my preliminary oppositions. The ad hoc committee in my mind has not demonstrated that there is something radically broken in the present system. The new system would require several years of rewriting of the current governance documents. Virtually every governance document of the University would have to be reviewed and rewritten. This I believe would be a lengthy implementation period which would involve the Senate in an awful lot of tedious work. This energy I think would be much better spent working on the capital campaign or working on the Distinctiveness and Excellence project. In my mind, the proposed system will lead to turf wars between the various bodies. The proposed system marginalizes students as they would not be as centrally involved in academic affairs as they were before. The proposed system does not present a model for a faculty senate that is in reality what has in the past been lobbied for. This model actually distances the faculty from critical issues that are now handled within the Senate by the Rules Committee, Administrative Affairs Committee and Budget Committee. For example, if you read the proposal carefully, the University Council has primary responsibility for the Constitution and for rules. I would remind you that in our recent past we had very dramatic events over the Constitution and that was in a situation where the faculty had a clear majority over the rules in the Constitution. So, I would not want to see rules and the Constitution in the University Council with its one faculty member majority. The proposed system fragments faculty leadership by creating two chairs, one of the University Council and one of the faculty senate, and creates a context where medieval alliance building would be the order of the day. This is I believe is a divide and conquer type of system. The proposed system increases the burden of committee work by 100% moving from 50 to 100 members who participate on committees. The proposed system denies the students a valuable and practical learning experience of working with faculty in the academic setting. The University Council has been described to us not as a decision-making body but as a coordinating body. But in many conversations that I have had with members of the ad hoc committee and by reading the document very carefully, it has become very clear to me that the University Council is a very important legislative body, for example, in areas of what are described as priorities and mission. Priorities and mission are the responsibilities of all four senates to make recommendations to the University Council. The University Council then has to synthesize that information on mission and priorities. To me, mission and priorities are a central long-term responsibility of the faculty of the University and to make that something that a body on which the faculty has a slim, one-vote majority is not acceptable. This would marginalize rather than centralize the faculty's role in governance. I will say that there are many very good ideas in this document. I don't believe that the members of the committee need to feel any sense of regret over the work that they did. I think that it is going to have a very concrete and very practical kind of consequence in governance, and I hope that the Rules Committee will turn to that immediately and that we will be able to institute some of these ideas into our current governance structure.

**Senator Mushrush:** My focus is going to be on the division issue also. Suppose this document passes and

we have four senates. Suppose the student senate comes together and decides that an office should be created where all the past exams of the entire faculty are stored and can be obtained for anyone to look at. Also, in that office will be the students' evaluations of faculty. I am guessing a lot of faculty members are going to feel that that is not a good idea. However, this is not an academic issue; it should fall into the realm of students and the faculty don't vote on it. Most people know that most students are against the proposed document primarily because we don't get to vote on curricular issues. Though I disagree with the initial student response that we should have an equal vote in curricular issues, I disagree that curricular issues should fall within the faculty senate. I agree that the faculty should have a majority, but I think that there should be some student input on the final vote. Last year the Graduate Student Association took this proposal on and we came to the conclusion that unless there was at least one student voting on curricular issues, we would not support it. On behalf of the Graduate Student Association, and as a member, we will not support the proposal because of that. There are two many gray areas in this division of senates. I think that giving sole authority to one senate on one issue is not going to work. We do not need to not focus on the division.

**Senator Biondollilo:** I would like to see what could be done to improve our current governance system. I think it should change due to the dynamics of the society that it governs. I will not vote yes on this proposal because of the marginalizing of the role of students. The Student Government Association will not support this.

**Senator Kurtz:** I wholeheartedly endorse Senator White's comments. I am fully in support of the core principles of shared governance endorsed by this document. However, I do not regard that as sufficient reason to support en toto structures that have been proposed in support of those core principles. The governance committees arose out of a crisis situation at this University, a crisis that has subsequently disappeared in an atmosphere of increasing harmony and communication. One of our greatest fears is if we embark on a very long process of implementing an extremely complex structure, we will simply revisit and perhaps revive the very dissent that brought about the impetus for this document. I would support a proposal that would say let us endorse the principles, but let us instead look at alternative ways of improving what we already have.

**Senator Goldfarb:** There has been a good deal of discussion about the battles between the various senates. I would argue that the committee perceived that we would operate under a different level of principles in relationship to how the senates would work with each other. The major principle is trust in a mutual sense. There may be cases when the student senate might not be happy with the faculty senate's decision and would have an opportunity to speak to the University Council or directly to administration about those issues. What we hope wouldn't happen would be that the structures would be seen as battle grounds, but would be seen as places in which there is interaction with the overall administration as well as the overall community of governance itself. I think what occurs very often is that the separate bodies are presented as working in vacuums as opposed to working across lines. I feel very strongly that they would work across lines. As indicated in the report, whether we agree with the structures or not, the structures are not embattled. I would suggest that the SGA could undertake an issue that would require administration working with that organization, as the proposed structure requires that level of interaction. I guess I become concerned when there is a presentation that suggests that this necessarily has to become a battle.

**Senator Landau:** Is it practical and feasible that we table action on this and request that the Rules Committee give us a competing document that focuses on principles without addressing the structural changes?

**Senator White:** You can make a motion to table the issue, otherwise, I am not quite sure what to make of your comment. Your comment could be construed as part of an argument for tabling, but first we need to



have a motion for tabling. Otherwise, your comments are not in order because they are not germane to the discussion of the motion on the floor.

**Motion XXXII-34:** by Senator Landau to table the discussion on the governance report, second by Senator Holmes.

**Senator Landau:** I would be interested in a competing document presented by the Rules Committee with the principles that many of us seem to endorse.

**Senator Razaki:** I don't see what purpose would be served by tabling this motion. I think that most of us are committed to have a thorough discussion of this document. I don't know what time span the senator thinks that it would take to come up with a competing document.

**Senator White:** We do have a deadline of November 1 for reporting our decision to the President. It would be impossible for the Rules Committee to come up with an alternative in that time frame.

**Senator Razaki:** That is what I was trying to point out, that it would be an impossible task. Therefore, tabling the motion would not solve that problem. Therefore, I am opposed to tabling this motion. We should either vote it up or down.

**Senator Reid:** The ideal situation would be to have a competing document. It would take us at least several months to half a year to put together such a document. The only option would be to ask the President to put off that deadline in order to do that.

**Senator Landau:** That is the reason I asked if it was practical to do that.

**Senator White:** Would you care to withdraw your motion?

**Senator Landau:** I withdraw the motion.

**Senator Razaki:** Called the question.

**Senator White:** Does anyone object to calling the question? Seeing no objections, we move to a roll call vote. An aye vote is an approval of the proposal and a no vote is disapproval of the proposal. The final vote on the proposal was 32 no, 3 yes and 3 abstentions.

**Motion XXXII-34:** By Senator Weber, second by Senator Chang, to adjourn. The motion was approved by standing vote.

Academic Senate  
Hovey 208, Box 1830  
438-8735

E-mail Address: [acsenate@ilstu.edu](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu)

Web Address: <http://www.academicsenate.ilstu.edu>



Microsoft Excel  
Worksheet