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I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: Good afternoon. I want to call the November 4, 2009 meeting of the University Council to order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: I want to call for a motion to adopt the agenda today. There are no walk-ins so the agenda is as published. Is there a motion to – second? All those in favor say aye.

Hansen made the motion. Valentiner was second. The agenda was accepted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 7 (sent electronically)

President Peters: You have received electronically the minutes of October 7. I’ll call for additions and corrections, not electronically. All right, hearing none, motion to approve? Second? All in favor? Okay.

Thu made the motion. Latham was second. The minutes were accepted as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: I hope everyone is doing well on Halloween. It’s good to be back. I’ve been on the road for the last couple of weeks, in and out, but most basically on the road and a couple of things I want to say about what I was doing. I was at the NCAA – you know I’m on the Executive Committee of the NCAA – and Division and Board of Directors. I was there last week for three days; two and a half days and the first thing and the first thing I did was a tribute to Myles Brand and most of you know, Myles died of pancreatic cancer after a heroic battle of about 7 months and Miles was a philosopher and actually was chair of Philosophy at UIC and then he went on to be provost at Ohio State and he was president at the University of Oregon and then he went to Bloomington, IU, and did a tremendous job of fund raising and raising academic standards. Of course, on the sports side, you know what he’s famous for. He fired Bobby Knight
which – then in a rather non-obvious choice to be head of the huge NCAA which is, you know, sets the standards for championships and student athletic participation and rules and regulations of the 2 or 3 thousand members for the Collegiate Athletic Association and not a very obvious choice. Usually the heads of that organization come from the sports administration world. They’re commissioners, former commissioners of the Big Ten, athletic directors – good people, but on the sports side. Several years ago – actually, beginning about fifteen years ago there was a movement, a faculty inspired movement and a presidential inspired movement, probably accelerated by the first Knight Commission report which was chaired by Theodore Hesburgh and President Friday, there’s a lot of clot there – a lot of gravitas. I can’t use clot anymore can I?

I’ve got to watch what I say – for academic reform and so Myles put in place a tremendous academic reform protocol in the NCAA; academic progress reports, graduation reports, tried to put academic integrity back into the process and also to reorganize. He did a strategic plan which was focused on academics and student athlete well-being and also presidential control as much as, you know, one can control an organization that has a 6 billion dollar CBS contract for basketball, almost half of which is returned to members. Us – we get money for students – scholarship athletes from the CBS contract. Well, at any rate, that’s all by way of saying how proud I am of what we do on this campus and recently our athletic director, Jeff Compher and our steering committee steered us successfully, let’s hope, through a reaccreditation – it’s called recertification; it happens every ten years of out athletic programs and they look very, very carefully, not so much at finances and things like that, but at academic integrity. They look at gender equity issues. They look at, you know, student athlete well-being, compliance and Matt Streb stepped in and chaired that and there were several other members who did yeoman work and especially Janaan Mickey who I believe is an SPS person or operating staff – sorry, they’re both great – doesn’t matter and actually she’s the real athletic director of athletics here and I just want to say there are a lot of people out there who on a daily basis have been doing such great work for us and I thought I would just stop a minute and point one of them out and say “gee, without her I don’t think we would have had this recertification” and, you know, it’s as bureaucratic as it can get, changing the tense of words in the documents that are – she just did great work with the logistics. Hopefully, the report was clean but, you know, it goes up the line now; it’s like an accreditation situation and we will know in April but I think it will be positive.

All I have to say about that as well is that we’ve had eight semesters where our student athletes, 468 give or take one or two, eight semesters of 3.0 or above and I think they won the MAC Academic Awards last year and, you know, I love to win, right – and I like the athletic competition but I really like that. I really like that our student athletes are in the classrooms so I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

So I spent a lot of time doing that and also want to give a report on what we have done – what’s happened in the veto session. The veto session was split into two weeks and then they had a week’s hiatus and it went by and there were some good things that came out of it some of which you know. One is our trustee, Manny Sanchez, was confirmed by the Senate finally after two years and he was serving without portfolio but as sort of a volunteer; he’s been reappointed and confirmed by the Senate and that’s just great. Manny Sanchez has been a long-time trustee. He was chair when I first – the second year I was here and he’s just been a tremendous asset and, you know, every once in a while if the trustees do a good thing, write them a little e-mail or a note and thank them because they’re so supportive of what we do and they’re so supportive of you. They’re so supportive of the concept of tenure and the concept of sabbaticals and they’re concerned about your salaries and your benefits and they’re always there – and, they’re concerned about the students. That’s the second thing that happened. Of course you know, the monetary aware program and we reached an accommodation with the passage of a Senate bill and we’ve talked about that and I’m still giving interviews on it. It was a great story and it is a great story. Now the revenue source is not tied to the legislation that they passed; you know that but
potential funding could come from a cigarette tax, there’s a tax amnesty program out there that it could come from. That one is sponsored by our own Representative Pritchard or it ultimately could come from an income tax solution. So, you know, you’ve got authorization but, you know, show me the money. They haven’t done that yet.

The other, and I’ve mentioned it before, it’s worth mentioning again. It’s sort of like something that didn’t happen and what didn’t happen was the passage or consideration of the so-called Harper Bill which would’ve given Harper College four-year degree authority in limited areas but we reached an accommodation in large part, I’ve been over this before, thanks to the faculty who have given us the flexibility to develop a Bachelor of Science and Applied Management and we did a little negotiating and sitting down with the Harper College folks, faculty-to-faculty, and worked out a wonderful program. Actually, there was something in the Tribune about it today – I think it was in the Chicagoland section. Anne Kaplan was quoted and you’ll have to tell her how she came off. Anyway, that’s a win/win situation and I doubt we’ll be seeing a four-year degree bill in the hopper in the spring and hopefully for a long time to come. I think it’s bad public policy and not a good use of resources and, you know, we do have a service area, 26 community colleges and 40% of our incoming students come from – our undergraduates – come from community colleges. They’re well prepared. By and large they do as well or better than the four-year – they’re called native students – isn’t that terrible? But, we work real hard at our community colleges relationships. Last Saturday, it was community college day at Huskie Stadium and I invited 8 community college presidents – actually, it was a ploy to get community college in the stands. We had a few. But I want to thank everyone who worked on that.

Capital funding – I see there was a headline in the Northern Star today. Capital funding – and this was a – even though we haven’t seen the release of the funding yet, I have to reiterate what a huge win, success this is because we did get authorization and appropriation for Cole Hall – 8 million; Stevens Hall – 22.5 million; the planning money for the Computer Science/Technology Center – 2.9 million; and deferred maintenance funds of 5 million. Now, we have a 400 million dollar deferred maintenance problem but boy, we need that 5 million because if we have a roof that leaks and we don’t have deferred maintenance money, we have to use other funds that could go toward computers or, you know, other kinds of academic infrastructure needs that we have. As you know, if you have a roof that leaks, you have to fix a roof. So all these projects were authorized and appropriated and really what they’re awaiting now is the sale of bonds and the release of the funds so the state has to find a way of finding the money and they do that by floating bonds, people buy the bonds and that gives them the income. However, when they tried to do this, there’s a legal suit filed by the distributors on the soft drink tax – there’s a soft drink tax as one element of this revenue and there’s a law suit so they’re holding up the sale of bonds and then the other problem is part of it was to be funded by video poker in, you know, bars, gas stations, wherever you play video poker – but they gave a local option and there are a lot of communities that are opting out. If too many of them opt out, there’s not a revenue stream so – but, you know, it’s still all good news. I think in Illinois, in politics, you have to take the good news and go with it. The Governor will do whatever – here’s the Governor, he’ll do whatever he can to initiate some action on this capital bill before the end of the year. That’s what I’ve heard. That’s what the Governor has been saying. The other thing about where we are in terms of budgets which is, you know, always frustrating because it’s – we haven’t reached anything definitive about where we are. We know the money we have this year. However, for a lot of individuals who rely on payments from the government, like medical reimbursements for docs and even payments to the universities because, you know, we get a disbursement from the state in – Eddie is it monthly payments usually or quarterly? And they have not been so timely. There’s a backlog of bills and under-funded obligations totaling today 10 billion; 10 billion dollars. You know it’s going to take, in my estimation, considerable political will to address those issues
before the February 2 primary. That’s when the primary is now, February 2 or even the November election. So you know if you’re in an election cycle, right, and people have opponents and a lot of opponents are anti-tax; a lot of people are anti-tax so and then the last part of this picture is that the building of the budget, the process, for next year with the state portion of the budget, is in process and the senior administrators, Ray and I and Eddie and Anne, there may have been others there, I can’t remember, met with the IBHE as we do every year about this time and for the eighth year in a row, we presented our request budget which is loaded with all the good things you know, salary increases right at the top, technology. We had an escalator for utilities and we change the numbers every year. We try to change the language. We don’t change the priorities and then you know what happens. But we did it again and they listened. The IBHE has been very helpful particularly in MAP funding and they are listening but we have this incredibly difficult budget situation that is facing the state and sooner or later it must be dealt with. Pensions obligations, the health insurance premiums, the backlog of bills, the fact we don’t have a balanced budget and no matter how, in my opinion, no matter how much you cut, you still won’t have a balanced budget. It’s a California situation potentially. So, but we’re, you know, we spend a lot of time thinking about his and modeling and talking and planning and when I have something significant to tell you, I’ll tell you but right now that’s sort of the bottom line right now. We’re okay; we’re doing okay. Wish I could say we’re doing great; we’re doing okay. I wish I could’ve released funds for salary. I can’t because I don’t know what’s coming but as soon as things are solid, believe me that’s the top of my priorities and the trustees’ as well.

The other thing I’ve been doing, I went to spend a day helping another president at another university who’s dealing with incredibly difficult budgets and it’s causing the community to split. They had a 12% cut two years ago; 14% cut last year and as I arrived, they got hit with a 6% rescission on top of that. Now add that up. How do you do that? I don’t know and everyone is accusing everyone else of hiding money or not having money when in fact, when you look at the books, there is no money. They’ve got a real problem and I don’t know how you do it. The only way you can do it I think is to be like we are and that is, and it’s probably one of the reasons I was asked to do it, is that it seems like NIU knows how to handle crisis and I think it’s because of our shared governance and our understanding of the situation and there’s trust. I hope there’s trust – I think there’s – I know there’s trust. At this place I was at, there was no trust. There should be, they’re good people. Smart people. No trust and no communication. And so I came back and I said first thing I’m going to do is go to University Council and I’m going to say how grateful I am that I work at a place with the kind of people that I work with even though I know how hard it is and how hard people work like Janaan Mickey and how frustrated you get and how easy it is to blame people, I mean, as to is somebody doing better than you are doing. I know how institutions work but I see less of that here.

Okay, I’m going to get off the soap box. I do want to introduce Ken Zehnder. Ken Zehnder has taken over for Kathy Buettner. Stand up Ken so people can see you. He is now the Director of State and Local Government? Ken spends a lot of time in Springfield. He is the person that is constantly monitoring our bills. As a matter of fact we’re working right now, Ken and I are working on trying to make sure Cole Hall and the other priorities are – you continually have to keep those in the minds of the Governor and the leaders and the legislators and Ken helps us do that and local issues too. Ken is going to do the local political issues. Ken Zehnder and how long have you been with us Ken? Nine years. Okay, well anyway, that’s where he is.

All right. Does anybody have any questions on that; on any of that before we – we’re going to have a couple of reports and a presentation. I haven’t felt the need to write one of my famous e-mails because I didn’t have much to say about that. I could write something one day and it’s going to be wrong the next in terms of the state budget.
All right, I’m going to ask our Executive Vice President – our Provost Ray Alden to update us about the Vice President for Research search and anything else you want to update us on.

R. Alden: Okay, last weekend we did have a search airport interview by the search committee and we had six candidates come in and we have narrowed it down to three and the HR process has gone through so right now we’re trying to schedule with those three individuals to try and get a campus interview for all three of them before the end of the semester targeting the week after Thanksgiving and maybe into the following week. I know that’s a busy time but we felt that considering we wanted to try to get this search finished before some of the others that are out there come to conclusion so that we can get the best possible candidate, the search committee felt an urgency to get that done so we will be scheduling that. You will see the notices for the open forums or for the various constituency groups. Please attend all of them. We want to give everybody a fair hearing and hopefully by the time break hits, we’ll have somebody, the best possible candidate, secured for that position. I also wanted to thank Jim Erman for agreeing for a second year to be interim. This was above and beyond the original call of duty that we had for him and he’s been a great steward of that office so I wanted to thank Jim personally on that.

We will have another search coming up. You probably are all aware that Lemuel has announced that he’ll be stepping down as dean of Education. However, he has agreed to stay on until the end of the academic year while we conduct a national search and right now we’re forming a search committee within the colleges as well as some outside constituent groups and we will be going to a search firm. We have three requests for quotes out and those should be finalized this week in terms of seeing among those three firms that were all on the approved list by the state so we don’t have to go out for an official bid but we do want to always get the best possible quotes from these firms. We picked three that had good records in deans of education searches over the last five years in terms of successful searches. So that will be – we’ll try to streamline that and get it expedited in the spring so hopefully by mid-spring we will have a permanent dean and as I said, I’m very grateful to Lemuel to stay on during that transition process to make a smooth transition as possible and I would like to thank him for his service over the last several years. He will continue on as Executive Director of the P-20 Center as well as obviously a professor in the College of Education. So thank you Lemuel as well.

President Peters: Good, any questions? Good.

A. Update on Baccalaureate Review – Jeff Kowalski (Pages 2-12)

President Peters: If you look on your agenda, we’re going to have an update now from Jeff Kowalski who has been helping lead the Baccalaureate Review. Rather interesting about this, at this university I was at a young woman comes up to me who was, I think she was a Ph.D. candidate in higher ed, one of those areas, and she went on and on – she wouldn’t leave me alone – about our website and our Baccalaureate Review and she wants to write a master’s thesis Jeff on it. So being the shared governance person I am, I gave her your name and e-mail address.

J. Kowalski: I’ll be happy to forward it to Greg Long.

President Peters: Jeff, the floor is yours.

J. Kowalski: Thanks. Well a number of faculty probably heard me give a version of this report at Faculty Senate last week so I’ll try to keep it a little briefer this week but I know
that others of you, students and staff and administrators, weren’t there so let me briefly go over this.

In your packet you have this sort of ???-sized report, the public report of the efforts that the steering committee for the Undergraduate Baccalaureate Experience Review has been doing in conjunction with a task force including 40 students, faculty, staff, and administrators at NIU. This was an outgrowth of the Strategic Planning process at NIU that identified a need for undergraduate curriculum review. At first, it was decided that a vital component of that would be to review our General Education Program but it was also realized that we needed to discuss how the undergraduate experience was both realized and accomplished in the major and disciplinary concentrations as well as in co-curricular activities. We wanted to devise a process that would be inclusive and so the steering committee and task force members set up a process last spring where we gathered together with various constituencies on campus and off campus to have focus groups, perhaps some of you participated in those focus groups, where we asked participants to respond to some six different aims regarding the undergraduate experience, what we expected undergraduates to sort of know or be able to do or to sort of – what people we wanted them to be when they came out of NIU and people also had an opportunity to respond to a survey that was conducted online and about 929 individuals took advantage of that as well. Putting all the data that we got, all the feedback that we got from the two processes and with a sort of subcommittee of the steering committee and the task force convening over this past summer, we arrived at three principal goals that we call the three C’s. They were critical thinking, communication and context. Under critical thinking, some sub-categories that were identified as important were literacy, reflectivity and information skills. Under communication, three components that we felt were critical were technology, particularly learning new technologies for communication, mastering the spoken and written English language and collaborating in order to research and/or produce knowledge. Then we had context as the third C including historical context, understanding that knowledge arises from that sort of historical, cultural, economics, social background. Global context, very important for our students today in terms of the connections we have with a wider world and social context being that piece of the puzzle in which students see themselves as connected to a wider society wanting, in some way, to give back to society after having undergone training, education at an institution like NIU. There’s already been some feedback we’ve been receiving from different areas of the university. For example, I mentioned at the last meeting that a number of people have contacted us and said well, what about the issue of creativity, creative thinking, creative activity, you know, innovation and things of that sort, should this be given a bit more emphasis in the final report as well and I know from having been on the steering committee, we’re taking all of this kind of input we’re getting very seriously and that’s the last thing I’ll say is that reading this report, as we hope you do, or going to the NIU main page, looking at the icon and button for the Undergraduate Review, clicking on it, you can also read the longer 23 page university report on these activities and this stage of our report and there’s a place for you to provide your individual feedback/input. Give us your best ideas, whether they’re things you noticed that need change because you think we’re not doing well enough in this report or tell us where you think we’re going well and that would be fine too. We want to make sure we just encourage people to take their final opportunity here to get your two-cents worth into this process, make sure that as many members of the university community, students and staff and administrators as well as faculty are involved in the final product. That then will be given to bodies like the University Council and the Undergraduate Coordinating Council to get a kind of final buy in or
stamp of approval before we take it to the next stage and figure out how do we begin to actually implement these things and integrate them into curriculum, course work, assignments and so forth. So that’s my report.

President Peters: Excellent. Any comments or questions anyone? Jeff, you put a lot of work into this. How do you think it’s going? What’s your personal opinion on this?

J. Kowalski: Well, I would say that my opinion is that it’s basically about on schedule although as we go through the process of getting the feedback from different constituency groups and discuss it as both steering committee and members of the task force, sometimes you keep adding a few weeks to that schedule over time but I think our goal, as a result of the feedback we collect by the end of this semester, to put together a final version of this report during the first part of the next semester and perhaps in time, by the end of the semester, try to begin getting it submitted to governing bodies that have the final authority to endorse these goals as the ones that we will use to define how we approach changes to our programs, our curriculum and course work and so forth at that point.

President Peters: Are you – I think, my experience when you do general education reviews and this is even broader, they’re very important because you can get all sorts of very good discussions going among people who normally don’t talk and my great fear in these things is always that you get to the penultimate point and then all of a sudden somebody reads them and they see something that they absolutely cannot stomach or their discipline or sub-discipline was neglected. That happened to me – imagine political corruption, not in general education and so I’m – the other thing is I hope we get to a point where we’re excited about our product because it does the job for our students.

J. Kowalski: Absolutely, I mean I think that’s why I’m stressing that at this kind of information sort of session that we have tried to be as inclusive and to cast a wide a net as possible in the first phase of the focus groups and the survey. We’re asking faculty again to please take advantage of this opportunity to read the reports and give us further suggestions as to how to modify and improve them in a way that you think will result in something we can use to better the undergraduate experience for every member of university community and I think the process is as important as the product here. That we keep on doing this process so that it’s sort of turned back into the way we teach and we show that we do care about what students come out of this university learning and being able to do.

President Peters: Ray?

R. Alden: I just had several comments. First of all, I want to congratulate the group, the task force, to have gone this far and come down to three C’s, maybe a fourth if you’ve got creativity, I think that’s great to be able to converge that rapidly even though it may not seem that rapidly. I’ve been through this process before twice and it typically takes two or three years even at the gen ed levels so to this at the baccalaureate level in less than a year, that’s pretty remarkable. I think the other point – two other points I guess – we have so many of our students, 40% of our students are coming at the transfer level, I think it’s absolutely critical to have these baccalaureate goals be looked at holistically, not which courses do the students take when they are going through gen ed in some sort of lockstep manner, but how do you incorporate all of these values and goals and competencies in a broad variety of our experiences, both at the lower division and upper
division level, as modules, as ways of thinking, as ways of assessing at every – maybe even every course – so I think looking at it holistically for an institution such as ours, is extremely important but at any institution. What we just went through the last few days, this Libertarian Think Tank, the Illinois Policy Center or whatever it’s called, institute gave us an F. They gave everybody an F. They gave everybody, half of the universities in the country; they’ve given F’s because they want to go back to the old school where everybody goes through six or seven checkpoint courses. Everybody has to take sort of reading, writing, and arithmetic and by the numbers US government and no other history is very important and so forth. I think if we can come up with a very holistic approach where everyone of our graduates regardless of which discipline they’re graduating from has a certain set of skills and competencies and we can demonstrate it through assessment and their employers or their graduate programs or their professional programs they go on to know it, I think that’s the best thing we can do so I think this is extremely important.

President Peters: Here, here. I think this group also, I just kind of speed read their stuff, rejects in the core curriculum, a course that is a single author like Shakespeare. I’m sorry, go ahead.

J. Kowalski: I was just going to say that has been a critical component of the discussions that have been ongoing among members of the steering committee and the task force and you summarized our thoughts very well and that’s one reason why this idea of the three or I think perhaps the four C’s if it emerges in that way, is designed to be broad and comprehensive enough that they are the sorts of goals that can be incorporated in virtually every aspect of our academic program at NIU.

President Peters: I think that’s very important. NIU, and we have a complex mix of students which makes our challenge that must great, however, we have tremendous responsibility. All of us do that represent four-year, traditional kinds of public universities that stand for general education, liberal arts education and creative thinking because there is such a movement lead by efficiency or economics, whatever you want to call it, to make higher education, to make our degrees commodities and it’s very, very difficult to stand and say wait, let’s carefully consider what an educated citizen needs in this very, very complex world. Some of that hasn’t changed, but a lot of it has. You know, what set of basic knowledge skills do they need, what critical thinking skills do they need, interpretive skills, cultural appreciation skills, however you want to put it. And to come up with a program like that for the great variety of students we have entering at different points, you know, it’s a mosaic now in higher education. It isn’t like when I went, you know, lockstep, like many of you. It’s a mosaic. Students step back, go to community college, they take a degree on line, they step out and they come back in and then they bring these credentials to us that we have to make some sense out of and then what we have to do is take that and what’s left and make our coherent general education. It’s a daunting task but I’m excited. It will be the most important work you do. I’m convinced of that and then I’m going to be there to try to support it but I have no budget. No, and then we have to really put our money where our mouth is whether it’s reallocation or whatever because I presume there’ll be some cost associated with this. Okay. I’ll get off the soapbox again. Yeah?

P. Henry: Yeah, I really also would like to thank the committee and I’m going to go back and try and talk people into looking at it and giving feedback. I think – and I’m also very pleased to see that Foreign Languages are mentioned as something that should be part of the communication set. I also – when I was looking through the critical thinking
and the context, the thing that kept occurring to me was if there maybe should be a little more emphasis also, or at least some emphasis on content and that if we get too much into the, you know, seeing the forest we don’t want to completely ignore the trees and I think you actually get to it in the critical thinking part where it’s talking about how to gather and make sense of various forms of information but that was the only point at which I was sort of worried that it was perhaps getting more abstract and while, you know, I don’t want to require a Shakespeare course for everybody, I think it would be useful to maybe make that more explicit that there is ???.

J. Kowalski: Thank goodness that’s another C. Well, we have been discussing that and we’ve gotten some feedback about the fact that some people felt that this was such a broad report that it ignored the concentrations and the majors to some extent. They are mentioned in the report as one vital component along with gen ed and sort of extra curricular experience so we want to make sure that we go back and figure out ways to integrate that emphasis on specific content related issues in the curriculum that students take. We are aware of it.

R. Alden: I would just say on that front, I was just assuming the content of the major was there. I mean, I’m assuming this is what is common across all majors regardless of the content that the majors provide to their particular discipline. So maybe that needs to be specified – this is over and above that assumption.

J. Kowalski: Yeah, I think so.

President Peters: Okay, any other questions? Ready to move on?

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen - report. (Pages 13-14)

President Peters: Earl do you have a report from the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE? It’s on page 13 and 14.

E. Hansen: I have it heard. The meeting was held at Northern and I’d be remiss if I didn’t state that – first of all, can everybody hear me alright?

President Peters: Yup.

E. Hansen: I’d be remiss if I didn’t state that the star of the meeting is sitting up there with a microphone in front of him with the yellow tie on. That’s you, yes. They were quite impressed with you coming in and talking about the status of higher education in the state of Illinois. This is the first time in my three years on the committee we’ve had a president come in and actually tell us how the cow eats the cabbage in relation to what’s going on in higher education, as long as you understand the makeup of the committee as a whole with the community colleges, the private schools and then the state institutions. A question was raised at the Faculty Senate meeting regarding the placement of a faculty member on the IBHE and that is in the process of being done. That person will have a vote. The Faculty Advisory Committee has put forward two names. One is an at-large which would have a vote also so we’re trying to get some faculty representation from
across the state into the IBHE and I remember you making that comment that you thought that was a relatively intelligent move on our part for a change. The other thing that was said there was the fact that they had never in the history – some of these people have been on that committee since Washington was on a horse I think – but the reality of it is that they said this was one of the better or the best meeting they had ever had catered to in the time period that they had been on the FAC and I think that I would be remiss if I didn’t make that statement that the staff in the Holmes Student Center from top to bottom did an outstanding job and I got – at the end of my notes here it says they thank you but they thanked me profusely throughout the meeting. It was an outstanding representation for this institution and widely acclaimed by the body that was there and that includes a lot of people from a lot of institutions around the state.

Moving on from that into the memo that I have here, there’s a P-20 longitudinal policy research summit in Springfield on the 17 of November where they’ll be talking about an interest in research in higher education. The points that are going to be addressed include what sort of data is going to be collected and how it should be obtained and the idea of assigning a student a unique identification number to track the students throughout their educational activity. While it’s a state initiative, it also has a federal tie in with it that I’m not familiar with but there’s going to be a tracking problem with it for out of state students coming into Illinois and Illinois students going out of state and how does that (tape turned over here ???)

The question was raised how does the FAC or higher education in general in Illinois get the word out about the issues if we’re not getting it picked up by the news media out of Chicago, the Sun Times, The Chicago Tribune, and WBBM were actually cited by members in the meeting and I’m just responding with what was done at the meeting and that pretty much wraps it up. We’re in Springfield this coming Friday and I haven’t seen the agenda on that but one of the items I’m going to put on the agenda was the question you asked me back two months ago regarding the make-up of the committee.

President Peters: Okay. Well Earl I wouldn’t have come to the meeting if you hadn’t asked me. I appreciate that.

E. Hansen: Well John I really mean that because I think it’s something that we tend to miss as faculty members that we tune into what rings our chime every once in awhile and we don’t ever look at the big picture and I think that was what they got when you came in and they all appreciated it very much. By the way, you actually told them how the cow eats the cabbage and I appreciated that.

President Peters: Well I felt safe because I can go in there and there was only one member of my Faculty Senate in there. No, but I’ll tell you what, there was energy in the room and, you know, it’s a very diverse group representing very diverse institutions with different points of views and agendas. I did, you know, because we’re all kind of in the same difficult economic and well the policy environment is difficult too. There is a kind of coming together and I did feel an energy and that’s what it’s going to take as we move forward and we get to that point in the spring if we’re luck enough to be able to put forward a proposal that will help fund post-secondary education, we’re going to need everybody and every hand and everybody together and that’s really what we’re all working toward. Somebody wanted to comment over here. All right, thanks Earl. All right, let’s see where we are.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – no report.


E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Barbara Jaffee, Chair – no report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Rebecca Butler, Chair.

President Peters: Boy, no reports but we do have Rules and Governance, right and it is the Clinical Faculty Appointments issue and I’m going to ask Alan to brief us on that. He briefed me and he really understands this well.

A. Rosenbaum: I’ll just give you a little bit of background since it’s getting late. The impetus for this is the fact that NIU is engaging in a number of initiatives with health related agencies and this is causing us to have faculty members who are not traditional faculty members but that are just involved in clinical kinds of activities so we’re developing a new category of faculty member. It’s a non-tenure track known as “clinical faculty”. I think the history of this is that Provost Alden took this to the UCPC, an ad hoc committee was formed. The ad hoc committee was chaired by Sue Willis who is with us today to answer any questions that people might have about the committee’s processes. They went through a very involved process and she can describe that if anyone wants to hear it. This happened mostly last year during the spring semester and it is coming before us now as a recommendation for a policy change or rather the addition of a clinical faculty appointment policy that will be, hopefully if we agree to this, placed in the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual. So I’ll ask – we can ask Nancy Nuzzo who is representing the committee, the chair of that committee, Rebecca Butler, could not be with us today and Nancy has generously agreed to fill in for her. So, Nancy.

1. Clinical Faculty Appointments – Nancy Nuzzo (Pages 15-16)

N. Nuzzo: Yes, as part the Rules and Governance Committee, we would like to move that the clinical faculty appointments be given to the APPM Advisory Committee.

President Peters: Okay, and on page 15 and 16 you have the proposal that will go for framing up and it will come back. We have to vote on this? And Sue do
you want to add anything to this from – since you slepped all the way over here, you have to take the microphone.

**S. Willis:** It’s very nostalgic. Let’s see, well the original impetus I think came from the Proton Therapy Center but there are a number of other places around the university where clinical faculty either are or are anticipated to be used. The original item that we sent along had a rationale attached to it which I see is not in the document here. I can read that if anybody’s interested or – should I go ahead and read that? It’s short, yeah. It says

> “In conjunction with professional programs such as those in Medical Physics, Audiology, Nursing, Speech Pathology, Physical Therapy, Reading, Family Counseling, Clinical Laboratory Sciences, and educational programs taking place in clinical settings, NIU anticipates employing persons whose primary responsibilities will be in the provision of clinical services but who will also be crucial to classroom teaching and/or clinical supervision of students enrolled in these programs. These positions may be funded at least in part from revenue generated by the provision of services rather than from state general revenue funds. Clinical responsibilities will replace the expectations of ?? scholarship. Clinical faculty differ from clinicians in their involvement in teaching and supervision of students as well as curriculum development.”

**President Peters:** You wanted to read that because you wrote it? It’s a good statement; it’s a very good statement.

**S. Willis:** I think it helps to provide a little context for why we’re doing this.

**President Peters:** Okay, we do have a question over here.

**D. Valentiner:** In my field and Alan Rosenbaum is in the same program, Clinical Psychology, there are some departments that have a history of having clinical professors who do not have the tenure status and it has sometimes degraded into I believe being a mechanism by which there’s some of the teaching load is carried by non-tenured track individuals. I’m wondering if there’s any provisions in here that provide for the protection of the existing faculty positions so that there isn’t a transfer of teaching responsibilities over to these new positions that the administration may be able to deal with in a way so that the teaching are being taught by people who don’t have protection of tenure and all that comes with it.

**President Peters:** Well, I was in part of this but in a previous life when I’ve been through this twice before. There certainly should be no expectation of that, that is, you know – but, if you do have an individual who happens to have a particular expertise that is needed from time to time and that person wants that opportunity, I guess I wouldn’t see anything wrong with that. But then again, I wasn’t part of the – Ray, does anyone have a feel for – I think this should be noted by the committee. Bridgid?
B. Lusk: I was on Sue’s committee and I remember it coming up pretty strongly that these people would teach only the same amount as tenured track faculty taught. The other research and service portions were be the time they would spend in the clinical so there would be no change in teaching load. They wouldn’t teach any more certainly. They certainly wouldn’t be put upon by extra teaching. That would be absolutely out.

R. Alden: ---emphasize that, quite frankly, since the discussion started with the Proton Center, those clinical faculty would actually teach less because they would be spending so much of their time in the clinical services, it may be only a third of their time is spent on teaching. This is not mean to replace instructions or be a second tier of teaching faculty. It’s faculty who have rank that do do the professional service instead of the scholarship component of a regular teaching load so they would be expected to do some service and probably in the form of student advising, student mentorship as well as some teaching but teaching could be less but I don’t ever see it being more than a tenure track faculty. I think another point that Alan and I have talked about, we’re still going to have to figure out how to populate this council or this committee, I guess it’s called the Council for Clinical Faculty. We did that for the analogue and research faculty by having distinguished research professors be the body of that committee at least until we have a significant critical mass of research faculty that could populate that committee. So it may be that we will have to call upon tenured senior faculty in those programs that have a lot of these clinical positions to be part of that council until that critical mass of senior clinical full clinical professors are significantly large to populate that council so in terms of the operations and implementation of this, there are still things to be done logistically but I think it’s a good start.

A. Rosenbaum: David, if I’m not mistaken, your concern is not so much what would happen to these clinical faculty but the possibility that they would replace tenured faculty members in departments and thus take over part of the teaching Is that accurate?

D. Valentiner: That’s right.

President Peters: That was my understanding.

D. Valentiner: I think my concern – to try to say it again, this is not intended to take away faculty positions but in my area, I could see eventually that somebody could take away a faculty position and create one of these positions, give the person very similar sort of teaching responsibilities. They wouldn’t have some of the curriculum development and oversight responsibilities, but they also wouldn’t have the protection of tenure and so that essentially the tenured positions get translated into non-tenured positions. I understand that’s not the intention and there’s a good rationale for having these positions in there, I’m just concerned that what we talk about and decide here now may not preside in later times and may not decide peoples’ decision making later. So I think that we should consider whether there’s some need for protection to protect existing faculty positions so that there isn’t this change in simply how we’re getting our courses taught.
President Peters: Dean McCord you want to comment or ask a question or whatever?

C. McCord: Thank you, that is a question we worried about and I think the answer is these are expressly designed to be non-research positions. The mix is clinical duties which are not traditionally represented in the mix of faculty roles, possibly mixed with teaching and so the move away from tenure track faculty, at least in our college, means a move away from a research mission which means basically an undercutting of our core missions and values and to the extent that we have the kind of mixed role of research, teaching and service that is the core of the university, these play a distinct role but they cannot by the duties that the people in these titles are allowed to hold, they cannot swap out and simply become a faculty who fulfill those roles but do so without tenure. So there is the linking of that core research and artistry scholarship component remains solely the province of our tenure track lines and that ultimately is the protection of – the protection of our mission means the protection of tenure track faculty.

President Peters: Shirley. Dean Richmond? I somewhat echo what Dr. McCord said in agreeing in the College of Health and Human Sciences who of course have numerous clinicals, we also have a lot of accreditation issues so again, the accreditation groups that look at us, look at the mix of faculty you have, at what types of research you have, whether they’re Ph.D. faculty, whether they’re primarily around clinicals so again, I don’t think we would be – that would serve any of us well to move from the tenured track faculty to the clinical faculty but when we need to have clinical faculty working with our students, it’s very hard to put the 4th leg on the stool because you’ve got research, teaching, service and then you’re adding clinical and therefore you sometimes are not getting enough time to do any of it well so this will help us enhance our teaching by having the research faculty and the clinical faculty.

R. Alden: I believe in Psychology, the APA looks at those kinds of issues. I know we had an accreditation team on campus last week and they were asking about research and scholarship among the faculty in the School of Psychology group so I don’t see that happening. I don’t see any way we can guarantee a certain number of tenure track in any given department because that’s a function of future productivity and budgets but I don’t think that’s really the role of this. It’s more to make more professional a group that we depend on so much and yet we have no way to acknowledge their professionalism by a change in rank and I think we’ll get a lot more interest on the part of clinical faculty if they knew that they could become a full clinical professor as part of their productivity on campus.

President Peters: Okay. We’ll take Lemuel Watson and then Suzanne.

L. Watson: I would just like to add to this discussion a more holistic way of how the clinical faculty fit within faculty in general. For us in the College of Education, we’re often limited by our capacity to form partnerships to create new funding for our units and so I don’t see how, you know, I understand the concern; it is a legitimate concern but I think it really increases our capacity to serve our region, specifically schools and partnerships and clinical faculty, in essence, if they’re in the field, they bring things to our faculty that sometimes are late
coming to higher education. It’s – there can be the link between the field and practice in what we’re doing in research and so for us, looking at the entire package in the College of Education with clinical faculty, research faculty, tenure track as well as instructors, there really is a need for all of them and for education it is essential that clinical faculty is approved for the way that we do business as well as continuing to get resources with contracts and things of that sort to serve our region.

President Peters: Alan?

A. Rosenbaum: I think one thing to keep in mind though, I believe that what is being said about this is correct but we’re also making a change that will go forward and be on the books so I think one of the things that we have to consider and Dave’s point I think is a good one, that if sometime down the road the university environment changes in some way that if we have not built in some of these protections, the things that we’re doing today might be misused if we’ve written them in such a way that it lends themselves to be misused so I don’t know how to frame it to put in protections for that going forward but I don’t think it’s a point that we should just ignore.

President Peters: Yeah, Suzanne.

S. Willis: The committee did as Bridgid said discuss it and Dean McCord also – we did discuss this at some length and originally we looked into rather the clinical faculty would be eligible for tenure in the usual sense. The problem is that it was anticipated that most of these people – and which is stated in the statement of the appointments – these people are not on state funds. They’re basically on soft money. Many of them will be generating their own funds through the provisional clinical services and so it was felt that – and we looked at models from other universities. I was looking specifically for universities that had clinical faculty outside the frame of medical school because if you have a medical school then it’s a different ball of wax and I was able to find a number of other universities that were public universities that had clinical faculty that did not have a medical school and essentially none of them had clinical faculty with tenure the same way as regular faculty do and it’s because of the funding source. So that – and that’s a distinction that we wrote into the policy itself and I would certainly not argue against further protection for existing faculty. I think that’s a perfectly good point but that was our sense of the crucial distinction between these faculty and regular faculty.

President Peters: All right. My view on this is this is a very healthy discussion and it demonstrates our evolution as a complex research university. You know, these sorts of debates happen. I experienced these many years ago at another institution when you had to determine how you handled medical clinicians and we went to four/five year rolling contracts and there was the tenure issue but, you know, as our institutions become more complex, we have different kinds of individuals doing different things and you have to learn how to accommodate them but I think the committee needs to consider all of these – throw these all in the mix. All right, is there a motion to send this to committee.

A. Rosenbaum: It’s already come back.
President Peters: It’s already come back so ---

A. Rosenbaum: So if we’re not ready to vote we have to send it back to committee.

President Peters: We’re voting on this.

A. Rosenbaum: I mean if we want to vote on it. What?

President Peters: We’re voting to approve?

A. Rosenbaum: We’re voting to approve or if people don’t feel ready to approve, we can send it back.

President Peters: We don’t need to read this. Is there a motion to approve? So moved. Is there a second? Okay. All right, discussion. All right.

Vohra made the motion; Johnson was second.

K. Thu: Obviously this is not a unique phenomenon to NIU. Is there any evidence that we’re aware of from other institutions where clinical positions exist that the kind of phenomenon that Dave is referring to actually occurs?

President Peters: Dean McCord? Served all over the place.

C. McCord: Clinical faculty such as this exists in most research universities and the phenomena of protecting or being unable to protect the traditional faculty roles have little to do with titles such as this. There are many other pressures as we know that can challenge the protection of traditional faculty roles, but title such as this neither make nor mar those kinds of trends. Institutions whether they have these kinds of titles or don’t have these kinds of titles have to figure out these arrangements and if they are seeing their traditional faculty ranks eroded, it’s not because their alternative titles like this make it easy; it’s because they have budget pressures that they have to respond to no matter what their array of titles is. So I see this as really neutral to the question of our ability to protect or not protect tenure status.


A. Rosenbaum: We need a count.

President Peters: Show of hands.

A. Rosenbaum: We need the – all in favor raise your hand please so we can get a count.

President Peters: Keep them up if you’re eligible to vote.

President Peters: Five. All right, what’s the count? 21-5, motion passes.

The motion passed.

I. University Affairs Committee – Carol Thompson, Chair – no report.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abijit Gupta, Chair – no report.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any unfinished business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: Any new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Anything for the good of the order? Any questions? Comments? Make sure you go to the football game tomorrow night. Okay, we’ve got questions here.

B. Lusk: We’re just concerned about what’s happening to this now?

A. Rosenbaum: It goes to the APPM.

B. Lusk: It does, okay.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: We’re adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM