I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Welcome back. I hope you all had a good break and are raring to go with classes and all.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda and there is one change to be made under “F” on part 8, Elections and Legislative Oversight. We’re not quite ready to do any selecting at this point so we’re not going to do that this time. We’ll do that next time; we’ll select those two committees. Are there any other comments on the agenda? If not, could I have a motion to adopt it? Okay. Second? Any other discussion? Seeing none, all in favor say aye. All opposed, abstentions. Okay.

The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2004 FS MEETING (Pages 3-6)

P. Stoddard: The next order of business is approval of the minutes from the December 1 meeting.

B. Baker: May I rephrase?

P. Stoddard: We need you to talk into a microphone.
**W. Baker:** Yeah, rephrasing. This is W. Baker. “Opined” – as is most of what we do here is to “opined” if you mean opinion. Could that be rephrased or reworded to mean “W. Baker observed that”?  

**P. Stoddard:** If you prefer. If you think that’s more elegant. I liked “opined.” Are there any other comments, editorial or whimsical that should be made at this point? Hearing none, could I have a motion to approve the minutes as amended and seconded? Okay. Any other discussion? All in favor of approval say aye. All opposed, etc. Okay.

The minutes passed as amended.

**IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**P. Stoddard:** Under announcements I don’t have too much other than the obligatory mention of our victory in the Silicon Valley Football Classic. One or two of us were there. It was very wet. After a slow first quarter, the team got on track and did very well. The crowd was mostly NIU people. I’d say out of maybe 5,000 people there, 4,000 were probably on the NIU side of the stands and 1,000 on the other and any other attendance figures you’ve seen are the amount of tickets they gave away, not the amount of people in seats. It was a fun trip and I think everybody who went had a good time and I think the President now has a built list of dedicated NIU alums who have money to go travel and I think they will probably put that list to good use.

The other announcement I have is not so joyous unfortunately. As I’m sure most of you are aware of the NIU community loss. A couple of people over the break. One was Kevin McKeough who served as Faculty Personnel Advisor and is, therefore, somewhat associated with this body and then the other was Dan Griffiths who used to have this position that I’m in. Dan served on the Senate and UC I guess from 1993 to 2001. He served on Rules and Governance during most of that period. He was chair of Rules and Governance for three years and he was the Executive Secretary of the University Council which is also President of the Faculty Senate during the ’00-01 term and he died December 21. I thought it would probably be fitting – the Executive Committee thought it would be fitting – if I and the President of the University wrote a letter of condolence to the family expressing our gratitude for Dan’s service to the University both academically and administratively. We would like to have that formally as part of the record and, therefore, I would entertain a motion to that effect from the floor. Okay, and a second? Okay, so we’ve got a motion and a second. If anybody has anything they would like to see included in such a letter, please feel free to pass that on to me or the President’s office and we’ll make sure that gets in there. Yes?

**W. Baker:** Is there anyway, maybe you have thought of it, that there could be sort of a Dan Griffiths memorial or something.

**P. Stoddard:** The thought’s passed through my head. I know I’ve had thoughts about that for other things which didn’t get very far so I’d certainly think that would be – if this body and the UC also – feel that that’s appropriate, that is something I’d be willing to explore if there’s sentiment for that here. So, yes. We might also check Biology since he served over there. But, yes, we can do that as well if you’d like to make a motion to that effect.
W. Baker: The motion being we find some appropriate way of memorializing Professor Griffith’s contribution to this body.

P. Stoddard: Okay, very good. Is there a second? Okay and once again, any suggestion of what people would like to see done, a scholarship fund or something along those lines perhaps, I’d be happy to entertain those. Feel free to let me know what you’re thinking. So we actually have a motion on the table. We never got the first motion. That’s okay.

Yes, okay. Maybe we can combine that with a letter of condolence. Okay, and whoever seconded Bill’s motion, is that okay? Okay, I think that’s all right. So can we move to pass both of these by acclamation? Any objections? No, good. Okay. We’ve acclaimed that those motions passed.

I guess that’s really all I have other than welcome back again. It was a slow break other than the football game as far as our office was concerned, so that’s all we’ve got.

Moving on, we’ve got nothing to consider. We’ve got nothing to consent to. So, I believe we can always count on Pat to fill us in on what the FAC has been up to.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 7-9)

P. Henry: We had a mercifully short meeting last December 8 that was actually held in Springfield with members of the IBHE staff and a couple of members of the Board. There’s another meeting that’s coming up this Friday and I’ll report about that later. The meeting in Springfield – just sort of hit on some points of information. One thing in point #1, where it says “Dan Layzell reported on the current context and issues for Fiscal Year 2006 budget development. In general, the state is “staying on track” in terms of the budget, but the recent Illinois Supreme Court finding against the state’s fee increases may mean some of the recent gains will be lost” That is not the Illinois Supreme Court finding – just cross out the Illinois Supreme Court. It’s some district court just for clarity, but as this indicates the budget situation doesn’t look like it’s going to get any better. Nobody had any particulars. The IBHE has priorities which you can see listed there. Ensuring affordability is always a bigger and the FAC commends this but does keep trying to hold the line in terms of quality of the education that is affordable being maintained and that just getting in is not the same thing as getting out with something valuable. There are pressure from things like the on-line Phoenix programs and so forth that are a matter of continued concern but there was nothing in particular decisive done about this one way or other except that the IBHE was informed of our concern. On the next page, under 2 and 3, this was discussion from members of the IBHE themselves other than – generally that was a member of the staff. Again, this is mostly just sort of projecting problems
that will be coming up with the budget and the fact that, for example, the IBHE is losing quite a lot of institutional memory. Lamont himself is actually interested in being an advocate for higher education so the FAC is hoping to work with him on that. The latter part of the meeting was with Gilbert Rutman and Proshanta Nandi who are members of the PPA, the Priorities – affordability – no, no – somebody help me – productivity – what’s the “a”, accountability, thank you. Quality is missing and it continues to be missing and Gilbert Rutman made the case that he actually tried to put it in but did not make out. One point that the FAC members tried to point out is that this constant push towards efficiency is not always in the best interests of higher education in terms of just creating a quality education so we continue to nag about that.

Part 4 is just an article for your information that was forwarded on the e-mail of sort of things to watch out for as far as the pension – the Governor’s Pension Commission as you probably know, it’s actually unconstitutional to diminish benefits in our SURS retirement system but there are problems that are not going to go away and there are some things that are being discussed. Nothing final on any of them but I think it’s the sort of thing people should watch out for. I think that’s it.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. Any questions for Pat? Okay, thanks very much.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: Moving on, while the sub-committees of the Board of Trustees did not meet, the full Committee did meet on December 9th and I’ve prepared a report here for you as a walk-in item. I’ll let you read most of that. The highlights of the Board of Trustees’ Chair’s announcements are that NIU has taken a leading role in reviving the neutron therapy program at Fermilab. This has been considered experimental but it’s actually produced some good results in treating certain inoperable cancers and other types of issues. It had been in place for several years. It died due to lack of funding but NIU has stepped in with some help from the Speaker of the House of Representatives to provide money to get this going again and I think we’ll be in the role of administrating this program and we’ve hired somebody to actually do that. Everybody, of course, was very happy about the football team again. They approved some money for improvements in the residence halls while we reached agreements with a couple of the local unions representing, I think, about a total of 45 employees about salary increases and so forth. Finally, the biggest thing that they announced was that NIU, I don’t know if it’s the biggest thing but a big thing, will be renaming the SSRI downtown as the William R. Monet building in recognition of Dr. Monet’s service to the university. Other things that have been floating around and got floated around at the Board of Trustees meeting include a less than cheerful report on the
state budget. They’re starting off with a bit of a deficit. What else is new? A lot of the fees that the Governor tried to institute last year have been challenged in court and I think that was what Pat was referring to so that adds to the deficit so we’re not out of the woods yet. Nobody seems to be anticipating any cuts to the NIU budget but certainly nobody is anticipating any additions for NIU budget. This can all change, of course, but it’s still not a very cheerful picture. The capital improvements bill never really got off the ground last year so there was no capital money for the university.

A couple of things and I think we mentioned this last time and it’s still there, is a proposal to start tracking students. This has a lot to do with security issues. It also helps with articulation issues. This is an issue that has come up if a student studies at one institution for a certain number of years, how does that institution get any credit for them if they then transfer somewhere else or whatever. Then, of course, they’re going to use social security numbers and as well know, that’s a very touchy thing. Anybody who has ever tried to post grades by social security numbers knows that you’re not allowed to do that and they’re not allowed to be used for ID purposes, etc., etc. but that’s what the government wants to do.

There was something on an omnibus funding bill which said basically on the anniversary of the U.S. constitution, September 17th, all institutions that receive federal money should have some kind of program, some sort of educational program addressing the United State’s constitution. Whether or not that’s constitutional, I don’t know. We could discuss it every September 17th to fulfill our obligation.

Then Pell Grants are to stay at $4,000.00.

There was a report on the Convocation Center. It’s doing well. In its first year it hosted 175 events and grossed over 5 million dollars of which $900,000 is profit. For the second year, they got 199 events, over 6 million dollars gross and $961,000 net. I’m told, or they mentioned, that the profits are going on reserve for long-term projects that have not been disclosed.

Any questions about the Board of Trustees and what they’re up to? Yes?

**P. Henry:** Wasn’t there something just last week that the Pell Grants were going to be increased at the federal level?

**P. Stoddard:** It’s possible. If it’s happened in the last week or so, I probably missed it.

**B. Miller:** For the Convocation Center money, how long do the profits go on reserve?

**P. Stoddard:** I guess until they identify and pay for long-term project but I don’t know what that is. I can try to find out for you if you’d like and try to get more specifics on where that money is going and what they’re planning on using it for.

**D. Smith-Shank:** It has been suggested at my table for an ice skating rink. If we’re not getting capital money.
**P. Stoddard:** I’ll look into it. Any other questions or comments? Okay, moving on to standing committees. Since there was a break most of them did not meet so this should go fairly quickly.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. Academic Affairs – John V. Knapp, Chair – no report

**P. Stoddard:** Academic Affairs, actually they don’t have a chair anymore since their chair is on sabbatical but they haven’t done anything yet. They haven’t been assigned anything and have acted well on that yet.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Radha Balamuralikrishna, Chair – report – walk-in

**P. Stoddard:** Economic Status of the Profession. Radha, there is actually a report.

**R. Balamuralikrishna:** Thank you. The report is a walk-in and there are basically four highlights in the report. On the back you’ll find a stop-the-clock policy that’s in the final stages. I don’t know if you all had a chance to go to it. It’s brief but still it’s one page. Our Committee discussed this policy even at this late junction and we noted many positives in the policy but for the sake of brevity and practicality we have only included the concerns in the report. Among the concerns are the that it doesn’t say sufficiently clearly anybody can seek this extension for personal health issues and also some members have problems that with the clause that one should have a proper progress towards tenure particularly in cases where you have extreme illness or if you’re in the very early stages of your probationary period. How can somebody then progress towards tenure. Even at this juncture, Carole Minor who is chairing the Committee, is willing to accept suggestions from our body and if anybody has anything to pass on, please let me know and I’ll try to do it. I’ll be meeting Carole next week at the UC meeting.

Second is the University Benefits Committee that’s informational. We voted on providing benefits for domestic partners which is not currently in the state plan. Many universities have done this as you probably already know and NIU is following suite.

The third item is kind of piggy-backing on my earlier report. I’m also including the NIU history in this table. The table looks a little busy but I thought it was better to be approximately right than precisely wrong, so the abbreviations – “M” stands for merit and “CR” for critical retention. You’ll notice in 2003, we had an across the board raise. The 2004 data doesn’t include the recent 1% raise that was effective in January. I will let you judge for yourself. At least a few members expressed some concern that their increases did not reflect these statistics or numbers so I thought this may be a useful table for some of you.

As new business we would like to look at the salary compression at NIU. Many of you may know what exactly this phenomena is. People who perform at or above average merit levels, their pay is not at par with those commanding the market salaries even after the critical retention, whatever, so that has been a concern. In fact, there is an ad hoc committee, I think at Human Resources, looking at this issue so we hope to establish some rapport with this committee and do our bit as well. Thank you.
P. Stoddard: Thank you. Any questions for Radha? Pat?

P. Henry: Yeah, just to clarify. In terms of the stop-the-clock policy, you mentioned these concerns to Carole? Am I correct? I’m actually on the committee that is going to consider that as well and I will certainly be thinking about these things too. One thing just to note sort of in passing, some of the language is a little unspecific because the desire was to leave a little room for departmental appraisal and so I take your point that progress towards tenure might be an issue but at the same time, we make it too automatic I think there are cases where the department would think that was sort of taking too much power away from the department so it is somewhat vague on those regards but we’ll consider other possibility and if anyone has any points that they wish to have considered here, this is definitely the time to bring them and either forward them to Carole or me or somebody.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any other questions or comments? All right, moving on then, Resource, Space and Budget I believe has no report. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, no report.

C. Resource, Space, and Budget – C.T. Lin, Chair – no report

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Chair – no report

J. Stephen: We’ll meet after this committee ends to schedule our meeting.

P. Stoddard: Okay, everybody catch that? There’ll a brief meeting of R&R to schedule a meeting right after this meeting.

E. Rules and Governance – Augden Windelborn, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Rules and Governance. Is Augden here? He’s not, but I believe that he just wanted to sort of remind people that they are working on the whole question of duplication of whether or not University Council folks need to be sitting in on Faculty Senate meetings or to what degree they need to be doing that. They’ve been coming up with some ideas. Some of them are pretty radical maybe so if you’re on that committee, and have a thought or two about that and how it should go or shouldn’t go, I strongly suggest you look for the announcement of a meeting and go to it. Apparently Augden has been having some trouble getting people to show up for that. This is an issue that affects most of us so it would behoove you to try to get to those.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on, we have nothing from Elections and Legislative Oversight at this time so, Unfinished Business, Buck?

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Update on Student Grievance Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen
J. Stephen: The Grievance Procedure Task Force has been completely filled. We got our last names on December 6. By the end of this week, we’ll be beginning to schedule meetings for the University charge on this.

P. Stoddard: Okay, anything for Buck on that? All right, we have no New Business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Any questions or comments from the floor or anything pertaining to the doings of the university? Yes, Beth?

B. Miller: We were just having an impromptu discussion before the meeting started about faculty service reports and wondered why, I mean I kind of historically know why, but there isn’t a form that is used university-wide although it’s done by school and then done by college and I just wonder if that actually does bring, you know, we have a standard tenure/promotion kind of policy – well, we don’t but we’re all covered by the same kinds of things. When we are evaluated for merit, and you know we look at this compression issue and all these kinds of things, if we’re not evaluated in any kind of way, shape and form in a comparable faculty service report – the deadlines aren’t the same, the criteria aren’t the same other than service, research, and teaching. That doesn’t lend some level of inconsistently across the campus, I mean, I know there are PhD granting programs and non-PhD granting programs university-wide and perhaps we have different missions within the department but it also seems that we have probably have more in common than not. I know that our forms are significantly different and I just wanted to throw out and see if anybody had ever talked about that in Faculty Senate or if anybody else has an issue with that or not?

P. Stoddard: Any thoughts from anyone?

P. Henry: In LA&S there’s wide variety in the way in which the forms are evaluated and some departments have negative numbers and others have many, many, many fractions and it does result in a lot of uncertainty, I mean, it does matter what department you’re in in terms of all the kinds of numbers you have. But at the same time, every attempt to try and standardize it I think would possibly create even more chaos and I think anything to simplify it would probably be good but it’s very hard to come up with one-size-fits-all for this is the only thing.

S. Webber: I would like to agree with what Pat just said. Our department has something unique in ours because it goes along with our mission so instead of just being evaluated on teaching, research, and service we’re also evaluated on our links to the profession and what we’ve done to make a professional contribution which doesn’t necessarily fit with all the programs across the university but we, in accountancy, are a very professionally oriented program and so I don’t – we would not want to give that up because it’s crucial for us to meet our mission. You get what we measure and we measure professional contribution but I don’t know that that makes sense across the campus.
**B. Miller:** I guess my other issue is there ever an opportunity for people to – like the same way we don’t all measure teaching the same way because we don’t all use the same teaching evaluations which I think is actually rather confusing to students. You know, they don’t get the same teacher evaluations when they are evaluating the professors. You know, there might be some avenue for looking at similarities benefiting from departments where they have revised theirs as opposed to departments where they might not have. I don’t know. It just seems that this an ongoing issue, you know, I know other universities, for example, they have much shorter forms. Ours is nine pages long. Okay, so obviously not everybody – I know, well I would like somebody else’s. You know, but if you only work in one department than that’s the only source of information you have and, you know, even if you expand to your college you still may not have, you know, shared information, the state-of-the-art of other people who can expand and, you know, I just brought up this – perhaps somebody might be interested.

**P. Stoddard:** Do we have anybody here from College Council or UCPC who has had experience working with all these different faculty service reports and could maybe speak to the differences involved and the similarities in them.

**P. Henry:** We don’t usually see the forms, we see the final numbers and, indeed, we do sometimes in the course of trying to figure out what the heck is going on, discover that there are, in fact, very different forms but ---

**B. Miller:** When I was on the UCPC we saw a lot of evidence of varying differences in the way people were evaluated and they were very different from the way people were evaluated for tenure and promotion which is why I was originally interested in the variety in ways in which people are evaluated but I think it’s an ongoing issue. It’s also an ongoing headache, I mean, we continue to kind of put ourselves through this every single year. Everybody complains about it. It’s a huge investment of time and energy which is a necessary thing in some ways to document our work and service for which we should all get outstandings for just having done it. You know, but I don’t know that it’s actually an effective tool whereas other universities are using them as an effective way where it’s linked to the mission, it’s linked to the assessment. It seems like as a body of faculty, we should do better instead of torturing ourselves on an annual basis for the benefit of the – what is it we get about ten dollars a month, you know, in merit in a good year. You know, I just think the Faculty Senate ought to be about doing things better and this is a huge thing that we do for ourselves.

**W. Tolhurst:** You know, this falls into the category of be careful what you wish for. If we adopted this uniform policy, we could all end up with nine page faculty service report forms and it seems to me if there are problems with the forms being used in some areas of the university, they’re more easily fixed if they aren’t mandated by a university body. If you’ve got something in place that says everybody has to do it this way, it’s going to be harder to get things fixed than if the problem is a more local problem and fewer people have to get involved in changing things.

**J. Holt:** Paul, can I make a comment?

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, go ahead.
J. Holt: This may not be an issue for Faculty Senate I think as much as the colleges but something that’s concerned me isn’t so much the form as the criteria by which the different departments evaluate and the differences across the departments and I say this may not an issue for Faculty Senate because I know within the College of Education we’re not consistent. In the reorganization, I went from one department to another and in the first department I think I had maximum I could get in research 15% and now it’s like 40% in the new department and so even within our college, the weighting that they give to the three areas just varies and seems almost arbitrary in the way that these numbers are picked and that does bother me but I don’t see how the Faculty Senate can really take it up until the colleges at least get some consistency within the colleges.

D. Smith-Shank: We’ve been working on our faculty service protocol and the assessment of our faculty service results over the past three years and I think it’s coming together but I think you have to work within the department for this. I mean, I don’t think it can be mandated because, of course, in the Visual and Performing Arts, we have so many different ways that we can actually make research and artistry and it would be foolish to think that you could assess that within a Math Department protocol or something like that.

P. Stoddard: It’s my understanding and anybody here is free to correct me if I’m wrong, but is that, you know, a faculty member in a specific department is not really weighed against a faculty member in some other department or college. You’re weighed against the other people in your department. The departments are then weighed against each other at the college level, the colleges are weighed against each other at the university level so if you happen to be in a department that does very well in terms of teaching or getting research grants or whatever, there’s a bigger pool of money that goes to that department because it does well and then your share in that is based on your placement in your department. So, in that regard, it probably is appropriate that each department set its own rating scheme. Each college then sets up its scheme for rating departments, etc. I think, I mean what I’ve been hearing too, is it’s very difficult to take somebody from the Nursing School and compare that to somebody from the Department of Physics and say who had a better year. Well, I’ll leave sport analogies out of this but it’s – so I get the sense form most people that it’s maybe not a perfect system the way we have it and everybody would like to see these forms cleaned up but trying to mandate something for the whole university would be problematic. Yes?

R. Meganathan: Like you have found out, it’s impossible to have uniform form because each department is uniquely different. Even within a college it’s impossible to do. Filling out the forms depends on the individual. I don’t like writing one page; I write one line. Here is the publication. So it depends on the individual who makes it nineteen pages. I do only two pages. I’m not going to waste my time filling it out for ten dollars. They know what I do and if they don’t like it, tough luck, that’s the way I do it.

P. Stoddard: Any other comments? Yes?

L. Kamenitsa: I know we all have made record time. Lynn Kamenitsa from Women’s Studies and Political Science. I don’t know about the rest of you but I’m going to go back to my office and fill out the forms about my teaching for the fall semester. We used to get to do this later in
the semester instead of the first week when colleagues have not even seen each other and we could coordinate our offering. My understanding is that the reason it was changed was that they did the fall and summer calendars together as one publication. Now they don’t do – there’s one schedule of classes for fall and summer, you flip it upside down. Well now that we’re not producing that document anymore, the printed schedule of classes, could we get our weeks back? Is there anyway you can look into this and see what the original reason was for it and whether it still applies and whether we could possibly do our fall schedule course request a little bit later in the semester? Does that make sense?

P. Stoddard: Is it the fall and summer or spring and summer that go together. Summer and fall?

L. Kamenitsa: Have people heard that is the reason? Well now that we’re not producing the schedule of classes in print form anymore, why should it matter?

P. Stoddard: Right, we should be able to print the summer now and worry about the fall in a month or two or something like that. Yes, I can look into that.

P. Henry: I would really like to second that because for – especially when you’re trying to coordinate things even across departments – at the Southeast Asian Center people often are – it really creates havoc to have to do it so early.

P. Stoddard: That’s a good point not to be able to coordinate with colleagues on offerings so I’ll be sure to mention that to somebody.

B. Miller: Students have a hard time registering for spring courses not knowing what summer school courses are going to be offered. I know, but if we’re going to link any two semesters together, spring and summer are better for me.

P. Stoddard: I think now that we’re not printing it anymore, there’s no need to link one to another at all. I think that was seen as a cost saving measure of some sort but once again I’ll look into it and see what they have to say. We are talking about fall of 2005, not 2006 yet? Any other comments or questions? If not, I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Second? All in favor? Opposed?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes
XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m.