FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2006  
BARSEMA ALUMNI AND VISITORS CENTER


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I.  CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II.  ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as changed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 29, 2006 FS MEETING  
(Pages 3-5)

The minutes of the March 29 meeting were approved.

IV.  EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council

B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty Personnel Advisor

V.  PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Okay, welcome back. Are we all set with the audio? Yes, good. When we get to reports from the standing committees you can make your report.

????: Or comments and questions.
**P. Stoddard:** That would be the most ---

A. **Recognition of Faculty Senators whose terms are:**

**P. Stoddard:** Under my announcements, the first thing I would like to do is acknowledge the senators whose terms have expired, those who have been re-elected and those who are newly elected and, in so doing, thank those who have retired – oh, sorry, whose terms have expired. In one case, retired is appropriate. Anyway, those people are Jeffrey Gordon from Marketing, Jean Pierce from Leadership, Educational Psych and Foundations, M.J. Blaschak from Allied Health, Steven Nord from Economics, Buck Stephen from Mathematics, and David Lonergan from University Libraries. Once again, your service on the Senate has been very useful and very helpful and I want to thank each and every one of you for your efforts to make sure governance works as well as it does here.

Those being re-elected are James Johnson from Finance, Nancy Castle from Communicative Disorders and Richard Green from Geography. So thank you for your previous efforts and your willingness to continue in this regard. Thank you.

The newly elected, and I believe we have at least one of those folks with us or we did, are Tanuja Singh from Marketing, Khan Mohabbat from Economics, Daniel Kempton from Political Science, Cason Snow from the Library, and Kerry Birch from LEPF. So let’s give them a hand for agreeing ???.

Again, thank you to everyone. Those of you who are just here anyway, thank you for being part of this.

B. **Provost Search schedule**

**P. Stoddard:** Next up, just a brief word on the Provost Search schedule. As you know, we’re in the process of interviewing three finalists for the position. The first of those people was on campus last week; that was Dr. Long from Florida. Arriving just about now should be Dr. Alden from UNLV. He will be here tonight, tomorrow and Friday. There is full faculty forum tomorrow at about 2:10 I believe so anybody from here should avail themselves of the chance to meet the candidate if their schedule permits.

???: It’s in 315, Altgeld.

**P. Stoddard:** 315, okay, the other one I have is at another time. Thank you Bob for keeping me up on that.

???: Excuse me. On the website it says 2:10, so is that wrong?

**D. Mathesius:** Room 315.
**P. Stoddard:** At 2:10 in Room 315. Then members of the Executive Committee, there’s a chance to meet with the candidate – that committee along with the Steering Committee of the University Council – and that meeting is at 3:15 in Room 315. So there was some talk of moving it to 210, but fortunately, cooler heads prevailed. So, those of you who are a member of the Executive Committee or of the Steering Committee, please try to make that meeting – that’s the one at 3:15 – if you can. Certainly, if we think this highly of shared governance, it would not look very good for the candidate if we couldn’t get together and meet with him. So, if you can make it, your presence would be greatly appreciated. The last candidate, Dr. Noren from Nebraska, will be here Sunday evening, Monday and Tuesday. The faculty forum should be Monday at 2:10; the Executive/Steering Committees joint session with him should be Monday at 3:15. Both of those are in Altgeld 315, which is the board room in Altgeld. So if you can make any or all of those, that would be a good chance to help the process. As a member of the Search Committee, I think we did get three very good people. These three had broad consensus approval from the Search Committee. There were other candidates who we have interviewed at the airport, none of which received the broad support that these three had. Given that, we decided to go with three interviews on campus rather than four. We figured if the Search Committee could not reach a consensus, why waste the campus’s time with a potentially divisive candidate. We do have three people, I think we all agree, Northern would be well-served by and then I leave it to you to decide for yourselves who you like best of the group or if there’s anybody you feel would not be a good fit for Northern and that probably is the most important evaluation you can make – whether or not the person is a good fit for the university. Any questions about the Provost search? Okay, if not we have one item for Faculty Senate consideration and then Dr. Castle would like to discuss UNIV 101 with us.

**VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

A. Nancy Castle to discuss UNIV 101

**N. Castle:** As you know, Northern is a big place with a very big enrollment and with a lot of freshmen coming onto campus and people transferring to this campus, it can be a little overwhelming. Here at Northern, to help freshmen feel more connected to the campus, to have an easier transition and selfishly to then maybe stay at Northern; they’re not just “crash and burn” at the end of the first semester, we have for many years a course on the books called UNIV 101. In fact, for many years faculty, staff and administrators have taught a section of UNIV 101 which is a 1 credit class. It lasts, I think, 8 weeks; not the entire semester. The orientation people who coordinate UNIV 101 asked me if I would please alert this group, the Faculty Senate, that they’re really looking for faculty to take this on. There is a $1,000 honorarium for doing this; $500 if you team teach it with somebody. They asked me to do it because I have in the past taught UNIV 101 and I can attest to the face that one, they help you a great deal. I mean there’s almost a canned curriculum if you want to follow it. If you don’t want to follow it they have sort of “here are the points you need to cover”. They have resources, people you can get to come in to speak to your groups. They do require you to go to like an organizing training at the beginning but really that is just to alert you to all of the resources that you can alert your students to. Again, part of the reason they asked me was in the times I have taught UNIV 101, I have at least two students per group that now – and the first group was like 8 years ago – I’m still in contact with. They still e-mail me to let me know how they’re doing and what’s going on and while you
spend a lot of time teaching other people and hoping that you’re making an impact, every once in awhile getting an e-mail from somebody where you really made the difference between “I was just scared to death being on this campus and you helped me to feel like I had a home here”, I mean that’s really pretty rewarding and so I would really encourage faculty to consider taking on a section of UNIV 101. They have freshmen sections; there’s also transfer student sections. There’s also the opportunity to teach sections that are tied to your college or your particular interest so if you’re interested in doing that, I would encourage you to get a hold of Denise Rode and let her know. Thanks.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Nancy. Any questions?

J. Stephen: Nancy, I told you I was interested in this. I teach LIAS 101 sometimes but I was wondering if this actually had any impact on retention for the groups that go through UNIV 101? Is there any tracking?

N. Castle: I’m sure there is tracking but I don’t have that data but if you ask Denise Rode, I’m sure she would have the information.

J. Stephen: Is it Brode or Rode?

N. Castle: Rode, “R”.

J. Stephen: Thank you.

B. Miller: I can tell you nation-wide, this has a dramatic impact. This is one of the most important things that we do university-wide on a national basis to maintain students in school.

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you.

C. Hubbard: How many students typically take this course overall?

N. Castle: A lot. I believe there’s 72 sections on the books I think. Again, Denise would be a better person to ask. In her defense, she did e-mail me all this information. I just didn’t take the time to memorize it. I think there are 72 sections on the books and each one gets about 15 people so you do the math. It’s very popular and they fill up very quickly. Usually, if you don’t decide today and you think over the summer, maybe you will, there’s typically an opportunity to even add sections towards the end of the summer because with orientation they fill up all summer.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions? Okay, thank you again.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve faculty to serve on Libraries Advisory Committee and University Class II Judicial Board
P. Stoddard: Next up we have the Consent Agenda and that’s the walk-in item. The topic is the Library Advisory Committee there’s another section on the University Class II Judicial Board. This is to approve faculty selected replacing the departing faculty or replacing themselves in several instances. Can I get a motion to approve the Consent Agenda? Is there a second? Any discussion?

J. Stephen: On the first entry, why is Augden being replaced by three different people including himself again.

P. Stoddard: Which one are you looking at?


P. Stoddard: Any further discussion? Library Advisory Committee is at the top of the page and there are 6 constituencies – Business, EET, Law, LAS – 5 constituencies. LAS is listed twice.

B. Miller: One question. It says each of the other degree granting colleges?

P. Stoddard: These are three year terms so these are people whose terms have expired so the others are --- Any others? All in favor of approving the Consent Agenda say aye. Opposed? Thank you.

The Consent Agenda was approved.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A.  Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Next we have a report from Academic Affairs. Unfortunately, Kendall has class at this time so he can’t be here. The report is in front of you and I’ll briefly summarize what it says and we have an expert witness here to help us out a bit should that be necessary. This is about an issue that was raised a couple of months ago concerning the personal response systems or the clickers that are now being instituted in some classes. The students have these little remote devices and can instantly answer questions among other things. There was a plethora of systems being deplored around campus. This has the potential to raise a lot of problems; compatibility issues, cost to the students, convenience to the students and so forth. We referred this to Kendall’s committee as part of campus-wide education on these systems, the Department of Faculty Development, Murali’s group, arranged several on-campus demonstrations of four of these. The results of those or summary of those is on the chart included with the report. The NIU Classroom Response Systems comparison and there’s a lot of information in there. I suspect you haven’t had a chance to go over it very carefully at the moment but the committee, at least Kendall and Winifred Cramer, I know they were very active in this, came up with a couple of recommendations. One is that we should probably think about recommending a campus-wide system. This would be a recommendation but ITS or whoever is in charge of this, the university as a whole would agree to support one system. It was felt that trying to be an expert on multiple
systems when these things are very new and likely to be changing would be asking an awful lot of university technical support. In addition, there are compatibility problems; you may not be able to have more than one system on a given computer and so smart classrooms would present a very big problem. Again, the issue of costs to the students. Right now, most of these systems I believe, the hardware is being donated by book publishing companies in an effort to get you committed to them but I doubt they will be donating the hardware for long and students would then have to be buying clickers for each individual course and would have to bring all the clickers with them. They’d have to remember which one is for which course and this could start presenting some real problems. So they feel, and others on campus seem to feel, that one university-wide system would be recommended. Now it is clear though that these different systems do offer different features that may be advantages in one class or one school versus others so you could certainly – any college or faculty member – could institute or use their own system but the university wouldn’t support it and they’d have to work that system around what the university already has. That’s the recommendation that we have in front of us.

The second recommendation is which system and this report is recommending the E-Instruction System and then the grid will help you to identify the various components or features of eInstruction. They list their advantages, the cost, the fact that it’s an established company with a track record. Users at Northern have already said good things about it and have plans to continue to use it, assessment comments from the faculty who were at the vendor presentations, compatibilities and features such as being able to interact with Blackboard and PowerPoint and the likelihood of continued tech support from the company. So those with the advantages they found. Anyway, that’s their report. We have Carol with us who has been very closely involved with a lot of this and can answer questions we might have on the individual system. She does not, I believe, want to be in a position of making any recommendations about a system so don’t ask her but she can tell her what they might be able to do and where the differences are. Any questions?

Janet or Janice ????: Two of them will be beta releases in the fall with the past systems – have there been a lot of changes and upgrades that need to be once they are initially released?

Carol ????: Both of those systems are beta right now but in the fall they will be the upgraded system. Both of them have been heavily tested and the systems that we saw being promoted were systems that are going to be released this fall. So they’re at the end of the beta stage but it will not be beta this fall.

Janet or Janice ????: With the other system, do you know if it was done in InterWrite? Did they have to do a lot of changes from when the first version came out?

Carol ????: The clickers have taken many evolutions within the last few years. I know Cole Hall used to have a clicker system and it was hard-wired, you know, by the seats so that was one of the original clicker systems so these systems have all evolved and changed drastically and that’s why I put this disclaimer at the top. You know, this was valid in April of 2006 because in May of 2006 many of these things may not be valid anymore. The eInstruction rep told us that basically everybody is looking at everybody’s technology and in a few years, everything is going to be standard. You know, they’re all going to have the same features and iClicker has few
features right now. It’s the newest company but, you know, it’s a very simple and direct system. eInstruction and InterWrite have been around a lot longer and they have a lot more advanced features if that’s what people need. I don’t believe the beta version is going to be an issue. I think that the features that they have will all be starting to be standardized over the next few years.

Janet or Janice ???: Okay, thanks.

P. Stoddard: Beth and then Buck?

B. Miller: When I see receiver costs, I wonder who has to pay for those and one of my concerns on going to this university is that departments have to find ways that – there are some departments that are wealthier than others and then there are smart classrooms and they get certain things and then departments and colleges have to fund their departments. Other systems, the costs are passed on to the students which I recognize is problematic, but when a department has to set up a room in order to do that, then I think that’s also a problem that gets not debated or deconstructed in some ways. This receiver issue – if a department had to set up 10 classrooms so that their faculty could move and use different classrooms around the university, where’s the funding going to come from for that? Is this university expenditure; is this going to be passed on to departments? Are we going to get into the same kind problem that we have now with, you know, some classrooms don’t have remote mouse or, you know, video projection equipment or microphones and then we have faculty who are not supported in what they need. I think that that’s part of what we have to talk about whenever we talk about purchases like that.

P. Stoddard: Buck?

J. Stephen: I agree with Beth’s concerns. I think that since the Provost has control over smart classrooms, we should tell the Provost to pay for receivers.

B. Miller: But not all of the classrooms are covered by the Provost’s budget.

J. Stephen: That’s true; I know that but they should be if he’s going to treat some of us. I think when we look over this ---

P. Stoddard: He or she.

J. Stephen: He or she. That is right. Our candidate last week was a very impressive candidate and a woman. Not that those are exclusive, sorry. Does somebody have a shovel? I think I can get deeper into the ground. One thing I’ve noticed on pricing is that there’s a hidden thing here. There’s the cost issue on pricing and then there’s a registration fee that some people – it’s under clicker registration, 4th line. I don’t think I’d like to see that. I also have a problem with anything that starts with a small “i”, be it i-pod or iCclicker and at the top of that self-paced testing, no they do not feel it’s pedagogically sound. I don’t want remote control people telling me what’s pedagogically sound. I do not time my math tests because I teach a lot of Math 101 and I just want them to be able to do it. I would have failed Phys Ed if I had to run 100 yards in 12 seconds or less and I compare it to that so I don’t like that idea. But one important feature is
the availability of the instructor remote and in the instructor’s receiver so I think that when it comes time to choosing, there’s a lot of details we have to be very careful about. So I think we have a lot to think about this and I think the report – sort of see how experience next year; how that works – comes out. But again, I agree with Beth about minimizing costs both to the students and the departments.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other comments or questions?

???: I don’t feel comfortable recommending one platform even if it’s a “try it; you’ll like it” basis because that gives an inside track to one vendor and if we decide we love it after a year, we have no negotiating power and if down the road we’re going to offer somebody 25,000 units, we’re going to have a lot of clout unless we give it away. So I’m all for supporting the idea of one platform but I’m not sure this is the right body to decide which one to recommend.

**P. Stoddard:** Anybody else?

Carol ???: I might just add that there are several very large departments that are going to adopt something for fall and I think that’s why Kendall was concerned about making a recommendation for one system now because there are systems, I mean, there are going to be clickers on campus in bigger numbers this fall so I think that’s kind of the issue that’s at hand.

**J. Stephen:** Do you know which departments those are?

Carol ???: Communication is one. I know FCNS is looking at some. Chemistry. Biology. It’s not the entire faculty, you know, it’s several faculty together and there was one other too. I can’t say off the top of my head.

J. Stephen: I was thinking that if we have that many departments interested, maybe they should start talking now amongst themselves and see if they ---

Carol ???: I think Kendall did send out an e-mail to everybody because I gave him a list of names that I was aware of and he sent e-mail out to them and starting a communication with them.

**J. Stephen:** Great.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes?

N. Churyk: It may be minor but as Buck was saying about that registration fee, I mean, they’re recommending that eInstruction – they’re missing whether it requires a registration fee or it just doesn’t say. It doesn’t say no registration fee or it doesn’t say it has one. All the others say either a registration fee per semester or no registration fee. This fails to say whether there is or isn’t one.

Carol ???: It’s kind of hard to get it all into a little box. They have a system whereby the student can pay either $39.00 all at once or they can spread it out over three payments over the
semester so that could be looked at as a registration fee or that could be looked at as the price of
the clicker and so the lack of information there is mine because I didn’t know how to compress
all of that into one little box. Their prices are actually quite competitive with the others. They’re
among the cheaper.

**B. Miller:** Another point I think that is not minor about that software is that if you notice it says
uploading questions from Publisher, it supports exam review text bank which is a text bank that
doesn’t – it’s a limited form of a text bank; it doesn’t work with all texts and it doesn’t – my
understanding anyway, is that it doesn’t always work for people who are working independently.
So, Carol might be able to help me a little bit but it’s a little different than uploading questions
from Word, uploading other kinds of things from PowerPoint. That also gives you a little bit
more restriction.

**Carol ???:** It does work with PowerPoint and – I don’t remember if it works with Word. I’m
thinking that it did; it was really quite versatile. The upload he said anything’s that’s in the same
format as those exam questions will upload and that’s what most of the publishers are using. I
have never tried that so I don’t know.

**J. Stephen:** If it’s the text bank format they use it’s a pain in the rump to use to formulate your
own.

???: I have one more comment. I realize we’re using these devices on campus now probably in
every college I would imagine and I really think it’s kind of early in the game to try to push us to
one platform. In the business school, we don’t use ITS for anything. We use these in the
classrooms; we have our own tech folks and it’s not really a problem for us. I think that to jump
on one right now – we’re going to regret it later on. I keep looking at all these things available in
August. We’re working really hard on it. It’s going to be great someday. Yeah, we’re doing
this. It’s in progress. Microsoft can’t get a new version of Windows on the market in a timely
basis with 60 billion dollars in their piggy bank, how we can we expect a professor who does the
“i” device to have it available in August working perfectly. I think that’s being overly
optimistic.

**P. Stoddard:** I frankly put more faith in an individual professor than I do in Microsoft. Pat?

**P. Henry:** Would it make more sense for this body to recommend that each college start looking
at a college-wide system because I can see where the needs can be very different from the
business school to LA&S. For most students, it could be a savings if they were mostly in the
LA&S college or mostly in the Business College to have a consistency college-wide.

**P. Stoddard:** That’s a thought. I worry that once you get past the gen ed courses, which are
mostly in LA&S, so the LA&S students could conceivably go through their entire career here
with just one system if LA&S adopted one but other schools would still potentially ---

**P. Henry:** Would still need the LA&S one.
**P. Stoddard:** I mean, it’s two instead of 8 so it’s an improvement for individual students. There is still the support issue. There is compatibility on machines because classrooms, especially the smart ones, are used by multiple colleges so there are still issues.

**J. Stephen:** Well, it might even be difficult to get everybody in LA&S to decide what they want in Cole Hall.

**P. Stoddard:** That definitely is a potential problem.

???: Another comment. At the end of the report it said something about they can’t guarantee which one would comply with Section 508, Rehabilitation Act. Are we legally obligated to comply with that? Is ??? the only one that has accessibility features? Should we give that some weight because of that?

**J. Stephen:** Well, the methodology of compliance can be done differently. Say in Math 101, I could just have one of my teaching assistants use the remote and that would meet the spirit of compliance. To have someone use the remote for them but that may be a difficulty in other courses. All of these things, I don’t think, are going to be that accessible especially to our blind students. None of them are Braille accessible yet.

???: I would be in favor of saying we recommend that we ultimately get to one platform but maybe it’s just too early on to say we need to do that right now, you know, pick the vendor of choice.

**P. Stoddard:** Would you like to make that motion?

???: I would like to make that motion, yes.

**J. Stephen:** I’ll second that.

**P. Stoddard:** Is there any more discussion?

**B. Miller:** I would like to also ask that we include some students in our ongoing discussion because they would be the people who would be involved in the other side of this; the cost and the use. We might find some way to involve the students.

???: I think if we eventually get a place where we want to go with one vendor, we not tell that vendor and we have two or three on the table and we put the screws down and we will avoid the bookstore at all costs. That will knock 40% off that way for them just changing hands. We sell e-books right now and the students go directly to the vendor and instead of paying $140 a copy, they pay $37 to e-book and I think we can do the same thing with this and once we have a lot of buying power. Supposedly the entire university says we’re going to need 25,000 units, then all of a sudden we have the attention of a lot of suppliers.

**P. Stoddard:** Do you want to make a formal amendment about the students or?
B. Miller: I would like to amend that any further review of this include student input.

J. Stephen: I consider that a friendly amendment.

???: That’s fine.

P. Stoddard: Very good. Any further thoughts? Yes?

Charlotte ???: Did somebody just figure out what other schools are using? Other universities?

???: Everything.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, I’d say that’s ---

???: Right now we’re in the middle of a VHS versus Beta and we have no idea who’s going to win.

P. Stoddard: That was my take on it too. Okay, any other comments/questions? All right, the motion is to recommend the university towards one platform but acknowledge that it’s still too early to decide what that platform is. However, as we move towards that we involve student input as much as possible in deriving or determining which platform to ultimately go to. Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Thank you Carol very much.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Radha Balamuralikrishna, Chair – 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: No report.

P. Stoddard: Did you want to discuss the Faculty Personnel Advisor or make any comments regarding that?

J. Stephen: Yeah, I think we have two things to address there. One is a reminder to charge Faculty Rights and Responsibilities next year to get the Provost to pick up the bill for the Faculty Personnel Advisor and what else did we want him to pay for?

P. Stoddard: Membership.

J. Stephen: No, no. What else did we want him to pay for? Oh, well there was the Faculty Advisor to the Board of Trustees and Financial support if requested by the FAC. So those two things I think we should add to our list to move the charges to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities next semester. Make up of the evaluation board for the Faculty Personnel Advisor. The suggestion was that that evaluation committee be broadened in some way
including an SPS and faculty members, I think, outside the Faculty Senate. Richard, what was your recommendation exactly.

**Richard**: To include someone from SPS on the committee – evaluation committee. Is that what you’re referring to?

**J. Stephen**: And I think that probably goes to Rules and Governance, doesn’t it?

**P. Stoddard**: I would think so, yes.

**J. Stephen**: So, two things for next year.

**P. Stoddard**: Is that a formal motion or just something to put in the minutes to remind the next –

**J. Stephen**: Let’s just put it in the minutes to remind – we might think of a longer list.

**P. Stoddard**: Yes, Beth?

**B. Miller**: Related to the Faculty Personnel Advisor, one of my concerns about that process was that the total number of responses was relatively low. Of those five people who sent in a response – didn’t have much information and that particular person deals with people who may not serve on the Faculty Senate or University Council. Seems to me that perhaps we could consider a way to access data from people who the Faculty Advisor actually serves. An anonymous survey or some sort – 28 faculty and 5 SPS met with the Faculty Personnel Advisor. We have no data about those people. They weren’t surveyed and yet that’s valuable information about the effectiveness of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. There might be some way that we could implement through that office a routine follow-up anonymous survey.

**P. Stoddard**: I believe and Tim can correct me if I’m wrong, that the Ombudsman’s Office actually does something like this. They have a survey form for each client which is anonymous or is filled out anonymously I believe and then they collect that for their own purposes. We could have that sent to the Faculty Senate or we could trust the FPA to assemble all that and turn it over.

**B. Miller**: And remove all personal information but that’s over twice as many people that we actually received data from and that’s a very different kind of analysis than this body reviewing your position.

**J. Stephen**: In a certain sense, we’re not having the evaluation come from his constituency though.

**B. Miller**: Exactly, and I think while our evaluation might be an important voice because we have perception of his role on campus and lack of awareness of that role, it’s also important to make sure that ---
J. Stephen:  It’s still just our perception.

B. Miller:  It’s our perception and the people that he or she actually serves is – their voices also need a place so if we could do a two-prong evaluation of some sort.  I’m not sure what committee needs to have that referred – that process.

P. Stoddard:  Probably Rules and Governance I would think to go along with the other.

N. Churyk:  I was on the committee that evaluated him and I, at first, also said well, do we have this information but when I was thinking about the people that he actually evaluates – or people that, of course, or perhaps not getting tenure or people who are in precarious situations, how would you evaluate someone when you’re under the position and you may going through troubled times and then you’re no longer going to be here – you may not send positive light on this person even though he’s given you some advice and maybe his advice doesn’t work out even though it’s good advice.  So, we will be evaluating him based on their evaluation of him when they’re in a bad situation.  So you’re getting this information and that may not be good information either.

P. Stoddard:  That’s an excellent point, yeah, what do you do with somebody when they go to their advisor and the advisor just looks at him and goes “you don’t have a case”?

N. Churyk:  I mean he’s giving him the best advice he has but it’s not what they want to hear.

B. Miller:  Well, I think you would have to use that data the same way you look at your course evaluations.

N. Churyk:  It’s different.  He’s dealing with people though who have already been told you’re out of here, you’re fired, you’re not coming back.  They’re there because they have a grievance.  That’s usually his role; everyone that goes to him has a problem or a grievance and that’s why they’re there.  It’s not because “oh, I’m having a wonderful day; I’m coming to see you”.  I mean that’s – and so hopefully it works out well for most of them but I have a feeling that probably a good percentage of them it doesn’t work out so well and they may blame maybe some of it because “oh, he didn’t give me good advice” and it’s not really his – I don’t think he had the expertise to give them that advice.

B. Miller:  Well, I think you have to recognize.  I mean, my perception is you’d have to recognize in the evaluation process that there will be some of that and you ask questions that are not directed to, you know – I think there are ways you ask questions but still assess the process and not necessarily the quality of the person.

???:  You could do a survey and the first question you could ask people that used his services was to say did you win or lose?  You ask students what grade do you expect to get in this course; it’s the same thing.  That way you can adjust what their response is.

L. Kamenitsa:  Yeah, I would agree that we can analyze this data more contextually and I don’t think it would be fair to prejudge what people are going to say.  They may come in and say “I
lost but he was the only sympathetic ear I had on campus”. I would second most of what Beth said except I think that we should not trust the Faculty Personnel Advisor to collect the data. If somebody is already feeling in a vulnerable position by virtue of being there, they’re perhaps not very likely to trust him to keep it confidential so I would suggest very simply that we send it to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate anonymously.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Two other comments – either to you anonymously or to be communicated through Tim Griffin anonymously. The second thing I just thought of was that the only personnel that you get information from is the UCPC but we have the Faculty Personnel Advisor also interacting with the department and college personnel committees. Maybe expanding the search to include those but it sounds like Nancy is going to have a lot to do next year.

**N. Castle:** I’m so glad I was re-elected.

**P. Stoddard:** Well, I mean today we don’t have to solve all these problems. I think there’s enough concern that this something that we should be referring to the committee next fall and let them spend some time thinking about how reliable the data would be and the best way to collect it and so forth. How to best use the data that is collected. Very good. Thank you all.

_E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair_ – report (Page 6)

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, Rules and Governance.

**N. Castle:** We were just a little busy this year. You recall earlier in the year with all of the questions that came up about the creative of the Academic Advising Center and whether the rules of shared governance had been followed. My committee was asked to draft language that would call for there to be a Faculty Senate rep on the UCC and, while we were at it, on the Grad Council and it turned out that we already had that language in our bylaws and so what our committee recommended doing instead, and I presented this to the Executive Committee that seemed to be in agreement, was that what we do is that we give the Faculty Senate person who is on the Grad Council as well and the Faculty Senate person who is on the UCC as well, time on the agenda of the second meeting of the Faculty Senate to appraise this group as to what it looks like is on their horizon in their respective committees. Then again at the end of the year, at the last meeting, to sort of just give us the heads up on what happened during the year, recognizing that we do get the minutes of those two bodies and the last page of the handout is always all of the websites to go to. We what ask those two reps to just keep us alerted to something like this Academic Advising Center that may come up that we would either be impacted by or that we should have an impact on. Then on that one page that we get that has the Faculty Senate, all of the committees listed, that the names of the two people who are also members of the Grad Council and the UCC be listed there as well so that we know who they are and can help to prompt them to bring things to our attention and that seemed to be the way to go in our opinion. Since we already have language that we have representation, the issue seems to be how active that representation is so that’s our recommendation.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, would you like to make a formal motion in that regard – to that effect?
N. Castle: I move that we do what we recommended as written.

P. Stoddard: Is there a second?

N. Castle: Do I just move that we accept this report. If we accept this report, do we accept the recommendation? That’s why I’m kind of hesitant.

P. Stoddard: Sure, I think that’s fine. That will work. Any discussion or questions? All in favor? Opposed? Okay. We’ll take those measures next fall.

The motion passed.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Nord, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Elections and Legislative Oversight. We have a bit of a full ---

S. Nord: We have quite a few elections I would like ???.

1. Election of President of Faculty Senate for 2006 – 2007.

S. Nord: We need to elect the President of the Faculty Senate. If you remember, I took two meetings ago, Paul stood unopposed. Subsequently, I would like to move that we accept the nomination of Paul Stoddard, close the nominations and unanimously approve he be appointed to this position. Do I hear a second? All those in favor say aye. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Technically you unanimously approved the unanimous approval.

S. Nord: Yeah, there you go.

The motion passed.

2. Election of UCPC representatives for 2006 – 2008 – ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting – voting will be by college – votes will be counted the following week and new UCPC members will be notified.

S. Nord: Next we’re moving on to the election of UCPC representatives for 2006-2008 and the following colleges have to each elect one representatives and that would be Business, Visual and Performing Arts and LA&S. Members of the election committees if you could help me hand these out kind of quickly if there’s anybody here. There’s nobody here.

P. Stoddard: I’ll help you Steve.

S. Nord: LA&S, if you’ll raise your hand, you get a pink ballot. Keep your hands up for LA&S. The next one would be Visual and Performing Arts. There’s only a couple and those are
orange if you’re Visual and Performing Arts and again just vote for one. The last one is Business which is green appropriately. Collect them as well.

**D. Mathesius:** Just to let you know I’ll be counting these next week and letting everybody know who the winners are.

3. Committees of the University 2006 – 2007 vacancies for Faculty Senate to approve or select – packet will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting.

**S. Nord:** The last thing to do is a little more involved. We need to elect representatives from the Senate to various committees. If you’ll look before you, it says Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee on the first page. It’s stapled and I believe there’s three pages. All right, the first one is to replace Augden Windelborn and excuse me as I probably mispronounce your name, we need to elect one representative to serve on Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee for a period of three years. Faculty selected were Rebecca Martin, Mary Pritchard and Augden Windelborn. If you look below, there’s a brief little statement regarding each of them. I think they or their chair, it was a little uncertain, provided that and what we’re going to do is, we decided we’ll do this by vote by show of hand but before voting would any of these selected faculty themselves or anyone on their behalf like to say anything for the first committee?

**J. Stephen:** I have a question of anybody who knows Mary Pritchard. It says that she was nominated. Does anybody from HHS know whether she actually expressed an interest in doing this?

???: She’s interested and willing to serve. She’s our Associate Dean.

???: She says she’s very interested. It might be a lie, I don’t know. I think she’s interested; very interested.

**S. Nord:** Any other comments or questions? All right, all those in favor of Rebecca Martin please indicate by raising your hand please. Are you still thinking? You can only vote once on this one. All right, those in favor of Mary Pritchard indicate by raising your hand.

**D. Mathesius:** It makes it easier if you really raise your hand up for us.

**S. Nord:** Those in favor of Augden Windelborn again if you raise your hand please. Augden wins it. Turn the page for Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee. Again, a two year term. This is to replace ??? himself has consented to be a nominee. Is it Jay ??? ? Anybody wish to speak on the behalf or for themselves for Sarah ??? -Chase? Any comments or inquiries? No? Anyone like to speak on the behalf of Jay ??? ? It’s getting late isn’t it? No? Those in favor of Sarah ???. ?.-Chase, please indicate by raising your hand please. Thank you. Those in favor of Jay ??? from LA&S. We have a tie. We have a tug of war.

**D. Mathesius:** I don’t know what we do on that. I guess we follow – when we have ties any other time ---
S. Nord: Do we flip a coin?

P. Stoddard: Mr. Parliamentarian what is the procedure here.

S. Nord: Do we revote?

???: If you didn’t vote, can we just vote again with you voting?

S. Nord: We’d have to revote.

???: That’s what I’m saying, can we revote?

S. Nord: Do I look like a person who really knows?

D. Mathesius: Can they revote?

???: I move to rule the last vote void.

???: I think there were three hanging chads on that one.

S. Nord: So what do we do with a voided vote? How can we screw this up?

P. Stoddard: We can either revote or we can select a name by lot.

J. Stephen: Move that we revote.

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have a motion and a second to revote. All in favor?

S. Nord: Those in favor or Sarah ???-Chase please indicate by raising your hand. Those in favor of Jay ???, please indicate by raising your hand.

D. Mathesius: Okay, Jay has it.

S. Nord: Next is a two year term to serve on the University Benefits Committee to replace Michael Duffy. The two candidates are James ??? . Does anybody wish to speak on his behalf.

???: I do. He’s in my college. He’s been on a number of college committees that I have served on with him. He’s very good; he’s very thorough. He’s very level headed. I think he would do a nice job.

S. Nord: Anything further?

J. Stephen: Used to be the chair – he’s a health economist. That’s an interesting feature.
S. Nord: Anything else. Anything negative or nasty. All right, moving on, Mary Grosch? Anyone like to speak on her behalf.

???: I know Mary. She’s been the College of Business rep for the library services. She’s great to work with and I think whatever she undertakes, she’ll give it 100%.

S. Nord: Anything further? All right. Those in favor of James ??? indicate by raising your hand please. Those in favor of Mary Grosch.

P. Stoddard: Would you announce who won please?

S. Nord: Yeah, the person who got the greatest number of votes was James ???. The votes there were 23 to 13 in favor of ???.

S. Nord: All right, the next one for the University ??? for a three year term. First one is replace Yokum ???. There are two faculty selected. The first one is Matalla. Would anyone like to speak on behalf of Iberheim ??? ?

J. Stephen: I know both of them. I think either one of them would be an excellent choice.

S. Nord: Gee, that really helps us. Anything further on the first candidate? Anyone on James Stewart? Anyone on James Stewart. Those in favor of Iberheim ??? Those in favor of James Stewart?

D. Mathesius: Raise your hands again. I’ve got 16; it was 15 to 16.

S. Nord: In favor of James Stewart. Now in the very last one, I want a clarification. We get to vote ---

D. Mathesius: You get to vote twice.

S. Nord: We get to vote twice but how are we going to do this. It’s got to be endogenous, right? All right, we’re replacing both ??? Narjar and ??? The nominees are Joseph ???, David ???, MaryLine ???, and Eric Mogren. Does anyone want to speak on the behalf of any of these candidates? All right, you’re allowed two votes which will be grate fun and you’re on your honor system and we’re going to try to march this out, we’re going to be here much longer and we’ve already been here too long. Those in favor and again, you get two votes out of the four, so you can vote more than once if you chose but you can’t vote three or four times. Those in favor of Joseph ??? indicate by raising your hand please. Those in favor of David ??? raise your hand. Those in favor of MaryLine ??? ?. Those in favor of Eric Mogren. All right, the two that had the greatest number of votes, MaryLine ??? had 22 votes and David ??? had 21. Eric Mogren 16 and Joseph ??? 4.

That’s it. Thank you very much.

P. Stoddard: Thank you.
IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: No unfinished business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of Faculty Personnel Advisor – see e-mail from Alan Rosenbaum (Page 7)

P. Stoddard: Under new business we have the election of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. I received one nomination; one person expressed interest. His letter is on page 7. I do know he spoke with the incumbent and the incumbent saw no problem with Alan taking on this role. Is Alan here? Yeah, there he is. Okay. So if you have any questions for Alan, now would be a good time to ask them. Otherwise, I’ll accept a motion to accept his nomination and etc.

J. Stephen: Where is Alan?

P. Stoddard: He’s about three rows behind you. You’ve been here three years I think?

A. Rosenbaum: Four.


A. Rosenbaum: How fast do I observe what?

J. Stephen: How fast do you absorb the kind of stuff you’re going to have to be reading and learning for this?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, in my discussion with Kurt, he didn’t think there was any problem with that. He thought that even I’ve only been here for four years, that might in fact serve as an advantage given that I would not have certain bases so he thought it would be a wash. He thought that would not be either an advantage or disadvantage. So I don’t know how to answer that, how fast. I know I will try to absorb it. I’m pretty good at consulting with people when I have a question.

J. Stephen: And you had quite extensive personnel experience beforehand.

A. Rosenbaum: I wouldn’t say extensive; I was on the personnel committee – tenure and promotion decisions, yes.

J. Stephen: Okay, I’ve talked to you a number of times and you seem to be conscious and know what’s going on.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s high praise indeed.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions? We need a motion then.
J. Stephen: I move to nominate Alan Rosenbaum for Faculty Personnel Advisor.


B. FAC to IBHE

P. Stoddard: The last order of business I have is again a call for nominations for the faculty representative for the FAC to the IBHE. We’re going to need somebody to take over that role for next year. Once again, this is a role very, very important to the university. This is where the faculty gets to have their say with the IBHE. It gets to point out to the IBHE what some of their proposed policies and so forth, what effect that has on the faculty. You have the opportunity to point out misconceptions members of the IBHE and their staff might have. You get to meet with and talk to colleagues from around the state and let them know Northern’s position on things so this really is a vital role for the faculty and Northern to play with the Board. Buck has served in that capacity on a fill in basis – I don’t think Pat is here today and I don’t think Sharon is here – so this is vitally important. It is a bit of time, however. Meetings are always Fridays; one Friday a month, eleven times a year and generally that involves travel on Thursday to meet informally with the group. It’s not necessarily but it is recommended to meet informally with the group on Thursday evenings. If you are interested or if you know anybody that you think would be interested and good at this role, please forward their names or forward your own name to me so that we can fill this very important position.

???: Sharon is not interested?

P. Stoddard: My understanding is two-fold on that. One I don’t know that she’s returning to the university. I’ve heard – she is not returning to the university so we’ll leave it at that. We need not decide this tonight. So again, if you know of anybody or if you are interested, please let me know and try to drum up some people if you’re not particularly interested yourself.

XI. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Moving on down, we actually have no reports from advisory committees.

A. FAC to IBHE – Sharon Holmes – no report

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 – Rachel Turner and Shey Lowman – no report
E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Any questions or comments from the floor? Dr. Stephen.

J. Stephen: I would encourage you Mr. President of the Faculty Senate to ask for transparency, using a word I liked from last week, concerning the salary equity study. The details of that have not been released yet even though the Executive Summary has been out there for almost a year. I have people, at least a dozen people, who have asked me – well, we’ve got an Executive Summary, there must be a salary equity study someplace. So, either let’s see it or find out why they’re not showing it to us.

P. Stoddard: Okay, I will explore that.

J. Stephen: I’ve got a second comment. What is it that we have working with the Oracle people? Somebody from Faculty Senate.

P. Stoddard: Myself and John Wolfskill.

J. Stephen: Then I’ll talk to you later about this.

P. Stoddard: Any other comments? Nancy?

N. Castle: Every so often it’s a little awkward to be a faculty member and be married to somebody who’s a major donor to the university. This time it’s not that awkward. Last fall when we met here, I was disappointed that the library was not opened to us and when I went home and expressed how disappointed I was, my husband thought it would be a nice idea to host a reception for the faculty and so he contacted the Zar’s, who sponsored the terrace next door, and so we invite you to come next door to the faculty library. See the books that we all have published; see how nice the library is. Have some wine, have some cheese, have some vegetables although they’ve been eating it for an hour so I don’t know how much is left although we ordered a lot. We also – faculty – bricks that were inscribed in honor of faculty were placed on the Zar terrace and should have just been placed in the last week and so we invite you to come out and take a look and really enjoy the room that is dedicated to the faculty of this university. Thanks Paul.

P. Stoddard: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? If not, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn to next door. Well, thank you all very much for taking part this year and I look forward to seeing most of you next year.

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board
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
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.