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THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Balamuralikrishna, Bishop, Bisplinghoff, Booth, Butler, Ceisla, Coller, Cordes, Doederlein, Factor, Gandal, Grall, Hamlet, Hubbard, Rollman, Karonis, Kolb, MacFarlane, Markowitz, Peters, Ridnour, Rosenbaum, Scherer, Schoenbachler, D. Smith, S. Song, X. Song, Straver, Tatum, Tolhurst, Tollerud, Wade, Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Okay, let’s conduct ourselves in an orderly manner. In other words, consider ourselves called to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. We’ve got a couple of walk-in items. One is from the Economic Status of the Profession so where it says “no report”, you might want to scratch out the word “no” on VI, B. Everybody else though is true to their word. Then under “Unfinished Business” on the Academic Advising Center, we’ve got a few handouts that are sitting in front of you now that will pertain to that discussion. May I have a motion for the approval of the adoption of the agenda? Thank you. Second? Thank you. This could have been a very long meeting, or short, depending on --- any other comments about the agenda? If not, all in favor of adopting the agenda say aye. All opposed? Abstentions?

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2005 FS MEETING (Pages 3-6)

P. Stoddard: Next up, approval of the minutes. Do we have minutes? Oh, I don’t in my packet because I don’t ever get the packet. Thank you. Any corrections or additions? Yes, Ken. Gallagher for Markle, okay. You’re there as present.
K. Gallagher: I also stood in for Chris Markle.

P. Stoddard: Okay, okay. Any other additions, deletions? Okay, motion to approve the minutes? Thank you. Second? Thank you. You guys might want to sit together next time. All in favor of approving the minutes as amended, please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Thank you. The minutes have been approved.

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Under President’s Announcements, it’s a nice day out so I don’t have any announcements. I will be meeting in the upcoming week, week and a half, with the computer committee, the CFAS, Computer Facilities Advising Committee, and also with the Campus Parking Committee so if any of you have any concerns about the way parking or computing has been working – yes Bill?

B. Baker: As you’ve raised that subject, could you remember to ask about the slowness of e-mail off campus? I’m sure other people seem to be nodding in agreement with me which makes a change. Thank you, Paul.

P. Stoddard: You mean in the working of the program or in the fact that your e-mails take forever to get to you?

B. Baker: Both.

P. Stoddard: Okay, I will be sure to raise that.

B. Baker: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Yes?

M. Morris: I would add that even on campus, the system for the last month has been terribly slow. I mean at certain times of day it’s almost impossible to get efficient e-mail communication because it just takes forever and it’s getting worse.

P. Stoddard: All right. I’m sorry, you’re new to the Senate. Could you identify yourself?

M. Morris: Michael Morris, Foreign Languages.

P. Stoddard: Thank you very much. Okay, I will certainly point this out, bring this up at the meeting. Any other issues? If not right now, if anything occurs to you or any of your colleagues please have them forward those to me both about parking or computing. Otherwise, I’ll assume everything is working swimmingly. I’ll assume it.
One other issue which will come up under Unfinished Business; I won’t waste time with it now, we did talk about the Advising Center and we’ll talk about that later.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION’

P. Stoddard: We’ve got no items for consideration.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Nothing on the Consent Agenda today, so - so far, so good.

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report.

P. Stoddard: I don’t believe Academic Affairs has anything at the moment. Is that true Kendall? No, it’s not true? Okay.

K. Thu: What does the Academic Affairs Committee do?

P. Stoddard: They do what we tell them to do.

K. Thu: Okay, fair enough. That’s just like my home front.

P. Stoddard: There is a matter that is pending that was brought up at the last Senate meeting regarding the FMLA (Family Medical Leave Act) and how its implementation at Northern is affecting the students, if it is, in a negative fashion. Radha Balamuralikrishna has a specific case I think that he would like you to be checking into.

K. Thu: Okay.

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

P. Stoddard: Speaking of whom, Radha?

R. Balamuralikrishna: Thank you Paul. The Economic Status Committee hasn’t met since the last general body meeting but basically what regards this walk-in is my attendance at the University Benefits Committee Meeting and also my one-on-one conversation with Jim Lockard from the College of Education. He serves on the SURS’s Member Advisory Committee and he attended a meeting as a faculty representative of NIU. So there are some noteworthy points. One good news is regarding pension benefits. We are not going to see anymore negative impacts this year at least. I believe the legislators are busy focusing on re-election. That’s the good news, however, we know the pension is always a moving target is eternal vigilance is something that’s called for on behalf of all participants and ??? holders. A lot of the legislators, you know, they try to convince the public, us in this case, saying that the Constitution protects our pension benefits. In reality, that’s not true. You know, first of all, any Constitution can be amended, you
know, through public vote. Another thing is the Illinois Supreme Court, it clearly says, you
know, only past pension benefits, you know, they are guaranteed – not future benefits. So ???
there are some things that future legislators can act on and I have bulleted four points there. You
know, currently, we’re currently billed 8 ½ %. That could increase. This is reality because this
has happened in one case where the teachers in downstate and other than Chicago areas they are
required to contribute 4.4% more towards their retirement system already. You know, this was
in affect recently I guess. So that could happen to us as well and the automatic cost of living
increase which is 3%, you know, anything could happen to that as well. These are all ideas that
legislators have entertained in the past. We already know that 30 and out, that provision is no
longer there under the new act and, again, you know people can increase the age when you can
start collecting your benefits. Likewise, you know, medical benefits that can be reduced. Not
mentioned here is, of course, the effective rate of interest that is computed. Typically, that has
been good, you know, it’s been 8 and 8% and above and recently, of course you know, that
computation was turned over to the comptroller’s office under the new act and there is no
guarantee of rate of interest either under the Constitution. Okay, so these are all some things we
need to watch out for and I hate to dwell too much on this because often these self-fulfilling
prophecies come true. So I am just leaving it at the bare minimum, okay?

Another thing, Jim was kind enough to give me all the motions that were passed at this meeting
and there are eight of these. The first four of these they basically talk about how the state could,
you know, increase revenue and earmark those increases for pension benefits. It’s wishful
thinking more or less. Items number 5 and 6, no negative changes in benefits. You know, how
many of you have seen the website www.saveourpension.org? I think this is a website that came
about in reaction to recent happenings and, of course, they condemn and criticize what the
governor’s stance has been and his leadership in this area in general. It’s worth looking at and
there’s lot of facts that may be of interest.

Of course, modest increase of state of Illinois income tax, you know, that’s always a possibility
with a sunset period and again, I don’t think the current governor is in favor of this and, of
course, many of you may recall the 1995 funding legislation, which said Surs should be fully
funded by 2020 or something like that and operationally they define fully funded as 90% of the
liabilities are being met. As of September 30, 2005 I think the liabilities that have been met are
about 63% so about a third of it is still uncovered and that’s really significant. Of course, we
would not like to see any changes to the 3% cost of living adjustment, you know, that’s currently
in practice and in reality the ½% we pay in the 8 ½% was earmarked to provide for this 3% raise.
Okay, so if legislators entertain this kind of idea, that’s definitely not right.

Okay, on another note, Surs is moving to replace Jim Hacking who left as Executive Director
and a lot of good performance of Surs during his tenure has been attributed to Jim’s leadership
and there is a search going on and some of you may be aware that there’s been a lot of change in
the Surs’s trustee composition, okay, as many as six members are new. They were all
appointed by the Governor and there is some fear that, you know, this search may be politically
motivated by those amateurs in Springfield. Should we give them a workshop on search
committees? In any case, Dan Slack who is Jim Hacking’s deputy, he’s now the acting director
and both Steve and Jim had nice things to say about Dan. He obviously will be one of the
candidates but that’s something we all should keep a watch on I guess.
Another thing is that if you decide to leave Northern Illinois University and you were an employee before 2005 and say you decided to accept a deanship at Illinois State, then you will still be under the first year so you can take the job without the fear of the new legislation affecting you.

Moving away from pension benefits here, NIU is administrating the Domestic Partner Benefit Program for the first year. This is locally funded for this year. The state is slated to take over this beginning FY2006. Right now, you know, the university has budgeted about $37,000 towards this initiative and although the benefits are the people who are directly impacted in terms of sheer numbers, it’s few, you know but I’m sure for those few people, this is a great program. On the other hand, the Domestic Partner Tuition Benefits, that’s still in it’s – it’s still being worked on, okay, and one of the things they’re working out, as you know, you have a certain part and how are you going to reallocate resources, you know, from one piece of the pie to another so up to that point, I guess, this is still going to be a grey area. That’s my understanding on the Domestic Partner Tuition Benefits.

Another thing to consider in light of all the changes that’s happening in the Traditional Retirement Plan, in the Supplemental Retirement Plan it takes on somewhat of a new meaning, I guess, to many of us and thanks to the initiative of some of our colleagues, Human Resources will actively work on this, you know, try to give us more input, more feedback and try to enlighten us on how the various plans have performed, you know, the 403B such as TIA Cref, the Lincoln, the Valic and help us, you know, in our investments. And that essentially concludes what I learned from these two meetings. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Rahda. Any questions? Yes,

R. Balamuralikrishna: Sure, the website www.saveourpension.org. Okay? It’s all one phrase, “saveourpension.org”. It could be pensions, I’m not sure. Another interesting website is www.suaa.org – State University Annuitants Association. A lot of interesting information there as well and SURS.org, of course, a primary website.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you again Rahda.

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

P. Stoddard: Next is a lack of a report from Resource, Space, and Budget, is that correct? No report, okay.

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

P. Stoddard: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Buck has nothing at the moment but will in a moment.
E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report

**P. Stoddard:** Rules and Governance, Nancy is off the hook for today.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Nord, Chair – no report

**P. Stoddard:** We’ve got no elections to do this afternoon so Stephen is off the hook.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Academic Advising Center – report – walk-in

**P. Stoddard:** That brings up Unfinished Business. This relates to the Academic Advising Center. We raised this issue last month. The Senate moved that faculty or that I get faculty together to talk with the administration about the implementation of this and to express our concerns about it. To that end, I have met with Gip Seaver and Buck Stephen has met with Gip Seaver and I think we’ve got a fairly decent understanding of what went on. I think the Vice Provost has a decent understanding of where we think things didn’t work the way they should have but Buck’s done a lot of work on this so I think I’m going to turn it over to him and let him refer you to the three walk-in items that he’s presented and take it from there.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, we’ve talked about this a couple of times. When I brought this up originally two months ago with Provost Seaver at University Council, he said we’ll make the catalog changes as if it was a done deal. We have those, they’re in fact at APASC while we’re discussing things here. We also have a timeline that he provided us with that’s worded interestingly. All presentations and discussions are reflected in minutes approved by APASC or by UCC, however, even though they went back to discussing in April, 2004 – no, May 5 and May 6 of 2004 – Vice Provost Seaver made a proposal for the Academic Advising Center to use APASC and UCC respectively, he didn’t call for it to be an action item so it was never approved so there is an aspect that it does certainly involve some faculty discussion but first of all let’s go through the findings.

Basically, faculty rights and responsibilities have been violated under the shared governance of NIU and we point out that that’s in the preamble and those are in Section 13. Vice Provost Seaver has initiated remedies to the procedural issues. We’ll see how that shakes out. We said encourage the Provost’s to attend to these matters concerning the faculty of the AC in as timely a manner as possible. I don’t think either one of us actually said it but maybe we should have said, you know, discussing a proposal with a committee is not the same thing as having the committee approve that proposal. That may be the misunderstanding.

**P. Stoddard:** I did point out to the Vice Provost a couple of times specifically that a vote would have been a good idea.

**J. Stephen:** I think so, especially when we’re spending money in these tight budget days and nobody is asked. The AAC handout that we discussed last time which was problematic for a number of reasons because it gave the AAC legal, binding rights which aren’t listed in the
catalog so basically are not part of our contract with the students, that’s a particular problem with
the handout. If we jump to point 4 right after that, we touch on the five major issues that were
problematic in the AAC handout and that will be reinstatements will stay the responsibility of the
advising deans of various colleges. That’s opposed to readmissions. Reinstatement is for a
student who is in academic trouble where readmission generally deals with a student in good
academic standing who’s been absent for a year or more. Third attempts stay under the control
of the departments. Articulation is still under control of the departments. We had a problem
with late withdrawals but Dean Grush solved that by charging a designee in the Academic
Advising office to deal with that and he did that in a timely enough fashion to deal with the
October 14 withdrawal deadline and then the fifth point was a broader one that we discussed
saying that they won’t – basically, they won’t enter into binding agreement that is enforceable on
the university, the various colleges or the departments. The Council of Advising Deans endorsed
the AC in September 2005 under a vote and were approving of the idea a year before but let
alone being a power of approval body, it’s not really even an official body I don’t think.

Okay, as for the way it was put together, there are quite a few people on the task force. There’s a
larger task force charged with recruitment, retention and this was one of the things that they
bulleted as an item of attention and the task force was representative and came up with this as
one of their ideas. In my research, it shows that such a center can have a surprisingly good effect
on retention when there existed absolutely no advising for undecided students prior to the time of
their creation. The experience of other universities where they’ve created this type of
distributive advising center has been less dramatic and if we see a change, I’d predict somewhere
in the range of 1 to 2%. But we’ve come up with the following concerns. Foremost, the ACC
must be empowered constitutionally to be an effective decisive body. Two, there’s no
mechanism for faculty oversight of the ACC. I tend to think that’s a very important point that if
you’re going to have centralized advising for undeclared students, there should be faculty input
on policy there, not just be a reporting body to the Vice Provost. There aren’t any clear protocols
of communication with colleges and departments. In fact, many of us had not even seen the May
23 document until last month and point 4, if you’ve noticed in the newspapers the last six or
seven weeks, about once a week, there’s an article about advising on the editorial page. It’s
usually the right hand column of the right hand page and if you cover up who it’s from, it’s hard
to tell whether it’s coming from the Academic Advising Center or the Career Counseling Center
and I think that we’ve communicated it clearly that you have to draw a line between academic
advising and career counseling. In some colleges, there’s naturally built in a career component
to the education but our university mission statement charges us with developing lifelong
learners capable of succeeding in an ever changing work environment, which means education,
not training so that blurring is problematic.

On the next page we have Faculty Senate concerns regarding the Academic Advising Center.
Seeing as we knew the catalog copy was coming up APASC today at the same time, the
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate communicated our concerns to APASC concerning
AAC. To point out several other things we said: if properly implemented it follows ???
practices but there’s some variations. Main variation is faculty oversight body. The use of forms
and clear advising routes. I don’t think that’s anything that wouldn’t naturally do anyway, but
right now the forms are somewhat convoluted and the advising routes are being worked out. I
think an on-line questionnaire branching kind of program like some universities have might be a
good idea to approach just to give students direction as to, you know, not quite build a Meyers
Brigg’s Interest Test into a computerized advising system but maybe even just an exclusionary
thing. Okay, so you don’t want to be an engineer but – and students can develop some
understanding of where they should go that way too. So we have protocols of communication to
assess advisement without compromising the academic authority of the colleges and
departments. That would also be reflective of faculty oversight and this is not a fun thing, but
number 5 says there should be an attempt to include faculty in the process of advising at the
Academic Advising Center. There are a lot of studies that show a primary factor in retention is a
strong relationship between a student and a single or more than one faculty member and
oftentimes that relationship develops through the advising process. On the other hand, that
would probably cost money. I don’t know how many of you want to go over and spend four
hours a week at the Academic Advising Center or whatever it would be or take on so many
students. Those are – so we had our report and our communication to the APASC there. I’ll try
to be brief since there’s a lot – we all read here, do you have any questions about the
investigation that Paul or I could answer? Pat?

P. Henry: Maybe this is covered here but how was the question of the globally undecided
students who had not yet chosen any college covered as far as who would be advising? Default
has been LA&S and that was one of the issues I know.

J. Stephen: And now it’s the Academic Advising Center and provisionally they’ll continue to
do that. They’ve got us by the – well, we’ve already spent the money and what are you going to
do about it – chokehold. On the other hand, we’re sending it through the process and right now
we’re not letting them do anything that would be problematic later on in their career as a student
as opposed to their career in the workforce.

P. Henry: I guess, I mean one of the concerns is that these were the people who didn’t have sort
of a dean or faculty member involved in the process of advising and the suggestions or the
concerns address that issue and that would, I mean ---

J. Stephen: There’s still no faculty that they’ll be involved with. That’s point 5 about faculty
involvement in the academic advising process because Dean Doederlein has been taking care of
that for what, close to thirty years, and the one thing that if you’re happy with the job she did or
if you’re unhappy, she was instrumental in the training of the present staff at the Academic
Advising Center according to Vice Provost Seaver.

P. Henry: She was also very unhappy with the way it came out I think as far as ---

J. Stephen: I’ve had several conversations with her and I can say that if done properly, she
thinks that it would be a reasonable way to approach advising undecided students – if done
properly. Any other questions?

K. Thu: Just real quickly, it says under number 4, the current understanding is that the AAC
will follow these provisional guidelines all of which look pretty good. How will we know
whether they’re following them?
**J. Stephen:** I like to sit on my back porch at night and watch the stars and I like it when O’Ryan comes into view because of my mentality, it makes me feel better when I can see O’Ryan. Um, however, when the clouds are there, I still believe that O’Ryan’s there. Unfortunately, I’m not going to believe these if there are clouds there so – right now, we’ll operate on, I believe that we should just operate on the assumption that Vice Provost Seaver will communicate these provisional guidelines and if they’re violated, somebody will tell us. So---

**K. Thu:** So we all should go on our back porch occasionally.

**J. Stephen:** Absolutely! It’s a great time for songbirds too, early in the morning.

**P. Henry:** Is there going to be some move to form a faculty oversight body? I mean that would be ---

**P. Stoddard:** The last page is a set of recommendations that we actually sent to APASC. APASC is meeting today to consider issues such as the faculty oversight. In speaking with Gip, I got the instinct impression that he was very much in favor of a faculty body that would be doing the oversight. I mean, strictly speaking as Vice Provost, he is a faculty member who oversees this. He says he doesn’t want that responsibility. He says no person would want that. So they are talking about it. He says APASC is not too keen on being the oversight body themselves so they are looking to form a body. Buck has laid out some reasonable expectations of the type of representation on that body. Ultimately though, I think the decision on what a faculty oversight body looks like is going to be the responsibility of APASC and the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. But we can express our concerns and we have.

**J. Stephen:** Nancy?

**N. Castle:** So just to be sure about the last question, the fact of the matter is that the Faculty Senate would not be the group that would be provided with information as to whether or not this is happening behind the clouds or not? That would be APASC and the UCC?

**P. Stoddard:** Well, we can certainly make sure that we are kept in the loop as it were.

**N. Castle:** But we’re not – we can’t do anything about it. UC does it, APASC does it, UCC does it – this body can only be an interested body.

**P. Stoddard:** I think that’s – or we can assign it to Rules and Governance.

**N. Castle:** No.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other questions for Buck or me or anybody else? Okay.

**J. Stephen:** Pursuant to that, we find a statement called an “Affirmation of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” and this is something that I’d like to move that we endorse and basically, I think about it as a way of saying okay, you’re probably going to get away with it this time, but don’t do it again. It says “As a result of recent procedural improprieties concerning the
development and formation of the Academic Advising Center, the faculty wishes to reaffirm its confidence in the shared governance system and to protect the constitutional rights of the faculty. The faculty of Northern Illinois University adjures that no officer of the university, the various colleges or departments shall alter, create or transfer responsibilities nor shall they alter policies which are reserved or assigned to the faculty without or before completing the requirements necessary for such changes through the shared governance process.” A little vocabulary – adjures is a wonderful word, it means to forcefully command, often accompanied with an oath or threat, but meaning two usually omits the oath or threat but it’s usually reserved for a solemn charge. What do we do with things like this? Do we endorse them and move them on to UC or -

**P. Stoddard:** I guess we could treat this as a resolution.

**J. Stephen:** Okay. I’m wondering in re-reading it, no – I just – someplace in there, in the opening paragraph, we want to insert a phrase something – in view of the best interests of the students and – something like that, so it’s just not about the faculty wanting to keep our power, that we’re really more concerned that the university as a whole operates for the benefit of everybody.

**P. Stoddard:** The sentences are already pretty long. Where would we put that?

**J. Stephen:** Well, we have a comment in the back of the room

**J. Johnson:** James Johnson, Finance. My question is if we were to pass this, what is this intended to accomplish?

**J. Stephen:** Nothing. It just says we’re pissed off.

**J. Johnson:** Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** Did you have any other action you wanted with this or did you just want us to pass this here?

**J. Johnson:** I just had a question wondering why we were doing this and if we’re pissed off maybe we could do a P.S. and say we’re pissed off.

**P. Stoddard:** I think that’s known but ---

**J. Stephen:** Yeah, I don’t think they want to go through that again, do you?

**P. Stoddard:** No. Pat?

**P. Henry:** Just to address your issue, if that first paragraph read “the faculty wishes to reaffirm its confidence in the shared governance system” and perhaps a semi-colon, “in order to protect” – no I’m sorry, just comma – “in order to protect the constitutional rights of the faculty and” – the phrase that you had was ---
P. Stoddard: Best interests.

P. Henry: “the best interests of the students and the university community? I would like to offer that as an amendment to whatever is being ---

P. Stoddard: We don’t officially have a motion on it do we? Did you move this Buck?

J. Stephen: I said I’d like to but I haven’t yet.

P. Stoddard: Could you repeat what?

P. Henry: Yeah, where it says in the first paragraph, “the faculty wishes to reaffirm its confidence in the shared governance system, in order to protect the constitutional rights of the faculty and in the best interests of the students and the university community” that’s sounding a little bit funky – “and ensure the best interest”.

J. Stephen: Of the students and the university community”?

P. Henry: “Ensure the best interests of the students and the university community?” – maybe just the university community includes the students and the faculty as well, but ---

J. Stephen: Yeah, well, I don’t know – we’re talking about the faculty rights, the faculty rights – I would, I don’t know – it’s a group resolution here so, however people want to word it.

P. Stoddard: Okay, would anybody like to move that we resolve this or pass this – yes, Kendall?

K. Thu: Would you read it one more time?

P. Stoddard: I think what we’ve got is “As a result of recent procedural improprieties concerning the development and formation of the Academic Advising Center, the faculty wishes to reaffirm its confidence in the shared governance system, in order to protect the constitutional rights of the faculty and ensure the best interests of the students and the university community.” There’s a slightly better way of doing that I think which is “to ensure that the best interests are served”. Yeah, “to reaffirm its confidence in the shared governance system, in order to protect the constitutional rights of the faculty and to ensure that the best interests of the students and the university community are served”. New paragraph, capital The, etc.—- David, you had your hand up?

David ???: I call for a motion on this.

P. Stoddard: Oh, okay, so we have a motion.
J. Stephen: I’ll second my own motion.
**P. Stoddard:** Buck will second it. Any further comments or questions? All right, seeing none, all in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. All opposed? Any abstentions? People voting present. Okay. Yes, Kendall.

The resolution passed.

**K. Thu:** Where will this actually go now?

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, well what happens to it now – well, it goes into the minutes as a resolution that’s been passed. It can be moved to be forwarded to the University Council.

**J. Stephen:** It can be moved to be forwarded to the University Council or ---

**P. Stoddard:** It can be – one of our Council – we have several people here who are on Council. We can move that one of them bring it to the Council.

**K. Thu:** So moved.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, we have a motion that this resolution that we’ve just passed be presented to the University Council. Any discussion? John?

**John ???:** What do we hope will happen when it goes to the University Council?

**P. Stoddard:** What do we hope will happen when it goes to the University Council? The powers that be will fall down on their knees, beg our forgiveness and promise never to do this again.

**John ???:** Seriously, is the point then simply to enter it into the official record at the Council?

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah.

**John ???:** Just as we have done so here?

**P. Stoddard:** Correct. There may be a slight rewording since this specifically says the “faculty adjures” and I don’t know that the University Council can resolve something on behalf of the faculty. So, whoever brings this to the Council’s attention may want to make a slight editorial change to make it more appropriate.

**Larry ???:** Could the Council be asked to affirm this and therefore get the administrators and the representatives from the other bodies involved in that to agree to it, to give it a little more weight and to, of course, go in the minutes, etc. I mean, it really only works if everybody agrees to do it.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, right. I think that’s an excellent idea. Have the Council affirm the adjuration.
**J. Stephen:** While looking through the constitution and checking out things, there really isn’t a lot that we can do quickly when things like this happen at the Faculty Senate level or the University Council level, other than be incredible pains in the rear and then stop it when it finally does make it through which is sort of problematic. We don’t have any sort of instant action kind of power, but then again, maybe we shouldn’t.

**P. Stoddard:** Again, going back to the original mission of the Senate, formally the Faculty Assembly, we are really a group that talks about how things ought to be done, make suggestions to the University Council about how things ought to be done and oftentimes, and certainly my first impressions of the Faculty Senate when I first sat on it many years ago, was that it’s a group of people who get together and gripe about things that have just happened and they can’t change. We are kind of in that situation. Part of the point of gripping about it however, is to try to ensure that it doesn’t happen again and considering when I first took a seat out there, there were a lot of these grip sessions, they have gone way done in the past several years so I think people really would prefer to avoid the messiness that arises when I’s are not dotted and t’s are not crossed and the spirit of the shared governance is violated. So I think even though we may not be able to stop the AAC, even though we’re not even convinced, a lot of us think it’s a good idea – we don’t want to stop it, we do want to let people know that there are channels that really need to be gone through in order to honor the shared governance approach that we have here at Northern. Everybody I’ve ever talked to, at least publicly, says how great and wonderful a thing that is. Well, if it’s great and wonderful in public then you want to act on it in that fashion and really, one of our main goals here is to help the administration remember how great and wonderful shared governance really is. I think that’s the main goal we have with this issue. I think bringing it to the Council to have them affirm that issue would be very useful. Yes.

**J. Pierce:** One way of rewording this would be to say the Faculty Senate of Northern Illinois University and then invite the University Council to add “and the University Council”.

**P. Stoddard:** That seems reasonable. So, Kendall, as the mover of this, would you accept that as a friendly ---

**K. Thu:** Yes.

**P. Stoddard:** And Larry you agree?

**L. ???:** I second it, yes.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other discussions on bringing this to the Council? All right, seeing none, all in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, thank you very much.

The motion to bring the resolution to University Council passed as amended.

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

A. GA for Faculty Advisory Committee representative.
**P. Stoddard:** Under New Business is a suggestion that’s come up – oh, I guess before we even do that, we’re going to lump IX-A and X-A together because they both deal with the Faculty Advisory Committee representative who is Sharon Holmes. I don’t know if we’ve officially introduced here. Sharon, why don’t you stand up, wave or say hi to everybody. Sharon has graciously agreed to be our new FAC rep. She did go to the last FAC meeting and will be preparing a report for us soon. One thing that came up in the search for an FAC representative is the fact that this does take a certain amount of time. It requires you to be off campus on a regular basis, you know once a month, but all day on Friday and probably a good chunk of the later part of Thursday and this can eat into somebody’s schedule and it was suggested that some sort of assistance, and this assistance took the form of a graduate assistant, might be a nice thing to provide the FAC representative to make their work that much easier, or at least offset the additional work of serving on the committee. So, I thought I would bring that to this body and see if people thought that was a good idea; if they thought it was a bad idea; if they thought there were better ideas. If you think there are worse ideas, I don’t know what the point in suggesting them would be. So, I’ll open the floor to comments.

**P. Henry:** I think it’s an excellent idea.

**P. Stoddard:** And Pat is speaking as our past representative of course.

**J. Stephen:** And having been her substitute for six months, I agree with it. You trade away a lot of favors for Fridays.

**C. Smith:** What about programs that don’t have graduate programs, where there are no graduate students. There are probably better inducements for this sort of responsibility. Untenured faculty members who might be serving in the role would probably benefit from having course releases in exchange for their time.

**J. Stephen:** It’s not that much work.

**P. Stoddard:** Jody?

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I was going to say something similar, but not a course release, maybe it could be broader – more broad wording about release from designated activities or graduate assistant help that would again cover a variety of different department needs across the campus because right now, I’m teaching only graduate level courses and so I can’t have the graduate students that are in those courses teach the courses if I were to go to this. So, more broadly worded assistance might help. I don’t know exactly what that would be, however, so ---

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, I’m getting a --- Larry?

**Larry ???:** Just a clarification, would this assistant have to teach for you or could it be assistance in another form? GA to me doesn’t sound like a GTA and I would think you could have a graduate assistant by having a student from another program do this or maybe somebody would get some experience and ??? the job a little.
**P. Stoddard:** There are at-large assistants. Some of the committees, I know the Gen Ed Committee in the past has had a graduate assistant working for you, obviously that’s not tied to any specific program and so forth, so there are some assistants out there who might be able to help the FAC rep in a non-teaching fashion so, I mean, if your concern is that you have to miss Friday class and you need someone to teach it for you, then this wouldn’t work. If your concern is that you have a lot of other things that need to be done, this might work and that would also apply to programs that don’t have graduate assistants. Richard?

**Richard ???:** Well, of course the question would be who’s going to pay for that because the Faculty Senate doesn’t have a budget for this even though we’ve got cookies. Another suggestion might be, being a colleague of Sharon’s, I think she’ll understand this too, is there are ways of covering classes without having human resources. You can use Blackboard. You can use on-line instruction to cover those times when you may be absent too so there may be other things that we need to explore in order to provide assistance if a class assignment is the crutch of the issue.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, I’m getting a feel that there’s a fair amount that needs to be looked in here in terms of how best to implement this, where to get resources. My gut reaction is the Provost Office. My second gut reaction is that’s not going to happen, but it’s something I think we probably need to formulate a nice proposal. If we can come up with a well-formed proposal, vote on it as a Senate and then vote it back to the Provost Office, we might get some action, we might get some satisfaction. Pat?

**P. Henry:** I think something along the lines of resources as appropriate, whether it’s release time or GA assistant or something else and I absolutely think that the Provost’s Office should supply it and that’s part of the commitment to shared governance.

**P. Stoddard:** I agree so what I’m thinking right now – go ahead Jody.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** Perhaps we should ask for that before we send this resolution.

**P. Stoddard:** Well, that’s an interesting thought. Or maybe if they come through with that, do we then continue to send the resolution or do we just, okay – we’ve been bought off. So, what I’m thinking would be the best course of action would be to refer this to a committee to take a look at it. I’m not sure off the top of my head which one is best. So I’ll offer it up to the various committees out there. Are any of you interested in looking into this? Bill?

**B. Baker:** With due respect Paul, if you put this thing into a committee, it defers things, it delays it. Could we ask – there seems to be a consensus of agreement here – could we not have a motion on this matter? I’m not so sure that a committee – what more could a committee do? There seems to be a consensus here.

**P. Stoddard:** I think there is a consensus that something should be provided. The form of what that is, be it a TA, be it some other type of resource – a GA, I’m sorry – some other type of resource is still not resolved. I’ve heard several different suggestions and I think rather than
make a vague motion which allows the Provost to say yeah, that’s a good idea and give me something specific and I’ll act on it, I’d rather go to the Provost with something very specific. And I might even, in the odd interview coming up during this year, be able to suggest it to a new Provost that I’d like to see their commitment to shared governance as might be demonstrated by providing ---

**B. Baker:** But what about Sharon in the meantime?

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, that’s an interesting – Sharon, are you having any problems being accommodated for these meetings in your department for this semester.

**S. Holmes:** All right, I’ve just attended the first meeting on October 18 but it appears that there will be a lot of travel time associated with this. I teach on Thursday night. Now, I know that Jody may be substituting for me for this one coming up, but I am really looking at my schedule and to be gone all of the good part of Thursday and all of Friday ---

**J. Stephen:** There’s several downstate trips.

**S. Holmes:** That’s correct.

**J. Stephen:** You’ll miss a good meal if you don’t go Thursday night.

**S. Holmes:** Well, you know, I didn’t that I was going to be required to go this past Thursday, you know, on October 17, but they were very adamant that you need to be there. That’s a crucial part of the discussion and so I guess they were planning for what they were going to be talking with the Board about so ---

**J. Stephen:** Usually two to three hours of eating and discussing.

**S. Holmes:** Yeah, I think we were there about four hours that night and I got there just in the nick of time and so we really need to look at this. If not for myself, I think Pat probably made the suggestion when she was the FAC. It’s a need, whether it’s a GA or a TA, I think that it could be a person who could probably fluctuate between two of those things. I don’t really know what all of the need will be. Pat probably has a better idea of that right now than me, but from seeing just what occurred, I know that there will be a need.

???: Well, I don’t see that we can have anything specific but I think the spirit is to encourage the FAC representative as much as possible until we have a policy in place.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, something. Kendall?

**K. Thu:** Is it not the case that you would actually need a grad assistant, not only to take over some of your responsibilities but to do some of the background work in preparation for the FAC, so some of the other options in addition to GA wouldn’t substitute for it, it could be an addition perhaps so at the core here, what we need is a graduate assistant to help offset current work as
well as do some of the background leg work in preparation for the meetings and so I’d be willing to – is that not ---

P. Henry: I think it would be hard for a student or GA to do too much in terms of the background work. I’m not sure but it seems more likely it’s just covering the work that the faculty member would be doing at NIU would be the most useful thing.

K. Thu: In any case, a graduate assistant would be sort of the core of what you need.

P. Stoddard: Maybe it would be helpful if we had a list of specific responsibilities you would like to see the graduate student undertake. I mean, I really think the more specific we can make a proposal, the better chance we have of having some favorable action on it. If we just keep it vague and well, it would be nice to have this, you know, I can hear well, it would be kind of nice to have a lot of things. If we can specifically say we need this because a, b and c, we need the person to do one, two and three, I think that would be very useful. John?

J. Wolfskill: With respect, I believe the preceding discussion has been trying to do some lucky committee’s work and since no one else has jumped at this, I would like to venture to nominate a committee to take on this item. I move that this matter be referred to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.


P. Stoddard: Did you hear all the chairs of the other committees second that?

J. Wolfskill: One of my reasons for picking that committee is I know that Buck has personal experience with the matter and frankly, it doesn’t appear to be a real easy call among any of them.

P. Stoddard: Any discussion? Okay, why don’t we go ahead and do that and then charge them with coming back to us by next meeting with some sort of report on this issue so we want this handled in a timely fashion.

J. Stephen: I’ll have an announcement to make shortly after the vote here.

P. Stoddard: To the members of the committee presumably. Any more discussion? All those in favor of referring the issue of a GA for the Faculty Advisory Committee representative to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities signify by saying aye. Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, thank you Buck. We appreciate it in advance.

J. Stephen: I’d like to see the people on Faculty Rights and Responsibility after adjournment please.

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: We’ve got 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 – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Buck?

J. Stephen: How are the rest of you hearing about the present NCATE paperwork? Are any of the rest of you hearing about massive increases in the amount of paperwork for intake this year? North Central Accreditation? Okay. I’ve heard comments from people in two different schools about how it just seems to be worse than ever this year and I just wanted to see if anybody else had had that.

Richard ???: Well, the College of Education certainly feels the crunch.

J. Stephen: Does it seem worse than previous years though?

Richard ???: Oh, it’s tremendous additional – it’s a whole change of mindset of how we deal with teaching and I heard one faculty member characterize it that we’re all becoming data collectors now.

J. Stephen: My understanding is that essential guidelines for the evaluation has not changed but the amount of paperwork you’re doing has gone up experientially.

Richard ???: Well, we’re having to get used to the idea of using electronic media ??? in the College of Ed for example to – and then assigning specific activities to all of our courses so that students – and it’s becoming ??? so that all courses collect activities and develop certain ??? that will be able to allow us to aggregate data over a period of the next three years, before the next visit. So it’s quite a massive undertaking.

J. Stephen: So most of it has to do with the initiation of a longitudinal assessment process?

Richard ???: Yes, yes.
Michael: You mentioned two different organizations. You mentioned NCATE and then you mentioned North Central. North Central is not NCATE. So which one was it that you were ---

J. Stephen: NCATE

Michael: I think it’s fair to say that certainly NCATE is in the midst of a complete paradigm shift and they’re not only looking for massive amounts of data but they’re looking for different kinds of data than they’ve been looking for in the past and so it’s really the learning curve as far as, you know, knowing what kind of data they’re looking for and then figuring out how to collect it is certainly occupying a lot of the time of people who are involved in teacher education.

P. Stoddard: Any other comments, questions from the floor? If not, I’ll take a motion to adjourn.

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
J. Relay for Life (Pages 7-8)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: Anybody seconding that? Okay, please signify your agreement with the motion by getting up and leaving.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.