FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2006
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Arriola, Aurand, Baker, Burch, Butler, Roller, Elish-Piper, Greene, Hamlet, Hertz, Hubbard, Hudson, Johnson, Kolb, MacFarlane, Marchewka, Markle, Miller, Mogren Mohabat, Morris, Ridnour, Sido, Smith, S. Song, X. Song, Tollerud, Valle, Wade, Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Okay, are you in order? Okay, very good.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Our second order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion to approve the agenda? Thank you. Second, anybody? Thank you. Any comments on the agenda? I don’t think I have any. Next – oh, sorry. That’s why we have a parliamentarian, to tell me to vote. All in favor or approving the agenda say aye. Opposed? Okay, we have an agenda.

The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 6, 2006 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 3-7)

P. Stoddard: Next up is approval of the minutes. Anybody care to move approval of the minutes? Thank you and we have seconds or two. Very good. Any corrections, additions, modifications, deletions, alterations, amendments, emendments or other things that would require a red pen? All right, seeing no indication of any, all in favor of approving the minutes, please say aye. Opposed? Okay very good.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
P. Stoddard: Under President’s Announcements, I don’t really have any this time so we’re just going to zip by.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Nothing for Faculty Senate Consideration.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Salary Increments – refer to Economic Status of the Profession

P. Stoddard: The other one might take a little bit of explanation. That’s the salary increments. Normally what happens is the legislature – normally – passes a budget. They normally do this at the end of our academic year which is the end of their legislative year. They frequently go past that deadline which means they don’t pass a budget until the faculty have left campus. The budget, once it’s passed – that includes, of course, any funding from the state for NIU – then Vice-Provost Schwantes and Vice-President Cunningham get together and work out salary increments and so forth. Then they solicit the input from the faculty in the case of the faculty increments and the other councils in case of the other increments. Obviously, when nobodies here it’s tough to get that input. This happened last year. They asked for our input; the Executive Committee met and made a recommendation which was, you know, basically the views of six people or so and by the time we were able to get that to the Vice-Provost and the Vice-President, the decisions had pretty much been made on the nature of the increment and I was under the distinct impression that had we been able to get input to them sooner, we would have actually been able to shape that increment. So what I would like the Senate to do is be a bit more pro-active and actually say look, if we’ve got a 3% increment that we’re going to get next year, we’d like to see it divvied up as follows – across the board, or all merit, or half merit, half across the board or whatever. If it’s 5% or 8% or 100%, you know, we’d like to see it done the following way so that going into that meeting in June or whatever, we already know what it is we want to say. This would actually get forwarded to the UCPC, University Council Personnel Committee, which is the official faculty voice in the increment process but I think as of late, they haven’t been making much noise about this and so people in the decision making capacities have not had much guidance from the faculty. So by getting our voice in there and I think it’s appropriate for the Senate to have a voice in this, this will serve to let the UCPC know what we’re thinking and will also serve as a wake-up call that they need to be considering this and forwarding something officially to – well, getting their voice into the process. So that all said, rather than discuss that in a full Senate committee, a good suggestion was made that we refer to the Economic Status of the Profession Committee. They would make a recommendation and then the full Senate would have a chance to discuss their recommendation. So with that, that’s what Item A is all about. So can I have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda? Okay, any discussion on the Consent Agenda? All right, all in favor of consenting say aye; all dissenting so no. Okay, very good.

B. Academic Affairs Committee will be a reporting committee for NIU Connect.
P. Stoddard: Under Consent Agenda, we have a couple of things. One is, I think Professor Kempton will address us a little bit – a very little bit – in a minute, but essentially the Academic Affairs Committee will be the reporting committee for the Senate with the NIU Connect project. Again, that’s the student software implementation project so Vice-Provost Seaver has requested that we have a group that will hear what they’re up to and will keep us apprised of what they are doing if anything should come up that we think is questionable they’re the group to let us know that and then to reflect that back to the NIU Connect people.

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Daniel Kempton, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Next up are Reports from Standing Committees. First, I believe, Professor Kempton has something he would like to say briefly. I would like to ask you to get a microphone before you do so.

D. Kempton: This is not so much a report as just an update on what we will be working on and a solicitation for input if there is anyone who would like to provide some. We are working on two issues in the Academic Affairs Committee, both technological issues. One carried over from last year when Kendall was the chair of the committee. They were dealing with the issue of personal response systems which my department doesn’t use but last year’s committee put considerable work into evaluating the three or four different systems already being used at the university. There was a feeling on the part of the President’s Office as well as on the part of ITS that it might be advisable or helpful to students both less expensive and easier for ITS if we had sort of a university system that was endorsed. This would not be saying to faculty you cannot use one of the other systems but rather to say this is the one we’re going to use at NIU that ITS will support. If you want to use something else, you’d probably be on your own. The problem for students is they have to learn different personal response systems; these are little clickers I guess that students use in an interactive fashion. Some students have needed to purchase multiple ones so it also gets pretty pricey and carry two or three of them around with them. So this issue came up last year and we hope to finish that. If someone has information that they would like to add to that discussion, we will be revisiting it hopefully in the next month.

The second issue is, as our President said – President of the Senate – said, Gip Seaver, the Vice-Provost is looking for a faculty committee to be his connection for the Web Connect or NIU Connect updates and so we’re going to be dealing with that issue. If possible, I just e-mailed most of my committee members this morning looking for a meeting for October 18 at 1:30, that’s two weeks from Wednesday.

So, unless anyone has any questions, that’s it.

P. Stoddard: Any questions? Okay, thank you very much.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair – no report
P. Stoddard: Next is Economic Status of the Profession. Cason – is he here? Has nothing, okay? Not yet, but soon.

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

P. Stoddard: Resource, Space, and Budget, C.T.?

C. T. Lin: No report.

P. Stoddard: No report. Okay.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Janet Holt, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Jan?

J. Holt: We have met regarding the update – or to give you an update – we have met regarding the issue of academic administrators and reclassification of some of those positions as SPS business code position and we were able to meet with Frederick Schwantes, Steve Cunningham and Deb Haliczer and we have not yet processed all this information. They did give us a lot of information. They gave us a lot of material that we need to go through and we are still working on the issue but there is a lot and we’ll probably be meeting on this for a little bit.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any questions for Jan on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities on the reclassification issue?

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report

N. Castle: No report.

P. Stoddard: Moving right along then, Rules and Governance? Okay, very good.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Earl Hansen, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: I believe we have no Elections or Legislative Oversight business today.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: No Unfinished Business. That brings us to New Business.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Task Force on Strategic Planning – see memo Raymond Alden (Pages 8-10)

P. Stoddard: You have as part of your packet on pages 8-10 a memo from Provost Alden regarding the Strategic Planning Task Force. He is essentially asking us to give him three nominations, at least one of whom will serve on the task force. He lists on page, our page 9,
what he considers to be ideal characteristics for people on this task force. I hope you’ve had a chance to look at this. He’s got a very general make-up of what that task force will look like on page 10. The Provost’s main task this year and one of the main criteria in how he was hired, is to develop a strategic plan for the university. From my own observations, the university is trying to go in two or three different directions at the moment. It’s trying to be the public university in Northern Illinois to serve the students of Northern Illinois. It’s also trying to be a top flight research institution; a big ten caliber school and so forth and these missions are sometimes at odds when you don’t have infinite resources you’ve obvious got to prioritize. This strategic plan I think is really going to set the course of the university for the foreseeable future. It’s going to determine how limited resources are allocated. It’s going to be determining how we present ourselves. It really is going to define, I think, the university. This mission I think you would all agree, is going to be very important and I think it’s crucial that we get good people, willing people, to serve on this task force. So, you know, there’ll be demands on your time absolutely so if this is something you’re interested in but not really gung-ho about, you know, you want to think about that but I would like to be able to forward three names to the Provost from this body. You don’t have to necessarily be members of the Faculty Senate but we do need to nominate three or he would like us to nominate three. I’ve had one person express interest to me already. I don’t know if that person feels comfortable identifying themselves but – so, yes – Jan?

**J. Holt:** How long is the term?

**P. Stoddard:** That’s a good question. No, no, no. The plan is for five to ten years, not the development of it. The goal is to have a first draft of the plan, I mean, that’s a major portion of the work, done by May so we’re looking at a one year term basically. If it has to go over, I don’t think the Provost anticipates that anybody is going to commit to more than one year and if we had to we could always replace a person. Okay.

**K. Thu:** Three nominees doesn’t necessarily mean we’re going to get three representatives right?

**P. Stoddard:** Right, it says that at least one person of those three will be selected. Could be two, could be three, could be one. Jan?

**J. Holt:** I’ll self-nominate.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, very good. Anybody else? Jim?

**J. Giles:** Could I ask if Diane Swanson would be interested in being nominated?

**D. Swanson:** I appreciate your confidence in me. Well, I was just thinking about oh, my goodness, I’m trying to grade papers, prepare for class and be here and really listen at the same time. I don’t know if I can add another thing. I mean, if I do that, I’ll have to come off of something. You know, I’m interested in the project obviously, but I probably can’t stay on this body for example if I do that. ??? Oh, I’m sorry. I just was being appalled but thankful for Jim’s confidence in me. I don’t have time to do this unless I resign from something so I would
need to think about that. I may not be able to stay on the Faculty Senate if I do that for example – I’m also on my college curriculum committee and so, I don’t know, I’d have to think about it.

P. Stoddard: Okay.

D. Swanson: I’m interested in the project; I think it is very important. How soon do we have to decide these things?

P. Stoddard: Well, as you can imagine, this is a large task and they want to get it done soonish so the sooner we can get people named I know the happier they’ll be. Let’s hold you there for a moment and see what else happens. Yes?

J. Kowalski: This is Jeff Kowalski and I wonder if my colleague, William Tolhurst, would be willing to serve in this capacity?

W. Tolhurst: No!

P. Stoddard: Could you get a mike for that Bill?

J. Kowalski: That was a friendly question.

???: Has anybody here actually been through this type of process before and could talk a little bit about what commitment is involved?

P. Stoddard: I think basically the task force is not going to be the – I mean, they’re going to assemble a lot of information. They’re not going to sit down and out of whole clothe develop this plan. They’re going to be soliciting input from lots of different constituencies, from different departments, from new faculty, from established faculty, from staff, from students, perhaps outside of campus. They’re going to be responsible for collecting the data, assembling it and then coming up with something and probably trying to keep people noses to the grindstone on this so if they ask a department where do you see yourself in ten years, they’ll also be the people with the whips. Okay, we have one person who has self-nominated. Anybody else? We have one person who needs a little time to think which is a very reasonable request. I know, but I want her to – yeah? All those in favor of Brigid say aye. Doesn’t pay to show up late, does it? This is for the Strategic Planning Task Force. Can we get that on mike please? For the record, Brigid said she would be willing to serve. Okay, all right we have several names. Yes?

D. Swanson: I can talk to a few people and get back to you by tomorrow afternoon or Friday morning.

P. Stoddard: Okay, that would be fine. If the sense of the Senate is that they would like me to just forward names I can do that rather than have the Senate vote on three names or whatever. Would that be all right with the Senate? Okay, so I will go ahead – I think I have enough names to work with that I can forward those on to the Provost and satisfy – I think we’ve got good names and I think we’ll be in good shape. Any other comments on this? Very good.
X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Jody Newman-Ryan – no report

P. Stoddard: No report from the FAC. As far as I know, they haven’t met yet.


P. Stoddard: Board of Trustees, the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee? I believe we have a report.

J. Stephen: The Personnel Committee, sub-committee of the Board of Trustees, met on September 7. There was one action item. They endorsed a new Master of Science Program in FC&S. There are two emphases in there: apparel studies and family and consumer sciences education. This was later approved by the full Board on September 21. Any information items, the highlights are the Emeritus Faculty were recognized quite kindly by Provost Alden as were the Professional Excellence Awards for Teaching and Staff. The recipients of those awards were invited to a very nice luncheon with the Board of Trustees.

It’s important to take a look at Fiscal Year 2005/2006 External Funding for Research, Public Service, and Instructional Projects report. The detailed report was presented by Vice-President Bose. Highlights include the fact that although President Peters has a goal for $100 million dollars a year grant production, we’re still in the $50-$60 million dollar a year range. We dropped a little bit this year because of the way bookkeeping is done essentially so we’re going to see some pressure for grant production. Some highlights there are the national funding emphasis on Systems Biology, Cybersecurity, Nanomedicine, and the STEM grants. STEM grants are Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics and also include funding for interdisciplinary connections. It’s a good thing to look at if you’re looking at beefing up some portion of your program. Then there’s Energy and Environment that they’re looking at.

Then we got a report on our graduate student population and the fact that we have the largest minority population of doctoral students by percentage and that should be in Illinois not US. That’s a typo on my part.

I’d like to note that we got a positive thank you from President Peters saying that the faculty are responsible for our recent Carnegie upgrade to Research-High Activity ranking (which is actually the middle ranking). So our rating is going up but don’t be surprised if you get e-mails from your chairs and deans saying how about some grants guys.

That’s it. Any questions?

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you Buck.

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 Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report

**P. Stoddard:** Next up is a report on the full Board. This actually incorporates the recommendations that the committee on Finance, Facilities, and Operations made so rather than give you two reports that say the same thing, I just summarized it with one. That’s one of the walk-in items you have in front of you. A couple of things, there has been no capital budget passed by the state the last couple of years, several years, therefore, our list of capital requests – capital project requests – has remained essentially unchanged during that time. The priority list is exactly the same as it’s been for the last four or five years. The only thing that changes is the cost to complete these projects keeps going up with inflation. Smaller projects – we do see occasionally smaller things happening and these are usually addressed through revenue bonds, not from money directly from the state. Speaking of money directly from the state, the internal budget for Fall 2007 was approved and a little of mention was made of the state’s contribution continuing to drop. We now get just over 27% of our operating expenses from the state’s general revenue. Everything else is from tuition, bonds, gifts, grants and so forth. I should mention again, with the capital budget request, the full Board did vote to send along with the request – I’m not sure how nasty – but a nastily worded letter saying, you know, it’s been five years, we need to get things funded. We’re getting into the situation where safety is being put at risk and the ability of the university to carry out its mission is being detrimentally affected and so the Board is actually getting very concerned about this. Otherwise, the new housing for dependent students, and they don’t like the word new – it’s a renovation – we’re tearing down the old housing and building new housing – but it’s not providing substantially more apartments which would get the surrounding businesses a little upset – the housing businesses although some mention was made that we should do what’s best for our students regardless of how that might negatively impact local landlords. As Buck said, the new M.S. in Family Consumer Science was approved. We reached collective bargaining agreements with three unions and the main fundraising activity is going into endowments and I know the President last year expressed a lot of interest in this and really wants to devote his energy towards boosting our endowments in the form of endowed chairs and endowed scholarships and so forth. The feeling is that endowments are the hedge against increasingly scant state funding and we don’t want to have to raise tuition to continually make up for that.

Finally, we got a presentation from Dr. Leroy Mitchell, Director of the CHANCE Program. Again, highlighting some very nice success stories and we had one person, one graduate of the program, come in and explain how just the change of scenery, from just moving from inner-Chicago out to DeKalb and seeing a totally different environment – one she wasn’t really aware existed – seeing the difference in expectations, seeing her roommates study not even the night before the exam, but several nights before the exam, and just how her roommate was so upset over getting a B when this particular student would have been thrilled with a C. She just realized that there was more to the academic experience than she was aware of and so she found just that in and of itself made a huge impact on her life and she actually turned out to be one of the success stories of the CHANCE Program so that was a rather uplifting presentation.
With that, I’ll take any questions you might have about what the Board is up to. Yes?

**D. Swanson:** Well, just one comment about the comment that the Foundation is concerned that it’s going to be harder to boost the endowment because there’s no buildings to name but hey, endowed professorships get named so I hope they aren’t forgetting that.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, no they are not but I think still, you know, in the so-and-so building versus the so-and-so chair ---

**D. Swanson:** It’s less money though too.

**P. Stoddard:** This is true; this is very true but yes, they are aware of that. It’s a good point and I thought of that as I was writing it up but --- any other questions or comments about the Board?

### XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, are there any comments or questions from the floor in general? Professor Stephen.

**J. Stephen:** We should probably note that the back of your report has the alternate selection guidelines on it.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, I was going to mention that but thank you for pointing it out. Actually, Donna told me to mention it so I was going to mention it. Okay. Yes, the alternate list is on the back here so if you can’t make a UC meeting if you’re a UC member, these are the folks to contact. If you’re a Senate member and not a UC member and suddenly somebody says you want to go to the UC for me, look at this list and say yes you can, or no you can’t – also look at your schedule I guess, but – look at the list first. Okay, so she would be a bad person to ask. Thank you. We’ll name a replacement for her in a manner keeping with the Bylaws. Also, are there any other comments from the floor? Okay, yes, Bill?

**???: ???

**P. Stoddard:** If it’s one person – Donna says yeah, one was a queen-side bishop and the other was the king-side bishop and both were captured by the opposing side so we will get them off the list. Thank you. Any other comments? All right, next time Provost Alden will be here so this will be basically his introduction to the faculty. We haven’t really established a format; I don’t know if he just wants to talk or if he wants to answer questions. If you have questions, especially if they’re questions you think he might have to do a little research on, keeping in mind he’s new to the university, feel free to forward those to our office and we’ll get those to him so he can prepare for them. If you want to catch him by surprise on something, well then don’t forward that to us but be sure you’re here next time.

### XII. INFORMATION ITEMS
A. Academic Planning Council minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/APC.html  
B. Athletic Board minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/Athletic.html  
C. Campus Security and Environmental Quality minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/CSEQ.html  
D. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/CITC.html  
E. Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/CUC.html  
F. Graduate Council minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/GC.html  
G. University Assessment Panel minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/UAP.html  
H. University Benefits Committee minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/Benefits.html  
I. Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes  
http://www3.niu.edu/u_council/UCC.html  
J. Alternate List 2006-2007  

VIII. ADJOURNMENT  

P. Stoddard: With that, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn.  

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 P.M.