FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2006
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Order, order. Okay, the Senate is in order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda please? Any additions or comments on it? Can I get a second on that motion? Thank you. All in favor of adopting the agenda please say aye. Opposed? We have an agenda.

The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 3-5)

P. Stoddard: I need a motion to approve the minutes. Thank you, thank you. Any additions or corrections to the minutes? Sensing none, all in favor of approving the minutes please say aye. Opposed? Okay, we’ve got minutes.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Provost Raymond Alden, III will be attending the meeting.

P. Stoddard: Okay, today under President’s Announcements we’re fortunate to have with us our new Provost, Ray Alden, who has a couple of comments I think and then will be happy to answer any questions we might have for him. So I’ll just turn it over to Provost Alden.
Provost Alden: Thank you. Is there something to turn on? I just had a few things I wanted to say. When I first came here it was very clear there was a strong expectation to start university level strategic planning and as you are probably all aware, we’ve spent much of the last month or so since Dr. Peters announced the Strategic Planning Initiative forming this task force, we hopefully will be meeting next week. We are bringing outside facilitators in because we have a very aggressive timeline and I believe that that will help reduce the work load on the committee members to have a group facilitating and gathering information and interviewing all the various individuals and coming up with consensus documents and so forth. Anyway, the whole issue of strategic planning is to provide us kind of a road map for the next five to ten years and provide a kind of a professional branding or image of what we want the various constituencies both within the university and outside the university to know about what we value and where we’re going and so forth and hopefully, down the line, it will help with recruiting of both students and faculty. Hopefully it will help with the capital campaign that will be announced. Hopefully it will also help with our future budgeting assuming we get new resources down the line so I look forward to that effort. We have I think about forty-three people on the taskforce which is very representative and we will be putting the products on the web allowing people to, you know, add their comments to it and obviously be able to take input in real time that way but also to run the draft document through various groups such as this council and allow people to give their input so it is very much of a consensus building exercise.

Also, with the capital campaign which was more of a surprise to me because I didn’t realize they were on quite the aggressive track they are in terms of trying to get through the entire exploratory and silent phase of the campaign this year. It was a good thing that I found it was going to be devoted to academic excellence it’s just now we need to decide what that means so I have been asking all the various groups I talk to that one of the things they’re doing now is testing the concept of various components of academic excellence with potential donors but I think before we go public with this, I think each college is going to have to really define for themselves what would the vision be for enhancing academic excellence in terms of obviously things such as endowed chairs or endowed scholarships. Those are the kinds of things that immediately come to mind but there may be other things as well. It may be facilities; it may be infrastructure of various sorts; it may be more international travel or international programs so I think I would like everybody to be thinking about what would those case statements look like in your individual units and your departments and your colleges so that if you do have alums or you do have potential donors who are interested in a discipline, what is it you can share with them that would show – what would help enhance academic excellence and what would they expect to result if they were to give a gift of a given magnitude. So I think that’s an important exercise as well. It’s clearly tied to strategic planning and we would hope our roadmap and our campaign vision definitely support each other. I think since the topic is academic excellence, I don’t think we can go wrong with that but I do think we do need to have a lot of crosstalk to make sure our strategic planning goals and the action plans to achieve those take into account that this capital campaign could bring significant amounts of outside resources to the table.

In terms of some of the things going on at the state level, last week we had what they call “the big picture” meeting for budgets for next year with the Illinois Board of Higher Education. I will tell you that least the IBHE believes there will be some additional funds, new funds, next year which I gather is quite a relief since we’ve had so many years of either flat funding or rescissions
of some sort. I don’t think you can count on a lot; I think they’re banging around perhaps 3% increase, however, they are looking to a new model and that may be somewhat of concern in that they’re talking about half of that money coming in terms of general revenue to address issues that we all think are important such as deferred maintenance, salaries, affordable, the MAP Program, and that sort of thing. They also somewhat fixated on having state-wide data sharing initiatives; something like the unit record if you’ve heard the feds talk about the unit record where student records are shared across institutions across state lines and so forth. I think the Illinois Board of Higher Education would like to get this to a running start in the state and even though conceptually that might be a bad thing or a good thing, depending on your perspective and how you view individual privacy versus being able to assess your programs, it does potentially carry a fairly sizeable dollar sign associated with the hidden costs of trying to track all that record. Sort of envision the ??? system except for the other 95% or 98% of our students that are not the international students so that’s a bit of a concern. I don’t know where that’s going. The other thing that’s new is that they’re talking about taking half of the new funding, if the legislature appropriates it, and putting it into what they call performance contracts and these would be competitive RFP’s that each of the institutions compete for. They were talking about in three different areas; one on work course development, one particularly focused on critical needs areas – nursing, stem teachers and so forth, persistence primarily focused on degree completion, communication, the AAT between the community colleges and four-year institutions and what they call deficiency and I’m not exactly sure what they mean by that but I think it’s reduced time to degree, more efficient modes of offering courses, energy conservation. Anyway, that was what was presented to us before the meeting. We tried to moderate that and I will say that the IBHE is, in my opinion, looking for a mission in some ways because from what I gather in the last four or five years, a lot of the power that resided at that Board level has disappeared either because of individual boards at the institution or system levels or because of the way the Governor’s Office budgeted various things. There is another group and it comes from the Governor’s Office, the Budget Officer has been talking to the presidents of the institutions and they’re speaking about the same sorts of things except they’re more asking the presidents what kind of performance contracts should be created. We spent much of last week’s meeting trying to indicate that a lot of our priorities in the past, and we’ve had the same priorities on the books for the last four or five years, and since there were no new dollars those obviously funded and our top priority was more faculty and we tried to make the case that that hit in all three of the areas. Another area was diversifying the faculty, providing extra resources and infrastructure to make sure that as we recruit and retain faculty it’s a diverse community, web-based baccalaureate completion programs to make it more efficient was another category that has been on our list for apparently the last four or five years, pathways to academic success – the infrastructure to help students succeed and enhancing learning through technology – more smart classrooms and so forth – so we tried to show that those priorities we’ve had all along fit in all three of their categories and tried to make the argument that if they tried to make a RFP in each of those three categories, they’d lose a lot of the integration across the categories. The other disturbing thing about the performance contracts is that the concept was well, they give you the money for three to five years, see if you hit the benchmarks, if you didn’t, they may take it away from you so we made the argument that you can’t go hiring faculty and permanent staff to develop these kinds of initiatives and then expect the money to go away in three to five years. Whether they heard or not, I don’t know what the other campuses are telling them, but that’s at least what our story was. I think we made a pretty good case that we have done a tremendous
amount with less and less resources and that it’s not just faculty salaries which is extremely important, but it’s the number of faculty; it’s not just deferred maintenance but it’s new facilities, the capital budget that has not been passed in however many years it’s been. Whether they will have a big say in how the budget is allocated is yet to be seen. Like I say, there’s a parallel process coming directly out of the Governor’s financial officer so it seems like they’re going down the same track but they don’t seem to be talking to each other much.

At the national level, you may or may not be aware of the Spellings’ Commission findings and that’s a potential political issue. A lot will depend upon the outcome of the elections although the Department of Education can do a lot of changes just be changes in rule making which would never go to Congress. We’re watching that carefully if you’re not aware of the Commission Report. It is a fairly scary document. It is written as if it is an indictment of higher education. It focuses on trying to keep higher education affordable and accountable and it has a lot of recommendations for performance-based testing and testing for student engagement and all sorts of different other things. One hopes that it doesn’t come to pass because it could be like No Child Left Behind except at the higher education level and yet it is going to be tied to funding at the federal level so it is something we cannot ignore. Some of the higher education organizations such as NASULGC and AASCU are trying to head it off at the pass. There is some discussion amongst the constituent universities that maybe they’ve gone a bit overboard trying to comply too much. They’re developing voluntary testing systems. I’m not sure where any of this is going; I guess we’ll know a little bit more after next week and then the following week some of the national organizations meet and there may be more insight into what could happen from there. Higher Education Reauthorization Act, as John Peters said in Cabinet this week, has gone on longer than World War II and is probably just about as disagreeable in some quarters. Some of the drafts have been absolutely frightening as to trying to control higher education through the budget, through federal funding. Again, that seems to be kind of dead-on-arrival political simply because it is so controversial. Where it’s going we don’t know but one of these days they’re going to have to get around to reauthorizing the funding for higher education.

Finally, there’s a fairly minor thing but it could be significant that’s going on right now and it’s hard to tell how much political steam it has and that’s with the digital TV’s, the broadcast companies are starting to talk very seriously about tagging all broadcasts with a flag that would not allow you to capture or retransmit the information. This has significance for distance education. It has significance for people who use multi-media presentation. Let’s say you want to take a news story off the nightly news, you could not use it again because it would be blocked. There’s a gathering lobbying effort form the national organizations to try to get to the congressional representatives and try to make accommodations for public domain type of materials so we don’t have to work around not being able to use materials that are broadcast in public domain.

Anyway, those are some of the things going on at the state and national level and I don’t want to go on too long so I’ll just open it up for questions I guess.

K. Thu: Thank you for the update. What is the source of the desire for performance standards from the Board? Is that linked at all to the national effort?
Provost Alden: Yes, the Board – I’d better watch what I say – but, I think since the Board had a lot of its former responsibilities taken away either by local boards or by other political entities, I think they’re looking for a mission in some ways. I think they’ve watched the Spellings’ Commission. I think I sensed from the Academic Affairs Officer there at IBHE that they wanted to get a jump on the Spellings’ Commission so that Illinois didn’t look bad and the institutions were not left out of the loop and come in late. I think when the institutions started expressing their opinions about how to jump into an unfunded mandate that could be a difficult thing to accomplish and may not be extremely productive, I think they backed off somewhat but who knows where’s that going. The unit record is another thing that they really are pushing still and I think again that information is power – if they can centralize the information I think they have a mission but, again, that’s just my interpretation. I’m just a newbie on the block; I don’t know exactly what the political context is right there.

B. Lusk: I’m not familiar with capital campaigns and I wondered how accelerated ours is, how unusual this is?

Provost Alden: It’s quite accelerated in some ways in that typically a capital campaign has an exploratory phase, a silent phase where you gather most of the money, more than half of the money, and then you go public and that’s when all the colleges get involved and you bring in your alumni and so forth. Here, it’s accelerated in that the exploratory phase is nine months but they’ve done a lot of the fund raising in terms of the amount that Dr. Peters mentioned. In the last four or five years we’ve raised more than the previous hundred years of the institution’s history so that’s a good basis to start a capital campaign and so now it’s just trying to say okay, in the public phase what do we want our campaign vision to be and hopefully it will be based on academic excellence and what will those case statements coming out of the deans’ offices of the colleges and out of the various departments, what will they tend to look like? Is there some commonality? What are the differences if someone is interested in a gift at a certain level, do we just scratch our heads and say give it to us and we’ll figure out what to do or do we actually do an aggressive marketing of a vision? So that is what, the sorts of things, that are going to have to go on before the public phase really gets underway. Now the Foundation is doing, they have some outside experts doing some typical feasibility studies that they do. They identify some of the potential donors with the most potential for giving and asking them about some of these concepts. Would they give for a campaign that focuses in general on these kinds of topics, what level of giving and so forth? So that is very typical of the exploratory phase. Generally, at the same time, you have the various academic units sort of doing their own planning when we go out to our alums or we go out to our potential donors, what will be our package that will fit into this campaign vision? So that’s what I’m telling people that since we don’t have the luxury of a two-year process, let’s say, we have a one-year process, we need to be aggressive at that.

D. Swanson: I have a question about how these campaigns work. You’ve mentioned that various units developing their own visions – is this picking up? – okay, but I’m wondering is the idea that the capital campaign would be done by each individual unit, department, college, and that they would raise money that would go to them or is there also a general, you know, fund that the university as a whole is raising which will then be able to set priorities internally for that?
**Provost Alden:** The answer to that is yes to both sides. What typically happens is that you have the university level, the big picture level, issues such as trying to raise endowments for the university as a whole, maybe for scholarships, maybe for endowed chairs or professorships and something like the naming of a college or the naming of an existing building or laboratory or program or whatever. That kind of money is quite significant in that it doesn’t have to build the bricks and mortar. It can drop to the institutional endowment and quite frankly the endowment for an institution of this size is fairly small if you look at national statistics so that’s one thing that we would want to see built up because that means more faculty, more support for students and so forth but also there’s going to be expectations on the deans and their staff to be doing significant amounts of fundraising because like politics, a lot of fundraising is local because the alums tend to associate with a college or department or program more than they do with the institution as a whole. So, I would hope that as we get into the public phase, there would be a significant amount of coordination between the colleges, more development staff working with the deans to make sure that one dean’s not asking for a dime when somebody else is asking for a dollar from the same donor but also to help coordinate to make sure we’re not asking in one college for a small amount for let’s say a naming opportunity and another college is asking for an exorbitant amount. So there’s a lot of coordination involved. There’s also the issue of donors, particularly a more recent history with donors and this is a nation-wide phenomena, they tend to be more activists. They tend to want to tie strings to their gifts. They tend to want to have commitments from the universities to do it their way and so a lot of the coordination is to make sure that the strings don’t cost more than the gift is worth and I’ve actually been involved in some gifts that they were the gifts that keep on taking. They cost the university far more than the gift was really worth so the answer is yes, there will be opportunities from the department, college and university level but there must be a significant amount of coordination.

**D. Swanson:** Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other questions? Okay, if not, I’d like to thank you for stopping by and visiting with us.

**Provost Alden:** Anytime.

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, I have one announcement. The update on the Strategic Planning Committee, I guess Provost Alden probably told you as much as I possibly could. The first meeting of the taskforce will be next week. The other item is on page 6, the search committee for the Dean of the University Libraries. This is something the bylaws say the Faculty Senate has to pass off on. Given the time constraints and the fact that they needed to get their tasks going, the Executive Committee of the Senate approved this list last week and so this is really here as an information item to let you know that that’s what has happened and to let you see everybody who’s on that committee. In addition, an undergraduate student has been added. They have not gotten a name from the SA when we approved this but there is undergraduate representation now on this committee as well.

I think that’s all I have for announcements so unless there are any questions about anything we can move on. Oh, I’m sorry, go ahead Kendall.
K. Thu: Have any faculty bodies at the university deliberated or responded to these performance standard setting initiatives either at the state or federal level and if so – if not, can we not take that up as an issue here in the Senate and make our voices known?

P. Stoddard: I am not aware of any bodies that have but that certainly doesn’t mean there haven’t been. This is something – do we have a UCC rep here? Somebody from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council? Has that come up at all there? No. So yes, to answer your second question if that’s something the Senate would like to talk about, I think that would be appropriate.

K. Thu: I would like to know more about it and I would like to, you know, it seems to me fairly fundamental to what we’re about and so is it something that we can charge one of our committees with to provide a more detailed update and possibly with potential actionable responses?

P. Stoddard: We certainly can. Would you like to make a motion to that effect?

K. Thu: Do you have an idea as to which committee it might go to?

P. Stoddard: The chair of that committee just gave me a thumbs down.

K. Thu: They seem to have a lot on their plate already.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, they do. Go ahead Bill.

B. Tolhurst: Is that something that might be appropriate for the Executive Committee to look at?

P. Stoddard: Bill Tolhurst asked if this is something that the Executive Committee might want to take a look at and I think that we could do that to spare Academic Affairs anymore work at the moment. So if you’d like to move to charge the Executive Committee to get some more information on that and bring it back to the full Senate I think that would be appropriate.

K. Thu: Okay, so moved – to charge the Executive Committee with doing an information gathering exercise to illuminate these performance standard initiatives for the Senate.

P. Stoddard: Dan if I were you I’d second that fast.

D. Kempton: I’m on the Executive Committee too aren’t I?

P. Stoddard: Oh yes, you are.

D. Kempton: I second it anyway.

P. Stoddard: Any discussion? All in favor say aye. All opposed? Okay.
The motion passed.

B. Dean Search for University Libraries (Page 6)

C. Update on Strategic Planning Committee

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Daniel Kempton, Chair – report

**P. Stoddard:** That said, moving on to Reports from Standing Committees, the aforementioned Academic Affairs.

**D. Kempton:** Okay, I’ll try and make it brief. We are dealing with two issues that I raised last time so I’ll try not to repeat what I said before. I’ll take the easiest first. We are following up on the very good work done by last year’s committee on personal response systems. We have taken a number of steps. Again, the issue here is that last year’s committee recommended that a preference be given to ITS of which personal response system be supported by ITS so that students don’t have to buy multiple ones, incur that expense and have all the problems of trying to support multiple ones. Last year’s Senate I guess passed a resolution to that effect but they recommended one more year of study. We are working on that. We have asked the Student Association for greater input although we haven’t heard back yet on that. We have also – I sent out on my own initiative a request for update from the Blackboard user’s group which I didn’t know existed but does exist. It has been posted there and we’ve already gotten some response from faculty teaching. We will send out a more general letter to the university committee. We’re also contacting sellers looking for updates and any compatibility issues that we saw between since these tend to be packaged with textbooks; some departments use a particular publisher and want to use the personal response system from another publisher so we’ve been asking those sorts of questions. Our time line very quickly is from mid-to-late-January. We want to get feedback from faculty, students, etc. If you have any of that, we hope to meet again in mid-to-late-January and please give us that beforehand.

The second issue which is a little more imminent and a little more sticky I think is that we are one of the contact points for the NIU Connect team that is installing this new software. At our last meeting we had a briefing done by Brian Brim and Vice-Provost Earl Seaver. I think they did a nice job and are working hard to enact shared governance at least now that the system has been chosen for NIU Connect to get our response to issues. This is moving along very quickly so I need to update you and get any response today or in the next two weeks at the latest. If someone would want to give feedback on this, the three issues that are involved – they’ve been doing what they call a “fit-gap” study looking at what NIU Connect can do, what we presently do and what we can no longer do once we adopt NIU Connect. One of the problems which I think has largely been resolved is the calendar will become on-line, it will become automatic so
dates you can drop classes get a little bit fuzzy for any courses that are not on the regular university calendar but they think they can manually override that issue so that, they’re saying, is largely resolved.

The second issue that came up was the question of transfer credit for courses that were ??? out of or were standard test ??? at other universities. For example, if a student transfers from Western Illinois and they have a lower standard than the one we set for the AP test in English, do we then accept the transfer credit? Our current response has been yes and that seems to be the response they’re getting from most of these faculty groups so if we feel differently we have to say so relatively soon. Again, they just discovered that issue; we have to have a standard policy. Mostly we’ve been saying yes in the past to meet I think largely the pressure from the IBHE for transferability of courses and records.

The third issue and the one I want to raise is probably the most serious. It may not seem controversial but it really is and that is what to do about retake policy. We presently have a rather arcane and awkward system but one that has worked with us but we cannot use it with NIU Connect. What we currently do is if a student has gotten a D or an F in a course, they can retake it in the next thirteen months and they will receive the newer grade but they will receive credit for whichever course they passed. In other words, currently if you get a D followed by an F and you get the F the second time, you will get the D replaced by the F. If you take it after thirteen months, they both appear on your record – I can slow down if this gets a bit bizarre but it is – but the problem is they’re getting the grade for one course and credit for the other one so they don’t lose the credit. NIU Connect cannot do that. You either have to go with the retake or you have to go with the original grade so what that means is you’ve got a choice to make that’s a tough choice. If you say the student gets the higher of the two performances that has a downside of encouraging the retakes by D students and sometimes you get a lot of students in your classes who are D, take the first test get a D or an F and then decide to not show up and you’ve lost class space to a student who’s basically one of the poorer students and we all have classroom shortages. The problem is if you do the second or more recent of the two grades, that may mean a student may get a D and if they do what I just described and fail the second time, they suddenly not only get the lower grade but lose credit for a course they previously passed. We have asked our representatives to go back to their colleges and look for guidance on this before November 15 which is our next meeting. I can tell you that I’ve talked with folks in LA&S. There is a memo from Dean Minor, Associate Dean Minor, to APASC which is going to be the main point body for dealing with the NIU Connect team on this. LA&S strongly prefers that we go with the more recent grade and discourage the retakes. That seems to be what they think is the fairest system and the one that is adopted by more University of Illinois System universities. It’s an interesting little issue that has considerably more potential than it would first appear to change the number of seats available.

I can take any questions or if others on the committee have already received – I know we only met a couple of weeks ago. If other colleges wanted to weigh in, we could do that.

**P. Stoddard:** Hold on a second, we’ve got one behind you.
Yeah, the College of Ed, the curriculum committee, decided that they would support the more student friendly approach and they in favor of going with the higher grade, not the more recent one.

**D. Swanson:** Can I just – well, I’m on the College of Liberal Arts and Science Curriculum Committee and when we discussed this, it was brought up that in fact going with the second grade, the retake grade, can also be student friendly in the sense that it encourages less taking up of spots in courses so that, I mean, every time somebody retakes a class, there’s a student who wants to take it for the first time who isn’t able to use that spot so that, in fact, there’s some question as to whether which one is most student friendly and I guess we were, when we were looking at how many students do this and how large a caseload of this there is per semester, it’s a very significant using up of class space resources so in fact it may be more student friendly to go with the you get the second grade and then go on a case-by-case basis in your college to petition for getting the credit back at least. If you got a D the first time, got an F the second time, the dean’s office in the colleges can reinstate the credit manually. So I think there’s a way around that problem.

**D. Kempton:** If I can just add to that a little bit. It is generally the case that the students looking for the seat who are doing the retake get the seat instead because they have accrued by nature of where they are on the system more credit hours and get the seats first. You’re right, the manual override is important and it still exists.

**J. Hold:** Is there a written report on this because I’m not sure I’m catching all the nuances of this.

**D. Kempton:** I have a draft written report which I could provide you a copy of. I have five copies I brought with me but I have not finished the revision. I also have lots of documents from different curriculum committees depending on how much written information you want.

**J. Hold:** A one page report would be nice.

**D. Kempton:** That sort of does it.

**J. Hold:** Thank you.

**K. Thu:** You would need a kind of position from the Faculty Senate in order for it to be in the loop.

**D. Kempton:** We are next meeting on November 15 at 3:00pm with Mr. Brian Brim and Vice-Provost Seaver. They’re hoping to get as much feedback as they can at that meeting. I get the feeling they’re trying to – we asked them when their drop dead date was – they wouldn’t give us a firm response but they said that would be soon enough. I got the feeling much after that would not be soon enough.

**K. Thu:** So we would not have another Faculty Senate meeting before that.
**D. Kempton:** Not another Faculty Senate but if you want to APASC again and I forget what APASC stands for – Admission Policies and Academic Standards Committee – is the one that really makes the decision on this so if you want to give later input, I would give it directly to them but the Senate probably won’t have time to meet again and offer an opinion that would still matter.

**P. Stoddard:** Anybody else? Yeah, Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** Since time is of the essence, would it be possible to get the relevant information posted on the web so that people in the Faculty Senate could look at it without having to wait for the next Senate meeting and provide input as they saw fit?

**P. Stoddard:** I know that the NIU Connect is going through Blackboard and we all are now I guess part of that group. ITS had a heart attack when I asked them to make all the faculty members of a single group but apparently they managed to do that and I believe this information – I haven’t looked so I can’t tell you for sure – but that would be the first place to go to look.

**B. Tolhurst:** You just log in and you’ll see a new item on your list of stuff and you just click on it.

**P. Stoddard:** I haven’t tried that yet.

**D. Kempton:** That is allegedly the case and Vice-Provost Seaver has assured us that the documents he allegedly sent to us as a committee to get the ball rolling are there. The responses from some of the curricular committees that are filtering in are not there yet or at least not when I checked but I know Bill Minor would be happy to share the LA&S and who would we go to to get the education one?

???: Jean Pierce.

**D. Kempton:** Jean Pierce? Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** Lynne?

**L. Kamenitsa:** I’m also on the LA&S Curriculum Committee and just one other thing to add to what Diana has said, our current system where they can get credit from the dean but the grade that goes on the transcript is the second grade, has a little bit of a disincentive to keep people from doing this kind of casual retaking of a course so there is a disincentive built into the current system. That disappears if you give them the higher of the two grades so people can just sign up and just take it for whatever – we’re already talking about thousands of students doing this each semester. I don’t remember the number. Diana, was it 3,000 students in a semester or 3,000 courses?

**D. Swanson:** It was close to 3,000 seats.
L. Kamenitsa: So 3,000 seats already and that’s with the disincentive built in so those numbers will be ballooning if there’s no disincentive to retaking any course that you got a D in. That’s going to keep a lot of students out of our courses who need to be in there.

M. Morrison: I guess at the end of the day that we wouldn’t be having this discussion at all if we were not going to this new NIU Connect system because I don’t recall that there was any controversy about the old system before this NIU Connect system emerged with this problem of the old system wasn’t compatible with NIU Connect and as a result, I guess I’m very queasy with the idea that we are allowing technological capability or lack of technological capability to determine academic policy, educational policy and I think that that’s a very powerful reason not to change what we’re doing if there’s no sound academic reason not to.

P. Stoddard: Okay, first could I get you to identify yourself?

M. Morrison: Michael Morrison, Foreign Languages.

P. Stoddard: A lot of what is going on, I mean, yes, you’re right. Nobody is very keen on letting the technology drive the policy, however, that said this and I mean I’m very sympathetic to that viewpoint, this process has forced us to go back and look at all the policies we’ve got and there are many places where the policies are very inconsistent because they’ve developed just growing up here and there in different places and in different ways and so, you know, nobody says well gee, NIU Connect can’t handle this so let’s change our policy but people – and ultimately we do have the choice to maintain the policy – I mean, but there are paper workarounds for most of these issues. As you said, we can fill out an exception which is a lot of times what we do now anyway with paper. So, I mean, just because it was brought about by NIU Connect, I wouldn’t say is a reason not to do it nor would I say that it is a reason to force us to do it so I think a debate on the merits of the policy itself is always a very worthwhile thing regardless of what generated that debate. But that’s me. Kendall, you want to ---

K. Thu: I just want to ask a question. For those of you who maybe know the history of this, why was it done in the first place? What’s the purpose of it? Well, the existing policy of allowing students to take a course the second time, if they do worse then they still get credit. What’s the rationale for that?

P. Stoddard: Lynne?

L. Kamenitsa: Well, the idea is that they worked for the D and they should at least get credit for that work that they did, they just can’t improve that grade. So they’ve got a D on their transcript; they’d like to see if they can get a C. They don’t manage that, at least they still get credit for doing whatever work they had to do to get that D even though the grade that went into their GPA is the F.

K. Thu: It sounds like basketball and golf. I’m sympathetic with the position, it just seems somewhat arbitrary almost and I mean I wouldn’t want those students taking up the room of the other students who want to be in the class. I think that would be the bottom line for me.
P. Stoddard: Okay, here, then ???, then Jay.

T. Sims: Tom Sims, Graduate Council. Let’s keep in mind that usual reason for retaking a course is hopefully to do better the second time around and there’s you know very little reason to take a course for any other point. While I hope that any type of policy or incentive that would put the student on notice that doing worse is going to be a major hassle would probably be a good thing so I would certainly be in favor of policy that does, in addition to any other motivations which may occur, encourages the student to get down to work and do better than a D.

P. Stoddard: Dan? Dan and then Jay.

D. Kempton: I can address a couple of the questions that have arisen here but unfortunately not all of them. I’m still learning; this was a new issue to me about four weeks ago. We can use parts of the current system. We can reinstall on a case-by-case basis the ability to give credit. Again, there are three thousand and some cases a semester. This probably wouldn’t want to be done in every single case. In addition to that, there is a fix for it but that fix costs at least tens of thousand if not hundreds of thousands of dollars and each time the system is modified and a new version comes out for it, we would have to pay again for the fix because they would literally have to re-engineer it for us. So it is the software that’s driving it. I agree with that comment completely. It’s regrettable. Unfortunately, that decision was made long ago and we can no longer address that. This is a PeopleSoft system and it was chosen partially because it’s PeopleSoft and it has involved the same contract and the same folks so that’s a little too late to be addressed although I wish it would have. I would also point out, someone asked about the incentive structures at other universities, as far as we know, Eastern is the only Illinois university that awards the highest. I’m going to probably get in trouble for saying this but the stronger Illinois universities tend to give credit for the more recent and to discourage sort of risk taking behavior on the part of students.

P. Stoddard: Jay?

J. ???: Yeah, I was wondering about these 3,000 students per semester who retake a course. What percentage of those courses is completely full, that is all of the seats are taken and so someone who wants to take it for the first time is not able to get into that course because of re-takers? Is that a substantial percentage of those 3,000 or is it a small percentage of those 3,000 students?

M. Morrison: At a meeting of the Dean’s Advisory Committee in the College of Liberal Arts it was mentioned that I think a sizeable majority of those seats were in courses that serve as prerequisites for Chemistry, Mathematics, you know, entry level kind of – what is the word I’m looking for – general education courses that are used to satisfy prerequisites to move on to higher level courses in those disciplines. It wasn’t, you know, I’m picking something out of the high. It’s not History 437 or something like that.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Nancy and then in the back and then ---
N. Castle: I’m on the College Curriculum Committee for the Health and Human Sciences College and you could certainly talk to our Associate Dean, Mary Pritchard, because I’m sure she’s got details and I don’t but it seems to me that there is some tie-in to Pell grants and financial aide and so on. There is some logic somewhere to this policy that has to do with sort of retroactive credits or something so it’s not totally as ridiculous as we might think because we don’t have that information in this body.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, microphone please.

M. Valle: I’m Maribel Valle from Health and Human Sciences. The 3,000 number, was that just LA&S or was that university-wide?

P. Stoddard: University-wide was the answer. Okay, Dick and then Jeff.

D. Dowen: Thank you. I’m here representing Academic Planning Council although I’m from the College of Business and it seems to me that our discussion is conflating two different issues. One issue is the whole issue of our academic policies which should be, of course, not in any way shape, manner or form be driven by technology, but we have a whole host of academic committees, curriculum committees in each college, in each department that address these issues as well as APASS and the UCC to address all of these sorts of curricular issues and I think one of the services that has come out of this process is the fact that we now have identified a whole bunch of contradictions in our curricular process and I would point out in the College of Business, which is my college, we have run into a whole bunch of these things and what we’ve discovered is there are workarounds in all of this. We do not have to alter our policies but we do have to do the workarounds. As to the technology, I’m in a position where I work with the existing technology. The existing technology is horse and buggy. It really is. It is out of the dark ages of computing. To pull up anything is a whole series of arbitrary codes. Nothing is matched up and this system will be a vast improvement over that. Is it the perfect system? Well, probably not but on the other hand there probably is not a perfect system because there are not all that many student personnel systems out there. So while I think we want to be sure and I would agree, I think Jim Giles and I are the only people who were present at the first meeting of the Faculty Senate, I certainly want to be sure that we never have technology driving academic policy, I don’t think that that’s the case now although I think that our curricular committees have found some new work and I do think that the change in technology is an appropriate change because we’re dealing literally with a 1970’s product right at this moment and person from the Graduate School has told me it literally takes them weeks now to come up with some reports which they will be able to generate with a few keystrokes once NIU Connect is up. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Jeff and then Bill.

J. Kowolski: My question is more oriented towards getting a number of percentages. If we have approximately 3,000 students who currently opt to retake courses per semester, does anybody know how many of them actually do worse in the courses they retake since we would have to manually override that to reinstate the credit, how big a problem would that be? Does somebody know?
**L. Kamenitsa:** As far as I know, Sue Doederlein does not have that information. All we know is that are some disincentives built into the system so presumably people who, you know, who just want to see what they can do on the first exam are not retaking it now without – hopefully, the disincentive is working now because they know they’re going to get an F if they take it again. So, what that tells us, you know, about how many of them actually do better, that would all be anecdotal and Dean Doederlein has tried to get that information and I don’t think she’s been successful.

**P. Stoddard:** Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** Yeah, I’m concerned about the unfairness of people who have already had a whack at the course bumping people who need it and I was wondering whether or not it might be possible, if there are certain courses that generate more than their fair share of those who need to retake, if we could see to it that those courses are offered during the summer and require the re-takers to do it during the summer so those other students would have a change to get the first take in a timely way? It would have the effect of improving the market for summer school in some departments and getting courses to make and putting money in our pockets.

**P. Stoddard:** Lynne.

**L. Kamenitsa:** I propose you do a pilot study in Philosophy on that.

**K. Thu:** There is a revenue issue here too if you allow students to do this then you’re going to cut out about 3,000 students paying for those courses, I mean assuming they’re not taking other courses.

***:** And how many retakes who are D’s who are going to get F’s. I mean we’re only going to dissuade a small percentage.

**D. Kempton:** I don’t think this is – my own impression when we first dealt with this is I don’t think it’s quite as big an issue as we deal with. There may be 3,000 retakes per semester but I think a lot of those students are F’s and are therefore going to retake it no matter what so we’re not going to effect those and all the D students are actually fairly serious about this and are likely to retake as well. The ones it’s going to effect and the ones we’re worried about and our target audience is really the D students who think they’re going to get an A or a B and after a week or two just stop showing up. It’s the sort of irresponsible student who really mucks up the system and I think the policy should be designed to address those. I don’t think for your typical D student who really is normally a B student is retaking it for that reason is going to be dissuaded at all by the new policy whatever it is.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, thank you Dan. I believe we have no report from Economic Status. Resource, Space, and Budget, C.T.?

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair – no report

C. Resource, Space, and Budget – C.T. Lin, Chair – report (Page 7)
C.T. Lin:  Yeah, the report of this Committee of Resource, Space, and Budget is on page 7. The particular report is already about one month old. We had a meeting on September 27 and most of the items I’m going to report to you I believe you already know either from the Northern Star or just an hour ago Provost Alden already mentioned some of those items already.

The report mainly really is a report from Dr. Eddie Williams and he, you know, mentioned that NIU has entered into the so-called Capital Campaign or so-called Fund Development Age. The reason for that is because the state funding is quite small and also, you know, alumni tend to give more of their support. He mentioned about two particular projects that are currently in progress. One is the Housing for Students with Dependents and the other one is the so-called Academic Athletic Performance Center. Those two projects are currently already underway so probably you already know about them. The second thing that he mentioned about was again the fiscal budget request for maintenance and repairs of existing buildings and that is what Provost Alden already indicated about that. One of the things mentioned here in this report says that there has been a funding from the state for capital improvement for about five years now. Currently, NIU has deferred maintenance of up to $185-190 million. Well, you NIU doing a really smart type of, you know, related to this maintenance is the so-called “Performance Contracting” which involves paying the contractor via energy savings and this particular technique, you know, for improving some lighting and windows, etc., in the library and Zulauf Building. The other thing discussed was about the change in retirement process involving faculty who typically try to increase their salaries the last three years before retirement. Dr. Williams says that the university will no longer pay the 6% to SURS for summer teaching those last three years before retirement for the faculty. He also mentioned that if the department or college is willing to do so, then, you know, they can do whatever they want to but the university will not longer pay for the so-called 6% to SURS.

Provost Alden also mentioned the Spelling Commission: Accountability, Affordability and all those things. One thing that this particular commission, Dr. Williams says, currently also raised the question about what is happening to buildings that are empty at nights and during the summer. On the other hand, the student issue has also been raised. We also talked about the Carroll Cinema Theater space and building. Currently it is being used for parking and Dr. Williams said that currently we have several other buildings that have higher priorities. Those things are the report from September 27. This report was written by the University Council ??? so if you have any question, you can ask her about it. Thank you.

P. Stoddard:  Jeff?

J. Kowolski:  I’m not quite near enough to retirement to have taken an active interest in that question of the implications of the university no longer paying the 6% to SURS for summer teaching. I know it has been a common practice for people to avail themselves of teaching summer school to increase their overall salary during those last three years. Does this mean then that if this 6% is not paid, that those summer salaries will simply not be applied to the salary total for that three year period? What is the implication of it? Can you clarify that for me, anybody?
**P. Stoddard:** I’m not really sure. I think, I know, there was discussion when the pension reform originally came down but what they want to do is cut back on the abuse of people getting large salary boosts the last four years to up their annuity artificially. People might be given a new title even though it required no new duties and gotten a huge raise as a result of their new title so they passed this rule that any raise over 6% per annum in the last four years of your service before retirement, the institution would be responsible for the extra annuity that you would get over that 6% and that was originally a pretty hard and fast rule. Steve Cunningham has worked hard with other folks to get exceptions to that, exemptions to that. My understanding is that summer teaching actually is an exemption so that, you know, taking on extra duties by teaching during the summer that you might not otherwise have had and so that might not quality for this cap of 6%. If you got promoted from Associate Professor or Full Professor to Provost and got a, you know, quintupling of your salary who whatever that might be – I didn’t say that – then that would also be exempted from this cap because presumably as Provost you’re taking on a whole bunch of new duties. Would that be correct Deb?

**D. Haliczer:** Your description is very good Paul and I wanted to say that Steve Cunningham suggested that you all invite him to an upcoming Senate meeting so that you can pose your questions directly to him since he really is the definitive speaker on this.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, we will and tell Steve it starts at 2:30. Other questions for C.T.? Okay, thank you C.T.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Janet Holt, Chair – report

**P. Stoddard:** Next up, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Jan?

**J. Holt:** Hi – you have sort of a lengthy report there. I’ll try and summarize it for you. We were charged two Faculty Senate meetings ago to investigate the possible reclassification of faculty who hold administrative appointments as SPS employees. To investigate this, we collected information from some individuals who hold academic positions and have faculty rank and that this might have occurred to them as well as we met with Frederic Schwantes, Vice Provost for Resource Planning, Steve Cunningham, Associate Vice President for Administration and Human Resources and Debra Haliczer, Director for Employee Relations. We gathered a lot of information and to sort of boil it down, what did actually happen in the spring between April and June, eight employees, three from the College of Education and four from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and one from the College of Business, the positions that the hold – not the individuals themselves – but the positions that they hold were reclassified to SPS04 in the Human Resources Data Base and the reason it was done was really there’s three data bases, the Provost, Institutional Research, and Human Resources and they were not showing the same numbers and so actually there were more than eight people who were discrepant between the data bases and that information is given in the report here but eight of them were deemed worth reclassifying into the SPS04 position. Well, the SPS04 position does not mean they are Supportive and Professional Staff. It’s only a business code given to that particular position and, in fact, our Constitution basically says that faculty, the whole rank and academic department cannot be SPS so the employees themselves were not reclassified. On the other hand, they were not notified their positions were reclassified in this way so there was an issue here. In
investigating this, we also found out there were quite a few people who hold positions such as Associate Deans who never knew that their positions were SPS or if they knew they’ve forgotten over the years and so there does seem to be a lack of communication on this whole general issue. Then the other side of the whole issue was the fact that their evaluation – the reason that they found out given that they weren’t notified, was because their evaluations were based upon what the SPS and Civil Service Councils have voted on for their increase this past year which was 3% across the board and so a lot of these faculty who may hold positions such as director of a center that are supposed to be getting a good percentage of their salary based upon their merit procedures for their department because they’re very involved in scholarship and grants and so forth and teach, were not, they got a 3% across the board increase. So, based on all this information on the last page of this report, there’s five recommendations basically that Faculty Rights and Responsibilities is making to Faculty Senate. If Faculty Senate adopts this, we would hope it would go forward to the Provost Office and to Human Resources.

First of all, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities agrees with the recommendation made already by Steven Cunningham. They realize that there’s a problem and they’re working on correcting it themselves so we’re not the first ones to tell them this. To change the name of academic administrators on all personnel forms to a title that reflects the employee’s faculty rank and tenure and the academic administrators who have rank in academic departments should be rewarded for their job responsibilities that are academic in nature in accordance with the personnel merit procedures of their department in which they have rank in proportion to the times spent in these tasks which are academic in nature. Very importantly, we think there should be prior notification and agreement from the employee whenever changes are made regarding a business code, a job classification, the position they hold changes and additionally to those, individuals who already hold a particular – that hold any academic administrative position – they should be fully aware of how their position is classified with all of the data bases at NIU.

Fourth, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities is very concerned about a larger issue that the recent changes set a president for changing job classifications of positions historically held by faculty with rank to classifications that would not require a faculty member to hold that position, yet the knowledge and experience that the faculty member has would be critical to that position. Therefore, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee recommends that any changes to academic administrative positions should be reviewed and approved by faculty bodies before the position is reclassified to one that could be held by a non-faculty employee. Fifth, a lot of issues just sort of surfaced during this whole process and we didn’t know that it was even our position to resolve all these issues but clearly deliberations need to occur on some of these issues with faculty input and three of them that we came up with are possibly creating a separate salary pool for academic administrators. Right now they are less than 5% of the pool that they’re in and so the SPS and the Exempt Civil Service people that are in that category really carry more weight in how the pool is divided among the employees. Secondly, deciding on clear guidelines for salary increments for academic administrators and third, determining what proportions one’s job responsibilities needs to be administrative in nature to be classified as academic administrators and we put in there including department chairs because in looking at this, it isn’t entirely clear to us that some of the people that are currently classified with these SPS for business codes for instance do administrative responsibilities as, for instance, a department chair would. Some of them have responsibilities that are very academic in nature and so we thought maybe there should just be some discussion along those lines. Any questions?
K. Thu: How would we propose to determine the proportion of time spent in either academic or administrative work?

J. Holt: Well, I would think a lot of that would come from the position description of the position they hold and it would be very specific to different positions. For instance, I know associate deans vary across the different colleges in their teaching responsibilities. Some associate deans teach, some don’t. Some directors of centers have a large proportion of their time spent in research getting research dollars for their center and a lot of them is already detailed out. Some of them already have memos of understanding regarding their evaluation procedures which were not followed last year so I would think it would have to be sort of a case-by-case basis but there should be some documentation of that and it should be agreed upon by all parties.

P. Stoddard: We all fill out faculty activity reports and we have to say how much time is administrative and how much is teaching and how much is research. I imagine you could use something like that. Jan, did you want to make a motion that the Senate take up these recommendations and that they be forwarded to the people you mentioned with the substation of Faculty Senate for FRR Committee in here?

J. Holt: Yes, I would like to move that the recommendations in this report be adopted by the Faculty Senate and be forwarded to the Provost Office, specifically Provost Fredrick Schwantes and also to Steven Cunningham to be adopted in future use.

D. Swanson: I don’t know – I have one question. Should this go forward to University Council or should it go directly from the Senate? I’m not sure what should, you know---

P. Stoddard: Well, we can do this any number of ways. We are the Senate. We are an advocacy group for the faculty essentially and so we looked into this matter through Jan’s committee and said these are things that we think the faculty would like to see these steps taken in faculty positions so I think it’s very appropriate that the Senate appropriate that the Senate forward this to Fredrick and Steve. We can forward this to the Council. My take on that we would do that if we wanted the Council to take official action on this. If we wanted to force the hand of Steve Cunningham and Frederick Schwantes to make them implement this. My take right now is that they are amenable to these type of changes; that they want to work with the faculty and come up with a system that everybody is happy with and so I would suggest at this point going to the Council might slow things down more than speed them up. Thank you. Any further discussion? All right, all in favor of the motion say aye. Any opposed? Any abstentions? All right, we will forward that on. Thank you Jan. Job well done.

The motion passed.

I see we have no reports from Rules and Governance nor do we have one from Elections and Legislative Oversight. We have no Unfinished Business; no New Business

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Earl Hansen, Chair – no report

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – Teaching Standards (Pages 8-10) and report

P. Stoddard: I have a report form the FAC to the IBHE. I was filling in for our normal representative who is Jody Newman-Ryan. The Committee met, the Council, the Faculty Advisory Council met last October 20 at SIU Edwardsville and I’ll skip the niceties; you can read those for yourselves. The major thing I think that’s important to report on is this draft that you have in your packet. The report itself is a walk-in item. This draft is about teacher preparation and this is something that evidently the FAC has been working on for a little while. Unfortunately, we have not been represented at the last couple of meetings and so a lot of this work went on without us. Basically, this draft addresses the preparation of teachers at the elementary ed and higher levels and makes suggestions along the lines of teachers should have a degree in content areas. That’s a specific one for elementary ed. There are others for the upper levels as well. I talked with Vice Provost Seaver about this and he pointed out for the upper level teachers we’re doing everything if not more than has been recommended in this particular document but for that the elementary ed, the College of Ed had some severe reservations about this, specifically about the time that would be added to the teacher prep. Basically, it would be impossible for a teacher to graduate in less than five years and in practicality we’re probably talking about six years. That, of course, gets into some serious problems with tuition and all sorts of other concerns. At the FAC meeting, I raised that issue and they acknowledged that it was in fact an extra year of training. They talked about streamlining and combining courses and other issues but it was clear to me that wasn’t particularly well thought out yet. There was also talk of state support for such an initiative – we’re going to have students for another year. That’s another, you know, more resources that we’re going to need and somehow the state is going to have to help provide for that so we did introduce the words state support in this document which doesn’t show up here but in the final draft it should be here. There was a small change about the degree which is currently in Liberal Arts and Sciences LA&S and the thought was that should better be little letters, lower case letters because not all such content is actually in any given LA&S college. So for example here, if you had a degree in music, it would not be from LA&S, it would be from VPA and it would be an appropriate degree for a music teacher. Anyway, they voted on this. It was passed. I’ll say it was passed unanimously. I voted for it because basically what happens to this – this is just a position paper by the FAC. This is presented to the Board of Ed for them to discuss, to debate and so forth. Not only does the Board of Ed get to discuss this, but actually the ISBE, the Illinois State School Board of Education, is the one who controls the certification requirements and so whatever the IBHE might end up saying would be overkill if ISBE doesn’t adopt the same things so this is really just the very beginning of discussion on this issue. I voted for it because I felt that this all was an important debate to have in the state – how should we be preparing our teachers – and I felt that by voting for it I would help ensure that
debate continued. In that debate I would certainly hope that extra time required for elementary ed would be a major point that would have to be discussed. Anyway, that’s what this document is. There’s the rationale for it. There’s the changes they suggest and there’s the actual changes and so forth and, you know, nobody should panic that this is going to happen. The IBHE may choose totally to ignore this. That would not be unusual for them to ignore what the FAC is saying to them. Ideally, that is not what we want to have happen but this is just a discussion opener. So there’s a long way to go before any of this sees the light of day really. Other than that, like I said, we got a talk from the SIUE Provost. I found that interested. It was a gentleman named Paul Furgeson who they hired from UNOV where he had been the Vice Provost for Research. In that capacity he worked under Ray Alden whom we just hired from UNOV so I think that says something about where we stand in the pecking order since we hired a vice provost and we hired their provost. He talked about what SIUE is doing. One of the interesting things was differential tuition; tuition based on courses of study, based on market and so forth. What other things – nothing was talked about in any detail whatsoever. The other thing we got was a report from the IBHE working group which is highlighted in the third paragraph. These are things the IBHE are thinking about at the moment so there’s a couple of things to think about there perhaps. Then we got a talk from the Eastern Illinois University Trustee about public relations really and how teachers, how faculty might better make their case at the state level. So given the length, given the hour, I’ll leave it at that and take any questions. Jan?

**J. Holt:** This is really disconcerting for colleges of education. I wonder about the representation about the colleges of education in the state for this. It really would undermine our preparation for our students and I’m not clear, could you deconstruct this a little bit more? Would that mean that the students would no longer be getting a degree from the College of Education, the degree would be from Liberal Arts and Sciences?

**P. Stoddard:** No, I think that was additional. I think that’s where the additional hours are coming from. Basically, according to Vice Provost Seaver, we’re looking at thirty extra hours here to do this sort of thing and that’s a year. So no, I don’t think there’s talk about not getting a degree from the College of Ed, it’s doing the course work required to get it, an addition degree in a content area.

**J. Holt:** So they would be getting two degrees plus filling all their certification requirements to acquire a job which is very underpaid?

**P. Stoddard:** Right.

**J. Holt:** How likely do we think that that’s going to happen? I think this is really undermining the qualities of education. I do not think we should support this in any way, shape or form without getting significant input from the College of Education and from the scholars in the College of Education that know the research of literature in elementary education, know that students are out there that they say they need work on is not necessarily that they need an LA&S degree but what they want to know is how to deal with kids that are behavioral disordered, how to deal with kids that are English language learners. I mean, there are some real issues in the schools where they need some more expertise and the scholarship isn’t pointing in this direction and so I just think we’d do a disservice to the College of Education.
P. Stoddard: Bill?

B. Tolhurst: Just a point of clarification on terminology. Are we really talking about a double degree or are we talking about a double major because the requirements for a double degree are different from those for a double major and so I just assumed when I read this that what was being talked about was if somebody is going to teach math they have to have a major in math and they may have to have other stuff too.

P. Stoddard: Right. I think your point is well taken. It’s more a major than a full degree. We have a whole bunch of other course ---

B. Tolhurst: So one could be listed as the first major, your degree could be in, you know, whichever one you wanted I suppose.

P. Stoddard: Right.

B. Tolhurst: Whichever one you took to be your first major.

P. Stoddard: Jan?

J. Holt: Currently at NIU anyone who teaches in secondary school and teaches a subject area does have a degree in that area so kids that teach math already have a degree in math. We’re talking about the elementary ed teachers.

B. Tolhurst: I know. That’s why I chose my example from the other area because I didn’t want to get involved in what you know more about.

P. Stoddard: Oh, go ahead.

L. Elish-Piper: Laurie Elish-Piper, Literacy Education. You raised the issue that it would be another thirty hours so you’re saying that all the preparation necessary to be an elementary teacher could be put in to thirty credit hours? Is that basically the stance that this position paper takes?

P. Stoddard: Well, this comes from Gip Seaver that thirty hour number and I think what he is saying was that the hours for a lot of the majors that people might take for their content, that’s thirty hours of major content, okay, so it’s not talking about the education hours at all, it’s purely major content so it would be thirty additional hours unless there were some creative scheduling and overlap if that were possible in some instances. Basically, we’re looking at thirty hours; we’re looking at another year. Some majors are more.

L. Elish-Piper: Because when I read this position paper it looked almost like the fifth year programs that I am aware of in states like California where there’s been research that indicates those programs are extremely flawed in terms of trying to compact too much of the course work and the experience necessary to be an elementary teacher into a very short time frame and how
many of those teachers, once they get into the class room, they leave after one or two years because they’re so under-prepared to be successful in that particular framework so I would hope that as we look forward with this, we can involve some of the people who are involved in the elementary education program in the conversations because I think it’s a very different animal than those who are prepared to teach at the secondary level. Having taught at both levels myself, it’s a very different task, it’s a very different type of preparation so I’d really hope that we could have an opportunity for some involvement and input as Jan said to share some of the research and perhaps learn from some of the states that have done similar moves and have been very unsuccessful in doing so.

P. Stoddard: Okay, good point. Dan?

D. Kempton: There are things about this I like but I think there are things that clearly are a slap in the face to the education college. I wonder if they couldn’t, this subject matter, be approached in a less sort of combative way. To talk about something like specialist certificates or area studies with specialist certificates that would give some sort of academic recognition to those who were doing this two track approach but without sort of demeaning or undermining what their education program is doing and allow you to bifurcate how you’re hiring teachers based on that and not require it of everyone, particularly primary school teachers which, it doesn’t make a whole lot of sense. I mean, I can’t think of a major that is really is going to behoove them to get a full major in at the second or third grade level. I mean, maybe I’m missing something.

L. Elish-Piper: One of the things that I think a lot of us would argue if someone was going to be a primary teacher, their specialization should be within an area of teaching. For example, they should earn an endorsement in reading instruction or they should earn an entitlement in teaching second language or they should earn a specialization in the area of special education to allow them to become experts within an area that would enhance their teaching and their service to their students.

D. Kempton: It makes a whole lot more sense. Are we coming back to this issue or is it just you’re done with it?

P. Stoddard: Well, for the time being, like I said, this is just their ideas. I can certainly revisit this at the next meeting with them and I’ll pass along to be sure the reservations that have been expressed. Any other comments on this? Okay.

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 Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report
XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Any comments or questions from the floor? Going once, going twice.

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.