FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2006  
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Welcome. Looks like an orderly bunch so I guess we don’t have to actually do a call.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first of business today is adoption of the agenda. Could I have a motion? Thank you. Can I have a second? Thank you. Any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of adopting the agenda say aye. Thank you.

Giles made the motion; Gallagher seconded. The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2006 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 3-7)

P. Stoddard: Next up is the minutes. Same drill as with the agenda. Thank you. Thank you. Any additions, corrections, etc. for the minutes? All right, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed?

Giles made the motion; Gallagher seconded. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Strategic Planning Task Force

P. Stoddard: Under President’s Announcements I’ve listed a couple of things. One is the Strategic Planning Task Force. That body met a couple of weeks ago. There’s about 43 or 45
people on it. It’s a sizeable group. Actually, I think I was going to let Brigid give the report since she was part of that.

**B. Lusk:** Sure. Well, it is a large group and there are representatives from just every single department area in the whole university and we just met once and the plan is now, over the next month – the meeting was coordinated by the outside consultant who is from a company called The Learning Alliance based at the University of Pennsylvania – and over the next month, one of their people is going to interview all us individually for a 45 minute interview wanting to know our dreams for NIU, what we think NIU can do and what we think NIU maybe can’t do so well. After that company has reviewed all our dreams and all our interviews, they’re going to make up a document which we are going to be discussing at a day-long meeting in January and then I believe we’re going to have weekly meetings in small groups based on themes that will come out of what everyone said in those interviews. So the timeline is pretty fast. I think is it by April they want something? Very early information will be given to the Provost and that poor chap has to write the whole report up based on – I mean, he will be given obviously all this information – but the actual report will come from him based on the information from the Strategic Planning Task Force. There will then be another full-day meeting, I believe as I recall right, that is to review this document and these full-day meetings actually will be meetings of about a hundred people. They’re inviting about 50 other different, specific entities to make sure that everyone is well-represented. Then the hope is that this will be out certainly by the end of this academic year so that the capital campaign has something to run with in terms of where we want to go as a university. Any questions about it? That’s the rundown; we really haven’t started working yet.

**E. Miller:** Is there a website with a list of members?

**B. Lusk:** There will be two websites. One is being organized by the company and that I believe will not be open to everybody but then NIU is putting up its own website and that, I’m sure, is open to everyone to access and that will have updates on exactly what we’re doing and the list of members which actually I have right here if you want to see it – just as an FYI – and the point was made again and again that this was supposed to be and should be a totally open process. Very much so, it’s very much everyone can discuss – the only things we were told was we’re not to discuss things with a name attached to them but just these were the discussion issues that were brought up. Just to keep it at that sort of level. The other thing I should have mentioned that came out loud and clear was that the Provost anticipates acting on this strategic plan. He said he came from an institution where there was a strategic plan in place and then he evaluated colleges on how they did and some deans found that they had less money at the end of that evaluation and they said why and he said because you didn’t follow the strategic plan and so he said that will happen here. He said he’s very, very serious that we take it extremely seriously and act on it. That was more than you needed to know. There’s the list.

**D. Swanson:** Hi, I’m Dianna Swanson. I’m also a representative from the Faculty Senate on the Strategic Planning Committee and I just wanted to underscore the fact that officially, we are representing the Faculty Senate as well as all the faculty so please do contact me, Brigid Lusk, Janet Holt, and Paul Stoddard with concerns, ideas, anything that you want to contribute to the process because we’re there to represent the faculty, not just our own ideas. So, thanks.
P. Stoddard: Right, and I guess I would add – I mean, there are representatives as Brigid said from all different constituency groups, by college, by profession, by job title and so forth so do try to contact for the Senate one of us or for your college or whomever because obviously this is a plan for the university and I think the idea genuinely is to try to make it of the university by the university community, not just the President or the Provost saying this is where we need to go but us, we get to say where this needs to go. Okay. Any other questions or comments about the Task Force for Strategic Planning? Okay, if not, I’ve got the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee.

B. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee

P. Stoddard: I sat in on their meeting recently. The main topic of discussion was the personal response systems, the classroom clickers, whatever we call them. ITS would like to make a decision as to which one to support. The Senate last year to remind you, pretty much decided that the university should support one. It doesn’t mean that’s the only one allowed on campus by any means, but there are distinct problems with multiple systems and so it would be best to support one. Which one that is, I guess, is a topic that Professor Kempton will deal with in his report or will you today or? Yeah, okay. So I don’t need to go very much into that. We got a demonstration of what one of these things looks like. Basically, it does allow students to enter during the class, their response to a question. These things are coded to individual students so you could do grades or attendance or quizzes or such using these. There is, however, no assurance that whoever is punching the button is the student that claims to be punching the button. There are no fingerprint detectors or retinal scan devices or anything like that associated with these and there’s nothing to keep one student from having five of these for his friends and clicking away. But they do look like they are of some interest and they certainly are of some interest to certain departments on campus already that are using them.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Moving on then, we have no items to consider at the moment and nothing to consent to.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Daniel Kempton, Chair – report (Pages 8-10)

P. Stoddard: So, without further ado, we’ll hand it over to Dr. Kempton.

D. Kempton: All right, I’m going to go to our first report and just make a couple of brief comments and I’m going to do this in reverse order, not to test your astuteness on this rainy day but because that should make some sense.
On the last item on our committee report, the clickers, we are moving forward. We’re looking I think – last year’s committee when Kendall Thu was in charge of it, did a nice job of putting together basic information on the clickers. We’re following up on those. We’ve updated a couple of the systems already; what’s changed for this academic year, what’s coming for next year. We’re still looking for more student and faculty input. We have contacted the students and have a preliminary response from them. We’ve also contacted the Yahoo users’ group for personal response systems and got some response there. We have in the works a letter to all faculty so if you know of anyone who somehow missed one of these screens who wants to provide input, we need it by the middle of January. We’re going to make a decision by the middle of January for your February meeting to hopefully take a vote on.

The second item on the list which is the first one in the February 15th report was still these issues coming out of the NIU Connect System. There was a new one put on the table. I know it created a lot of confusion where I did this with an oral report so I think it’s in the written report. Basically, the issue is how long do students have to drop classes and add classes. It currently is two weeks for graduate students and one week for undergraduates. They are considering going with a uniform two weeks for everybody. We discussed some of the preliminary advantages and disadvantages of that. The advantage is that it goes better for undergraduates with the deadlines for their funding and for their financial aide offers and all of that. The down side to it is that you may have a person come into your class the end of the second week of class saying I have every right to be here where you all maybe feel they don’t have a great opportunity to still pass the class at that point. So that’s the down side. We’re going back to our faculty and looking from our colleges for feedback on that issue. If you want to say something today on that that would be helpful as well.

The first listed that I want to talk about finally is the one we discussed last time and that was the issue of on a retake of an exam or a retake of a course, which should count, the higher retake of the exam (in other words, if you get a D and then an F, does the D count or is it the more recent retake). We went back to our colleges and got some information. It was not as uniform as one would hope but we nonetheless took a vote. I’ll just report basically what we have. LA&S, both faculty and advising staff, appear to favor the more recent retake of the counting. The College of Health and Human Services – there’s some ambiguity – some of the faculty favor more recent but at the same time, their Curriculum Committee has now taken a motion and say they prefer the higher so Health and Human Services in the highest category. College of Education is more, I think, united in the highest retake category – the higher I should be saying. College of Business is clearly in the more recent retake category. College of VPA, Visual and Performing Arts, prefers the more recent. We met as a committee; discussed it as faculty, realizing that the curriculum committees are influenced both by faculty and by advising deans who have an important and somewhat different stake in this. The faculty on our committee did make and pass a motion recommending the most recent retake be the one that is counted which is consistent with the better schools in the state, maybe I should be cautious saying that, with the tougher admission standards schools in the state. Let me use an objective criteria and I guess we would like to forward that recommendation to you and have it voted either up or down. I think either way would be a good thing. So I’d like to formally make a recommendation that the Senate approve the motion recommending to the NIU Connect team that they adopt the standard of the most recent retake being the one that would count toward calculation of GPA. Thank you.
P. Stoddard: I met with these folks; they had a group yesterday, yeah, yesterday and one point of minor clarification. These would be repeats. I was told that if you average grades together, that’s considered a retake. If you substitute one grade or take just the one grade, that’s a repeat. Seems minor to me but they were very keen on that.

D. Kempton: Okay, so we’re talking about repeat policy.

P. Stoddard: Right. We don’t allow retakes. We allow repeats. So I believe we have a motion. Is there a second to that motion? Okay, any discussion of the motion?

K. Thu: This is for anybody. What is the time period then within which someone has to do the repeat?

P. Stoddard: Thirteen months. That may be disappearing with the new software, yeah.

D. Kempton: With the NIU Connect because it has trouble counting months in that fashion. Not unlimited. You get one repeat but that repeat doesn’t necessarily have to be within a thirteen month time frame, I think is my understanding of the NIU Connect system. It’s the next one. You get one more repeat and we’re deciding whether it’s the higher or the more recent of those two grades. That’s my understanding, yes. Am I wrong on that? I know you said thirteen months; I know that’s the present rule but I think it’s changing – let me look at my notes while others are ---

T. Sims: Tom Sims, Graduate Council. Just to state what I hope should be obvious or ask. I presume in any individual case the student can always appeal to reinstate the higher grade and if the instructor and the department recommends that that can be the case?

P. Stoddard: Yeah, most of the things that we’re talking about with the NIU Connect program there is always room for exceptions and exemptions and so forth. Yeah.

D. Kempton: My understanding is that you can do the exemptions but it’s not the instructor who does it, it’s the advising dean in the appropriate college of the course in which it was taken. They get to set those rules. I think that’s correct. College. The college in which the course was taken so that advising dean would get petition to override if you wanted to use an override.

P. Stoddard: It did come up briefly in the meeting yesterday that other college advising deans might like to have that opportunity but that was quickly laughed down. It was said in jest. While Dan is looking that up, are there any other questions or comments or thoughts about highest versus latest?

T. Griffith: Tim Griffith, University Ombudsman. Just a question for clarification. Would the scenario then also be possible under this proposed system where a student would pass with a D earning credit for the course if repeating the course and failing would then no longer receive credit for the course?
D. Kempton: If you adopt the most recent standard yes, you would lose credit for a course you previously took which would discourage repeats unless one were serious about it. On the other hand, as the point was made over here, you could, if you were in that situation and failed the second time for a serious reason, you could go to the advising dean for the college in which the course was offered and ask to have the original grade reinstated but you’d have to show the impetus and go do that yourself. It wouldn’t happen automatically as an appeal.

A. Tatum: I’m on the College of Education Curriculum Committee and it’s clear to me why we voted in favor of the higher grade for that very same reason which students lose the credit for that but I’m not clear why the other colleges before I make a vote, why they voted on the most recent grade and the rationale that, you know, the tougher admission standard schools are doing this. It just doesn’t set well with me so what was the rationale for the most recent as opposed to the higher grade?

D. Kempton: That’s a good question and the logic isn’t just wanting to be with the higher admission schools, the logic particularly for LA&S which I’m more familiar with is basically this, this repeat request tends to occur in very high demand, high enrolled, 100 and 200 level courses. These are often closed courses where seating in these courses are at a premium. So essentially you have a net good to give away. The question is should we be giving it away to relatively better students who are new or relatively more senior students by encouraging more repeats and we thought it’s better to give the seats in those closed classes to the new student rather than the one who’s failed it the first time. Understand that most of – I’m not sure if in other colleges this is also true, but in LA&S priority of schedule for a seat goes by the number of credit hours you’ve already taken. Those people who have taken courses and failed them are likely to have more credit hours under those belts than those who are taking it for the first time. So our sense was we would be unfair to the better students and being overly fair to the students who failed the class in our giving away of this limited good. So that was I think the rationale that sort of drove the vote in LA&S. I can give you a longer document but its 7 or 8 page to peruse and I’ll find a copy of that.

T. Sims: One more comment, in the discussion that we had on this last meeting someone raised the comment about is there any data on the number of repeats and the number of repeat students who actually get a lower grade the second time around and I believe the answer was no, there was absolutely no data. So I think we’re kind of arguing in the dark here and again, from the standpoint of the comment I made last time, I think the point of repeating a course is to do better and anything that we can do in terms of policies to hold the students motivation to the fire, however you want to scramble your metaphors, is better.

N. Castle: Two things. Daniel, I’m on the HHS College Curriculum Committee. Our official vote was highest, wasn’t it? Okay. So officially ---

D. Kempton: ??? reported. I was correct in the original report which came our prior to ---

N. Castle: My memory’s failing me. I remember in our discussion one of the things that came up but I don’t recall that there was a resolution to, was the issue of if they lose the credit, for students who are on financial aide or PAL grants or whatever to retroactively take back a credit
from a semester that they’ve already paid for, could create some legal issues for those students who in good faith took out those loans, etc. with a full time credit load and then if we, semesters later, take that credit away because they failed the course, it could be an issue. I don’t recall us being able to figure out what the resolution to that would be other than that would be something that the Provost Office should verify before we execute anything that might put people in jeopardy like that if it does.

D. Kempton: It’s an interesting legal question but I would argue that anytime you take a new course you have the risk of lowering your GPA and endangering your financial assistance.

N. Castle: Just the GPA – it’s the number of credits. I’m a full time student this semester so the number of credits, not the GPA, but I’m not an expert on the financial aide stuff. Let’s just be sure somebody checks it out.

D. Kempton: We didn’t address this. I will point out that this isn’t our decision to make. We’re making a recommendation one way or the other and frankly not that wedded to either position but also I should warn you that there’s input coming in from the college advisory deans, there’s input coming in from the curriculum committees, it’s also being filtered through APASC so there’s are a lot of irons in this fire I guess. We’re just trying to get a more purely faculty position on it to the extent that there is one and there seems to be some division and that’s acceptable and I think there’s good arguments for the two sides on it.

P. Stoddard: APASC is actually discussing it right now as a matter of fact.

D. Swanson: Dianna Swanson again. I just wanted to clarify what I think was one of the arguments for the more recent grade being counted which was simply to discourage what might be called frivolous repeats or well, okay there won’t be any penalty on me whatever happens so I’ll just give it a try kind of thing. I think what we heard last Faculty Senate meeting was that there was something around 3,000 students – no, 3,000 course seats being held by repeat takers this semester so it’s a lot of students and a lot of seats in classes so I think we need to take into account the resources of the university and the departments and all of that in terms of how this all works out.

E. Miller: I will say I never thought about the numbers being 3,000 but as a person who advises undergraduates personally, I can say that the students who I have advised who are retake – repeating a class, it is most often a class in LA&S, are by no means frivolous in their attempt to take the class over again. They are struggling to pull up their grade point average, they are committed to that process and I would hate for this faculty to see our undergraduates in this view as being frivolous. They are very strongly concerned about their grade point average and trying to work hard in an area that they’re not comfortable in, most often math, and struggling to take it again and work harder and I think that that ought to be respected even within the confines of our financial restrictions and if that means that, you know, the next time they do it it’s a D again and the next time they do it it might be a D+, you know, they’re still struggling and they’re still working.
**N. Churyk:** I’m not on the college curriculum, I’m Natalie Churyk from the College of Business, I’m not on the college curriculum so I can’t speak for the arguments there but what I have seen in Accountancy, the students want A’s and B’s. If they’re not going to get an A or B, they will throw the final because if you get a C, you can’t repeat a class, you can only repeat with a D so they won’t show up so they can retake or repeat the class because if they don’t have an A or a B, they will not get a position in one in one of the public accounting firms and also in the College of Business, we’re dealing with juniors and seniors and so and I feel that perhaps one of the positions in our college is that if our students do not perhaps pass a class that we would rather have them have the last grade because we are dealing with majors at this point rather than freshman or sophomore where we may be more lenient to someone just coming into college. Here they should be ready, they’re ready to go out and proceed with their career and we feel that they should be more serious and if they’re a senior repeating a class, take their consequences if they don’t do well.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, some interesting discussion.

**D. Kempton:** This is just two comments; one is a response and again, I didn’t mean to – I didn’t use the term frivolous and I didn’t want to disparage the students who are repeating of course – I keep wanting to say retake – who are repeating a course but because it does not hurt in any way those who repeat it and presumably if you’re repeating and trying hard you should do at least as well as the last time. It discourages the ones who get a C or a D the first time and take the first test to see if they get an A or a B and if they don’t, then they just walk away and leave their seat closed which apparently happens, we’re told from the advising deans. Again, I apologize if it sounded like we were disparaging the students who are doing the retake – or repeat – by the end of this night I’ll get that.

I did find the note on the 13 month rule. We were told that to retain the 13 month rule would require an extensive modification to the PeopleSoft/NIU Connect system. When we asked for further information, what extent of modification meant, they meant we had to pay big time every time we got a new version of it and therefore that seemed to be not likely to occur so the 13 month rule, my memory was somewhat correct, it’s going to disappear.

**K. Thu:** We can’t have an academic policy disappear because software doesn’t handle it, I mean ---

**D. Kempton:** Well, that’s a nice theory.

**K. Thu:** Well, but that just shouldn’t be allowed to happen. So there’s an open-ended period of time for repeats?

**D. Kempton:** It’s still under debate but ---

**L. Kamenitsa:** Lynne Kamenitsa from Political Science and Women’s Studies. I am on the LA&S Curriculum Committee and there was not, as I recall, any support for keeping the 13 month rule with or without the software. I think it was one of those cases where if this went away, no one was going to be upset and if this was our reason we had to do it, so be it. I just
want to respond quickly to the comment, I think it was Beth over there, was saying about the
frivolous retakes, there are some disincentives in the current system to prevent this kind of
retakes so we’re not really talking about students right now who might do that, it’s that if we
remove those disincentives there’s a concern that we’ll have more students who are taking
courses in the way that Daniel described saying well, I’ll see how I do on the first exam.

N. Castle: Again I’m Nancy Castle, Health and Human Sciences College Curriculum
Committee. Our college curriculum committee was asked and we did review the 13 month
policy so I do think it went to college curriculum committees for feedback and we had the same
feeling that they did like gees, it’s more hassle for us to do paperwork with the 13 month thing
and we end up waiving it a lot of times anyway so that wasn’t an issue for us either.

S. Wickman: Scott Wickman. The question of data came up and what the advising dean had
said, although he didn’t have a specific number, of the 3,000 repeats he said it was a very small
percentage that we’re talking about who get a D and then later retake and get an F so we’re
talking a small percentage of students in this discussion.

P. Stoddard: Any other comments? All right, then the motion was to – what was the motion.

D. Kempton: I can’t remember whether it’s repeat or retake.

P. Stoddard: Let’s go with repeat. Repeat the motion on repeats.

D. Kempton: Okay. The motion was to recommend that the Senate adopt a motion favoring the
most recent repeat of the course for both credit and grade when faced with that choice. I believe
it did have a second.

P. Stoddard: It did yes. All in favor of the motion say aye. Opposed? All right, in the
judgment of the Chair, the ayes have it. The motion passes but not unanimously.

The motion passed.

P. Stoddard: With regards to the add/drop period, and things are always fluid with this NIU
Connect group, yesterday they were talking about the possibility of giving students one week to
add a course but two weeks to drop it so that might end up with some empty seats I suppose but
on the other hand it does address this issue of students adding the course after too long a period
of time has elapsed but that’s not been carved in ??? yet. Right. Any other questions for Dan on
his report? All right, thank you very much.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Is Cason Snow here? Okay. He had an oral report for us, the just of which is as
follows. At the beginning of the year we asked his committee to consider how any increments,
pay increments, might be apportioned should they come our way in the upcoming year or years.
This grew out of a situation that arises with a fair degree of frequency in which by the time the
state legislature decides the budget for the universities, it’s May or June, sometimes July, at
which point getting faculty input into how they would like to see an increment divided up becomes problematic. So, the thought was it would be nice if the faculty either, well partially through the Senate, ultimately through the UCPC, would get together and say if we got a 3% increment we’d like to see it done this way, x across the board, x merit or y merit. If we got 8% we’d like to see x I across the board, y2 merit. If we got 100% increment, you know, whatever. We can dream. Whatever. Anyway, what did he end up saying? In their discussions, it sounded like they didn’t delve very deeply into it. They basically said 50/50. Any increment we’d get we’d like to see half of it across the board and half of it based on merit. So that was the official recommendation of the Economic Status of the Profession Committee. Is anybody from the committee who is involved in any of those discussions, mostly via e-mail I believe – yeah.

???: My name is ?????. I was in that committee and we discussed about that. If I remember correctly, we decided in the following way. Any amount up to a living increase should be across the board; any amount after that could be discussed and maybe be divided equally by merit, by across the board or some other way. But if the increase is not more than the increase in living expenses, then it should be across the board. That was the discussion we had and I believe that was the decision.

P. Stoddard: All right, very good. That essentially should serve as a starting point for any discussion we might like to have on that. Personally, I’d like to see the Senate, if possible and it may not be, take a position for or against that. If it’s not strongly one way or another I suppose it wouldn’t make much difference. But if the Senate had a strong feeling on this, then this is something we could forward to the UCPC who the official faculty voice in the increment process. My take is that they haven’t been particularly active in that role; they usually have a pretty full plate anyway and if we can save them a little trouble and say this is what we think, I think that would help quite a bit. So, can I get a motion about anything regarding increments? Perhaps, to accept ---

???: I motion what we decided in that meeting.

P. Stoddard: Okay, very good. See, this doesn’t have to be hard. All right. Any seconds to that? Thank you. Any discussion about that particular motion? Dan?

D. Kempton: Just out of curiosity, does anybody know how many years the pay increase on average has exceeded the cost of living? That’s a serious question because I’m a little worried we’d be wiping out our merit system by going to something like this. So often the amount above the cost of living is minuscule that we would really be deflating the sense that we still have a merit system for faculty pay but I don’t know the data to back that up so.

P. Stoddard: Speaking anecdotally from my recollection, I think we’ve an average increment over 3% or 3 or 4% maybe once in my tenure here which is 17 years. Yeah.

D. Swanson: Dianne Swanson. And that’s the problem, right? The reason I’d be inclined to support this motion is two things. One, something that I’ve been concerned about for a long time is that faculty members who are doing a good job here, actually lose by, you know – in real dollars – they actually lose pay over the years. This seems very unfair to me because when we
only get a 2 or 3% increment and then it’s apportioned by merit, some people who are doing a
good job are only getting a 1% increase. So that’s reason number one. Number two is, if we do
move to this system, then it offers us a platform from which to start arguing and showing why
these pay raises are, you know, it gives us one more way to lobby to raise the issue of how these
pay raises are inadequate and given the fact that the legislature has just voted themselves an 8 to
12% increase this year, this seems to me, you know, an ideal opportunity to do so.

P. Stoddard: The legislature didn’t actually vote to give themselves an increase. They voted
not to not give themselves an increase. Nancy?

N. Castle: Nancy Castle, HHS. I would really be more in favor of tabling this until January
17th’s meeting for two reasons. The last time we all discussed, I thought that your committee
was going towards whatever the amount is that like a third of it would be considered cost of
living, not necessarily related to whatever the federal index cost of living is and I would be more
comfortable voting on something I saw in writing as opposed to just a recollection and that
would be my vote anyway, would be to vote to table this until we’ve got Cason’s report in
writing so we know what we’re actually recommended.

D. Kempton: If that’s a substitute motion I want to second it.

P. Stoddard: All right so a motion to table and second has to be voted on immediately. Is that
correct?

F. Bryan: Yes and I would prefer or Roberts would prefer this be a motion to postpone rather
than table because you’ve designated a specific time. Lay on the table typically means often to
kill a motion so I think the intent here is simply to postpone to a certain specific meeting.
Correct?

N. Castle: I would like to retake this repeat – I would like to postpone – and here’s the thing, is
what I’m saying in general I’d like to postpone it. If the people who made the motions want to
redo their motions that’s fine. I don’t have to move anything, do I?

F. Bryan: Did you make a motion to postpone?

N. Castle: Did I? Yes, and Dan seconded.

F. Bryan: Then we have to vote on that immediately. The motion would be to postpone.

P. Stoddard: All in favor of postponing until January 17 say aye. Opposed? The ayes have it.
Okay. Yes?

E. Miller: I believe that Rahda had prepared a good bit of information last year for this
committee on exactly what people are asking for on the cost of living and the raises that we got
over the last five years. I don’t believe I still have that archived information but –

P. Stoddard: If he presented it to the Senate then ---
E. Miller: I’m not sure he presented everything but I know that he presented it to the committee. Janet might – do you still have it? Some of us might still have it but there were charts and figures and costs and things.

P. Stoddard: 8x10 glossies with a paragraph on the back ---

E. Miller: I believe they were PowerPoint.

P. Stoddard: Okay, well we’ll encourage the committee to amass that data and formalize something that we can actually debate, maybe consider a couple of the comments that have been made in the Senate as well. Again, what we decide is by no means what happens. It’s the faculty voice in the process which also has the deans and the president and the provost and a lot of other voices but it seems that we definitely want ours in there, at least to me it seems that way.

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

P. Stoddard: Moving on, correct me if I’m wrong, but it looks like we have no report from Resource, Space, and Budget. No report from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. No report from Rules and Governance and no report from Elections and Legislative Oversight. That would be correct? Okay.

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

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 - report. (Pages 11-16)

P. Stoddard: Having no unfinished or new business, I’ve got an FAC report and we have a couple of BOT reports to go through.

The FAC report is on page 11 and there’s a document that follows that. Basically, the FAC met on the 17th at Illinois State. The first thing that happened was their legislative liaison, kind of our Ken Zehnder, met with us and discussed his feelings on how the election in Illinois pretends for higher education in Illinois and the main thing he said was now that the Democrats have a veto-proof majority in the Senate and a solid, although not veto-proof majority in the House, he felt that we’d get a capital bill finally which would allow us to make some much, much needed and well, frequently delayed improvements to Stevens and some of the other buildings on campus.
He was asked about HP750, that was the tax wrap bill, income tax for property tax, he thought that was dead for the time being and certainly in its current form. He said in general, universities play defense, they don’t propose legislation, they just try to deflect the more onerous legislation and reshape some stuff that’s not necessarily bad, but could be better. He cited the Truth in Tuition as one of the things they helped reshaped and now actually it seems that people feel that that’s actually a good bill for higher ed as well as for the students. We got a talk from Rick Pearce, who is an IBHE staff member. He’s also liaison to the FAC and he commented that the IBHE is developing working groups. Right now they have everybody in their respective silos, financial affairs, academic affairs, etc. and they’re getting people out, talking to each other about issues that we would see as more interesting and I list a few in the paragraph. Articulation and transfer of P20 initiatives and teacher prep which generated a little a discussion last time in here and so forth and he seemed to feel that if the FAC or if the faculty at Illinois universities in general through the FAC wanted to set an agenda with the IBHE, wanted to have points that they wanted to see the IBHE address, the best way to go about it might be to address the working groups individually rather than trying to go to a full Board meeting where everything is pretty much scripted and nothing happens that nobody hadn’t planned on already anyway, especially given that these working groups are new and they’re trying to feel their way in how to operate, where to get their input and so forth, that this represents a good opportunity for faculty to try to get a word in edgewise with the Board.

Finally, we talked about the – not finally – but as part of all this we also talked about the Teacher Preparation document that they had voted on last time. I was asked at one point if any College of Education people were involved in drafting that document. It turns out one of the three major drafters is from the College of Ed, that’s Marie Donovan from DePaul University. But everybody – there was a lot of concern raised about that document not just here but at other institutions as well. As a result, I think the FAC is going to try, or at least the drafters of the document, are going to try to meet with the deans of the College of Ed and address some of the concerns that have been raised. I think everybody sort of said yeah, that should have happened in the first place but live and learn.

Then finally another position paper that’s going to come up for discussion is on student debt. That’s attached here. This did not get any real discussion at the meeting but I give it to you here so you have a chance to look over it and if you have any feelings about it you can forward them to me or Jody Newman-Ryan and one of us will bring it up at the appropriate time I think.

So that’s my report. Any questions? Okay.


P. Stoddard: Moving on, BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee, you got something for us?

F. Bryan: The report is before you and there are a few things I would like to highlight from the meeting. It was actually a very exciting meeting and it was a meeting basically to announce the Proton era has arrived or is just about to arrive here at Northern. The Academic Affairs, Student
Affairs, and Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees met on November 16. All action items, the three major ones, were approved and will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees meeting on December 7. The main action item as I mentioned is the Northern Illinois Proton Therapy Treatment and Research Center, a big $3.3 million federal funding proposal to begin the formal planning of this Proton Therapy Treatment Center that will be adjacent to the Fermi Lab. Presidential Research Professor Gerald Blazey made a very informative PowerPoint presentation that was also supplemented by information from Provost Alden and there was genuine excitement in that discussion. To give you some idea of the timeline, they’re looking at the formal release of the request for proposal next month. In 2007 there will be a utilization of a contract for the equipment and architectural planning. The groundbreaking won’t take place until 2008 with a proposal to start installing equipment in 2009 and treatments won’t actually begin until 2011 but again, there is a lot of excitement and part of it I think was due to the fact that it seemed like Board of Trustees members on this committee were actively involved in the planning. I think they actually went to visit similar treatment centers around the country, looked at places where equipment is available. I was very surprised that they took an active role in this entire process. Trustee Murer emphasized that this Proton Treatment Center offered the university national leadership potential and would also allow the integration of various academic programs in departments. When Dr. Alden provided input on program opportunities he specifically referred to Allied Health and Medical Sciences, Medical Physics, Residencies in association with local medical schools, radiation therapies and NIU and community colleges. There would also be addition work and emphases in childcare and education, physical therapy, occupational therapy, nursing practicum, speech and hearing and audiology, with a hospitality program and nutrition and others. So they’re excited about the various academic programs. So that really was the bulk of the meeting and again, much excitement. There’s also an approved amendment to the Board of Trustees Regulations regarding student residency status. As many of you know, NIU as President Peters said at the meeting, has a very “user-friendly” approach to accepting domiciled students compared to other states nearby and there was finally an approved amendment to the Board of Trustees Regulations regarding military and disaster relief leaves of absence for university employees. This was done to clarify some ambiguity and also to adapt to recent changes in state laws or executive orders specifically issued in reference to the Iraq conflict and hurricane Katrina.

There were also information items about the Fiscal Year programmatic budget requests. A possible change in the guarantee agency for the Federal Family Education Loan Program and they also set the dates for their meetings next year.

I have the Board reports here if you have any questions but that’s my report.

**P. Stoddard:** Does anyone have any questions? Okay.

**C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – report (Page 19)**

**P. Stoddard:** Next up is a report on Finance, Facilities, and Operations. That would be by me. They met right after the committee Ferald just reported on. We also heard a little bit about the Proton Therapy project. NIU has received $3.3 million in federal funds to help plan that and the
committee approved a request for proposals for technical specifications necessary to get that underway. In addition, they approved a performance contract and this is one of these things where a contractor comes in and provides new, for example, new and more efficient windows or doors and so forth and NIU doesn’t pay anything up front. We pay for the improvements out of the energy savings that these improvements create. That can take quite a while, twenty years or so. The contractor is alright with that and after twenty years we have windows and doors that we never paid for. In addition - well, we sort of did. In addition, of course, the quality of the dorm or the building is improved, less drafting conditions and so forth, so this really is a win/win situation for everybody involved. NIU is I think is properly proud of these types of arrangements.

They officially designated the Housing for Students with Dependents as “Northern View Community”. They had groundbreaking on that a month or so ago. That’s going to be out past the Convocation Center.

They approved money to remodel the Office of Financial Aid to provide privacy for students who are discussing their financial needs and they approved money to improve Parking Lot W which is on Annie Glidden near Grant Towers, a large lot that’s rock at the moment, gravel, it will be paved and a lot of other improvements will be made to it so it will be a more attractive lot primarily for students.

All those are actions that still have to be approved by the full Board before they go into effect. I’m going to bet that they all are in fact approved by the full Board.

Those were the major issues that they covered. I’ll be happy to take any questions. Seeing none, we’ve got Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. That would be Rachel Turner and Bobbi Cesarek.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Rachel Turner and Bobbie Cesarek – report (Pages 20-21)

B. Cesarek: Thank you. We had the opportunity to attend this Board of Trustees Committee meeting in Hoffman Estates. The only action item that was there was a presentation by Sharon Dowen who’s Director of our Internal Audit. They had done a self-evaluation with the help of an external independent validation organization and the only thing – they changed a couple of things with their charter which was voted on positively by the Board. The main thing they were concerned about is they do perform some consulting services along with their auditing and that was not addressed within their charter so they did formulate some language in there to address that particular consulting services. They upgraded a little bit more of the language otherwise and rearranged it a little bit. For the most part though the only major change was the addition of the consulting services portion and again, that was voted on positively by the Committee.

Other information items and I find it exciting because I’m not too much involved in politics and to be able to find out what’s going on at the state level and the national level really is kind of exciting especially as it involves higher education.
The first information item, however, was actually by Steve Cunningham and what it looks like they’ve been working on with their particular office is to try to assimilate all of the various forms and policies of the university in one location such that that can be presented more ably to those that are first coming on to the university to be able to find things and probably not only to those new people but those of us who have been here an awfully long time and don’t seem to know exactly where to hunt for policies and procedures relative to employee/employment activities and the items that they have indicated that they’ve worked on so far are listed in 1-5 and you can read those yourselves but it looks like it’s going to be a good thing. It’s in draft form at this point. I know the legal counsel wanted to take another look at it and make sure that things were appropriate from a legal perspective and that everything was indeed in order. Hopefully, that will be out and available in the not too distant future. Do you remember a date on that Rachel? I don’t think they posted a date yet but it looks like it’s going to be a real good thing for everybody at the institution to be a little bit better informed about employment at the institution.

Again, Ken Zehnder – what’s Ken’s official title – he’s a government liaison? Anyway, relative to the state level so he indicated some public acts, Illinois Public Acts, that were again – there was a list of about twenty of them. I pulled off just five again by state number. I’ve got them identified. I’m sure they’re available on the Board of Trustees website as well for you to take a look at but they really affected higher education. Same thing with a couple of resolutions and then dropping down to “E”, Kathy Buettner did the same thing provided kind of an overview of what’s going on at the federal level. I know she spends a lot of time not only in Springfield but also in Washington and she highlighted some appropriate things that you might want to take a look at. Again, the fact that the state appropriations budget probably was not – did pass some things again relative to our Proton Therapy facility and our Rockford Rapid Optimization of Commercial Knowledge project that’s been going on so we know have some funding through those. Thankfully, the budgets that were approved unfortunately at this time, were more of the, in the military range but those were included within that so those did get passed. Defense budget, sorry. Higher Education Reauthorization Act still has not passed at this point in time and we’re not sure, we’ve talked and I know you are familiar with the Spellings Commission. Right now, with the change in the legislature, we’re not quite sure where that is at this point in time but it’s potentially still out there.

The other thing please make note about, under “D” we have a new person on campus, Lori Clark. Her title is Coordinator for Agency Relations and Research Park Initiatives. She’s been given that title; she’s spending a lot of time, most of her time, in Chicago and she’s actually going to be looking at how we can, as an institution, work within the innovation economy, trying to work with all of the things that faculty do on campus that puts us at the forefront and mold that into where the economy is headed and be able to push that along and forward. So it seems like an exciting position that I think will be helpful to the institution and you particularly as faculty.

If you have further questions, I’d be more than willing to help in answering those as I can.

**P. Stoddard:** Any questions for Bobbi? Yeah?

**T. Sims:** What is Lori Clark’s relation to the Technology Transfer Office?
B. Cesarek: I’m sorry, I don’t know.

????: ???

B. Cesarek: Is she External Affairs? Thanks.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions?

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

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

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

P. Stoddard: Anybody want to move to adjourn? Let’s stand adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.