
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Welcome everybody. Glad you all found the room. Anybody here not find the room?

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Before we adopt the agenda, there are a couple of additions I would like to make to it. One is I have an item under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. I have something for us to consider and then we will have a report on Resource, Space and Budget. So can I get a motion to approve the agenda as amended? Thank you. Second? Thank you. Any other additions or comments on the agenda? All in favor of adopting say aye. Opposed? Abstained? Okay.

The agenda was adopted as amended. Novak made the motion; Thompson was the second.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 23, 2008 FS MEETING

(Pages 3-6)

P. Stoddard: Next up the minutes. Take a quick look at those. When ready feel free to move, second or any of that other good stuff. Can I get a motion? Thank you. Anybody want to – thank you. Any comments? I think this is the most carefully they’ve been examined all year. All in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed? Thank you.

The minutes were approved as written.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Under President’s Announcements we have a few reports and discussions we’d like to take care of. I think our first report is from Professor Castle. There she is.

A. Nancy Castle – Progress report on Athletic Director search committee

N. Castle: You all will be hearing from me many times today. My first report is as the Faculty Senate representative to the Athletic Director Search Committee. I just wanted to let you know that the university has hired Parker Executive Search Firm. They do higher ed and collegiate athletics. We’ve used them before. Dan Parker, the President of Parker Executive Search came to campus. As many of us on the committee that could met with him. They’re working on a job description to put out and my request to you all, I have been instructed to say, is that if you know people who would be good athletic director candidates you should forward their names. If you yourself would be a good athletic director candidate you could forward your name and if you’ve got names or if you want the e-mail address for the person to forward them to it’s Dan Parker. They’re out of Atlanta, Georgia and I’d be happy to give you the e-mail address for him. So be thinking about who you know that might be a good athletic director. The intent is to have this search signed, sealed and delivered and an announcement made by graduation so they’re moving pretty quickly. And that is it.

P. Stoddard: I have some connections at Northwestern. I hear they have a good athletic director. I said I have connections at Northwestern and I hear they have a good A.D.

N. Castle: ???

B. Carolinda Douglass – Report on Strategic Planning Taskforce

P. Stoddard: Next I see Carolinda did not make it today. Are you going to fill in for her Professor Castle?

N. Castle: I thought about trying to change my voice for these reports but I can’t do it. I am also the Faculty Senate rep to the Strategic Planning Committee. Just need to let you know that we – for the progress to date – is that the Strategic Planning Taskforce is divided into two subgroups that are further divided into sort of sub-taskforce groups. There’s the taskforce on student success and their subcommittees include retention, impacted majors, campus climate and V.S.A. which stands for Voluntary System of Accountability and that’s actually kind of a new twist for us. The V.S.A system is something that was designed by NASALGIC and the Association of State Colleges and Universities and it’s really designed as a sort of preemptive strike against the Department of Education as the Department of Education toys with coming up with accountability measures and so on. This V.S.A. is sort of the universities trying to take that mantel on themselves and so one of our subcommittees is addressing V.S.A. as a part of our Strategic Plan. Then the other taskforce subgroup is the Taskforce on Curriculum Innovation and those subcommittees include the Expanded Enhanced Engaged Learning, New Approaches to General Ed, Capstone Experiences, Implementation of a Themed Year, Honors Programs, Departmental Honors Programs and then Strategic Imperatives, University Wide Curricula. In
fact, some of those subgroups have kind of combined themselves. The Engaged Learning subgroup has sort of taken on Capstone Experiences and the Honors Programs, you know, as we all discuss what engaging students might involve. So we too are working on – we’re writing and rewriting and revisiting concept papers – many people who wrote concept papers are being contacted to say your concept paper might have been a little narrow in scope, i.e., specifically about your department but the idea fits in to something that we’re discussing that would be more campus wide. Would you be willing to revisit your idea and think about rewriting it with a broader perspective? So we are continuing to tweak and again the plan is to have something to the Provost by the end of the semester that would give him sort of marching orders to maybe get some things going starting in July and I think that’s it. Paul’s been around for some meetings. Many of you in this room are on some of the subcommittees as well and I know Greg Long is going to be talking about Gen Ed and he serves on that subcommittee. Are there any questions? That one’s done too!

C. Greg Long – General Education discussion

P. Stoddard: All right. Greg is here but Nancy if you’d like to talk for him instead we could --- we don’t need to go there. Nancy did provide a nice sagway for us. We do have a guest today, Greg Long, who does chair the General Education Committee and the General Education subcommittee of the Strategic Taskforce on Curricular Innovation and he has some ideas about General Education he’d like to share with us or at least get us thinking about in preparation for what we hope will be a campus wide discussion on General Ed at Northern.

G. Long: Thanks. I appreciate your inviting me to the meeting today. As both Paul and Nancy have said, my major reason for being here is to just give you an update on some things that are happening and also to solicit your support and feedback as well. Just as kind of a brief history, the General Education Program here at NIU was last reviewed thoroughly in 1983. So twenty-five years ago was the last time that we did a thorough reassessment of the program and I will tell you the only reason I became part of General Education is back about five years ago I developed a course, Disability in Society, that we wanted to put into General Education. The process for putting it into General Education was really painful. I’ve written grant proposals that are easier than the submission for the General Education and then I joined the committee because I wanted to figure out so how does this all work? Well I’ve now been on the committee for three years and this third year I’m the chair of the committee and there are lots of ways in which the committee – shall we say the General Education program doesn’t work as efficiently or as effectively as possible. From the standpoint of how many of you in here know the General Education goals for the university? Thank you for a couple of you. Many of your colleagues did not raise their hands. If you go on the website for NIU and type in General Education as a search term, there is no General Education website or other specific information that pops up. It’s difficult for us to identify what the specific student learning goals are associated with General Education and if we don’t have those clearly operationalized, we’re not doing a good job of assessing that and, you know, as you all know, the need or the push for reporting and assessment is great; both up, side, and downward to all of our constituencies. It’s not just a call for accountability but it’s just that sense of what do we think our students need to know? I mean what are the skills knowledgeabilities that a contemporary student should have to be successful in, you know, the global society concept that we keep talking about. So as a result of the
Curricular Innovations taskforce work and the General Education committee, we are proposing to put forth a proposal to the Provost’s Office to look at a kind of a large-scale, redefining and potentially restructuring General Education. The way that we’re looking at that is kind of a four step process. The first step would be initially to do some benchmarking; some assessment of where we’re at right now because while I can certainly I think we’ve got lots of areas of potential weakness, there are certainly, you know, that’s my antidotal evidence and I’d like to collect some data on it so it would be nice to know, for example, what’s the proportion of people of instructor rank in terms of who teaches General Education. You know, how many senior faculty teach Gen Ed versus how many adjuncts teach Gen Ed. Look at syllabi that are out there and, for example, in a Gen Ed course does the Gen Ed course indicate that it’s even a Gen Ed course because we have lots of faculty who are teaching Gen Ed courses who don’t even know that they’re teaching a Gen Ed course nor the specific student learning objectives in the General Education Program that should be endorsed within that particular course. So the idea would be first off to kind of figure out where we’re at with things. The second part of it that would be proposed – and this is an important part and one of the reasons I’m coming to you today – would be the idea of engaging campus wide discussion on what would make a meaningful General Education Program. What kinds of things do we want to look at there? How can we develop a program that aligns with NIU’s distinctive mission and goals? Because again right now the last time we looked at it was twenty-five years ago and, you know, things have changed. We all have computers now. Back in ’85 it wasn’t even there so – at least many of us didn’t have them then. So we would like to engage, you know, faculty, students, potentially alumni, potentially people from community colleges, you know, and get some input about what would make, you know, what are the specific ideas, knowledge that we want students to get as a result of being involved in the General Education Program. Gather that information, work again with the General Education Committee and relevant governing bodies to talk about – so what would then be an appropriate General Education Program? What would be the structure that’s necessary to make that program work? I mean, I don’t know if you all know this but in terms of the General Education Committee, right now we meet once a month for about an hour and a half eight times over the semester and that’s really not a sufficient amount of time to do significant, you know, review – thinking about what’s important, how we might want to design things differently and so forth. Then obviously, so we benchmark, we gather input from across the campus, we develop and come up with some ideas for how we might develop a Gen Ed Program that is a better fit for where we’re at with things and then as a result of all those things, then look at implementation. So at this point the major, again, the major reason for being here is just to say this is something that we are moving toward – or would like to move toward – as a first step in this endeavor. There’s a group of us who submitted a proposal and will be going to the University of Minnesota at the end of May to stay in the dorms so – there is some cost to this you know – we stay in the dorms and we have a five day conference on General Education. The idea being that we’d like to bring back some sort of a white paper or some sort of a document that could be used to initiate faculty discussion and university discussion on the components of General Education and, you know, wherever we might want to go with that. In terms of products that might result from this activity, if, you know, if it’s endorsed and if we run it all the way through, some of the products might be, for example, a General Education website that people could readily, you know, go to. We might provide some specific faculty support, whether it’s financial or instructional but how do we, you know, how do we make teaching General Education something that’s valued because a lot of people, I mean, not to be cold but a lot of people don’t value teaching General Education.
It tends to be at the lower end of things for a lot of ways in which faculty look at this. So how can we raise it? How can we make teaching General Education something that’s valuable? I think we need to work on teaching the students. The vast majority of the students don’t know anything about General Education other than it’s a series of courses that they view as a hurdle to get through and there’s very little rationale or argument for how it fits with, you know, your overall plan of study. Talk about things like do we add a diversity component to what we do? Do we add a service learning component to what we do? There’s many things to talk about. There’s lot of potential deliverable products that could result from this and so I would just ask, you know, as a group do you think that looking at General Education in a more thorough, systematic fashion is warranted at this point? This has to come from the faulty. I’m certainly making the push on it given my role as a General Ed professor and as chair of the committee because of the things that I see and go and see what’s going on but, you know, it ultimately has to be faculty driven. I’m here simply as a messenger to try to sell the idea and hopefully you’ll think it’s valuable.

So that’s where I’m at with things. I’m certainly open to answering any questions. I don’t have preconceived ideas for what I see the program being. I mean I’m looking at this from the standpoint of being a researcher, not as an educator who says this is how it has to be happen and so I’d like to do it from the standpoint of really truly, let’s benchmark where we’re at. Let’s engage the university, I mean, after 2/14 this is I think a prime time to engage in some self-reflection and talk about where we want to be what do we want to do with things. Use that information to help us guide and develop a program or enhance a program that is a better match. So I’m not suggesting that simply shuffling around a few courses. I think that’s – I think, you know, it’s important to think about this as a culture shift where we really, you know, think about General Education as a way of branding and showing a distinctive NIU kind of education. So that’s where I’m at so I thought I’d share it with you.

P. Stoddard: Thanks Greg. Any questions?

G. Kostic: Basically to maybe lay down some opposite opinion. General Education is a very, very useful thing. Nobody is arguing about it. The question is what is the optimum for education? We ??? a second to fix the first ??? from Economics and we having General Education to come and fix the deficiency in academics or whatever learning in high school or ??? and I was ??? with the faculty from ??? from ??? and they have ??? convention and they restructured their educational system and let’s say I’m from Engineering and the problem is five years and actually the figure is now four years and they said how come? They say they get rid of General Education. That’s something students have to do in high school and they certainly have computers and internet, you know, and if it comes down to just carrying a couple of easy courses, then it’s really not a General Education, it’s a second courses for students to get easy credits and we actually know why ???, you know, because of society but we are ??? let’s get rich quick, you know, inflate everything. So basically – don’t take me wrongly – I’m an Engineering faculty ??? and – my grey hair – and I am now actually totally enthusiastic to teach next semester our new General Education course, ENG 101, Energy and Environment, so I know for General Education but I’m now torn between, you know, the ??? and curriculum – what’s important here. Are we introducing our engineering major to general engineering education ??? might be below expectations and now we are talking about setting up whatever ??? for some courses that are
supposed to be ??? are in high school. This is just another opinion to say there is many ways to look at things and if we, you know, ??? we could make an argument and spend our time maybe at the expense of something else ???.

**G. Long:** Right and I agree with your opinion from the standpoint of there are many options in terms of how General Education might be done and lots of ways of looking at it. I’m just suggesting that we discuss it because as a faculty, we have not discussed this for twenty-five years in a meaningful way. So there are lots of models out there. I mean, you know, I’ve been doing lots of reading on this topic – it’s good bedtime reading – you know, and doing this kind of reading has really opened my eyes to there’s a multitude of possible ways in which General Education can be implemented. I mean, for example, there are some universities that incorporate General Education not just as a first, you know, sophomore – freshman and sophomore years – but they incorporate it into the majors. You know, that there could be – and ??? it’s like the General Education learning goals – are the students learning goals or objectives? How can those be looked at in a course within the major and not just as a unique aspect of a General Education course. So again, I’m not coming at this with an idea of how it should be but rather to solicit your input; to solicit anyone’s input and do it in a systematic way so we can put this together with some endorsement. Yes?

**W. Tolhurst:** My name is Bill Tolhurst. I’m in the Philosophy Department and I’d like to talk a little bit about our experience of General Education. Our department is a huge fan of General Education. I mean Philosophy couldn’t do better than that for General Education. I’m not prejudiced of course. But let me tell you what happened the last time around. We had two General Education courses that we dropped for General Education credit. One was the World Religions course which is your perfect General Education course if ever there was one because if people don’t need to know about various religious are similar to and different from one another these days, I don’t know what --- and why did we drop that course for General Ed. Because the process of getting it recertified was so cumbersome and capricious that it was insulting and we had better things to do with our time because we know that that course will fill up no matter whether it’s Gen Ed or not and as a result, the students at the lower levels have been denied the opportunity to use what would be a perfectly fine Gen Ed course because it’s just not worth the cost in labor. A second instance. For the same reason, we dropped a 300 level course which had been Gen Ed because of the cost in labor and aggravation of recertification so Philosophy of the Arts is no longer a Gen Ed course. I’m teaching it this semester; it filled up. I’d love to have Art majors in there again in greater numbers. They really add a lot to the course and I think it helps out the College of Visual and Performing Arts by giving them additional options which they don’t have to staff. So I think there are some real problems that will have to be addressed in the process of certifying courses as appropriate Gen Ed courses. Of course, assessment has got to be build in so there’s a seamless ??? there, right? But what we were finding was that the demand with regard to assessment were unrealistic and unreasonable.

**G. Long:** Right and I would agree with your concerns. The initial submission process and the resubmission process is painful and I don’t think that as a committee we have guidelines established in a way that is helpful to departments to give them the information. I would certainly see that one of the outcomes of the effort that we’re proposing would be a streamlined submission and resubmission process because I agree with you. It’s crazy to have a department
who has valuable courses, pull them from the General Education curriculum simply because the process of keeping them there is too arduous and so no, I fully support your concern on that and that is absolutely something we’ve talked about because, you know, even the documents we have right now need to be revised as, you know, again inside information – if you submit something for resubmission, we don’t even at this point have on the resubmission form submit your assessment data that tells us how well you’re doing to collect student learning objective data. We don’t have a lot of support for faculty. I mean, wouldn’t it be nice potentially to have say a list serve or some other information in which faculty who teach General Education can talk to one another, get some support because really, right now, we’re all operating very much in silos and that’s not a healthy way of doing it. So I absolutely support your concerns. They’re ones that we’ve thought about – I’ve read many letters from department chairs who are not happy with us. Okay – we know.

**P. Stoddard:** Kendall?

**K. Thu:** Well, having sat on the Gen Ed committee a few years ago with my colleague Paul Stoddard in the era when we were reviewing Gen Ed courses and actually streamlining the process, so what you have now is a lot better than what we had when we got it. I can tell you that.

**G. Long:** Really, wow – thank you.

**K. Thu:** Yeah, but we were working on Gen Ed issues when the issue of evaluations was starting to come to the fore. Basically what the Gen Ed committee was doing was simply certifying courses and approving them and recertifying and that sort of thing. There was no way to judge whether or not the Gen Ed courses were doing what they said they were going to do in terms of meeting Gen Ed goals. So part of what we did was do a survey. We had, I can’t remember who it was Paul, assess alumni to determine from their perspective whether the Gen Ed courses they had taken were doing what they said they did and what they discovered was that the kinds of goals that we had in Gen Ed courses like, you know, critical thinking skills, by and large people were getting those but they weren’t necessarily getting them from the Gen Ed courses. They were getting them from anywhere so it led me to think do we really have a Gen Ed program that does what it says it’s going to do? If you’re really going to assess Gen Ed courses, you would have to say okay, how can you discern what Gen Ed is providing separate from what students are getting from other major courses and the like. I don’t think that’s really that important as long and they’re getting what they need, they can get it from Gen Ed courses or they can get it elsewhere so I’m not sure how much time and effort I would want to put in, since I’ve already been there, how much time and effort I would want to get involved in reshuffling a Gen Ed program so long a we know students coming out of the university are getting what they need to get.

**G. Long:** Thanks.

**P. Stoddard:** Dr. Castle then Dr. Sons.
N. Castle: Just two things. One – it’s unfair because we actually talked about this in the Strategic Planning Committee – but sort of for the group to hear it, in any discussion of Gen Ed we need also to consider that a lot of our students come to Northern with their Gen Ed met by getting an associate degree somewhere so we have to figure some way to account for that when what we’re trying to do is figure out how to make the value added of an NIU degree and that combination of the Gen Ed and whatever else. The other thing is what I didn’t say in my report that I know you’re going to say in a minute Greg and you’ve said it is that anything that comes out of the Strategic Plan process that has an appropriate line of approval and so on through shared governance procedures, we are planning to do so curriculum committees, you know, and UCC and so on all of that will be involved so this isn’t your only chance to provide some input.

G. Long: I would just make a quick response in terms of the idea of transfer students. Again, it’s how you want to conceptualize the process. There are universities for example that look at General Education as going throughout the curriculum and is incorporated into the major for example and so that – one institution in particular I’m thinking of – has a special seminar for students who transfer in to help bring them up to speed in terms of how the university looks at General Education, gives them some specific skills, critical thinking kinds of activities. So there are models that are out there that do address, you know, how to educate students who are transfers into the overall kind of NIU philosophy and approach to things. So, you know, if you limit yourselves to thinking of it as a freshman/sophomore kind of activity, then you’re right. We lose out on anything we could do for transfer. If you think potentially more broadly, there are models out there that do specifically address how to bring transfer students into the fold. You know and again from an empirical standpoint it would be helpful for us to know so what are the differences between students who graduate with four years at NIU versus the students who graduate after only two years here. Is there value to being here four years versus two? What do we add to that? There are a number of unanswered questions that in this process we may be able to get some information.

P. Stoddard: Dr. Sons?

L. Sons: I was involved in 1983-84 and it was called the Baccalaureate Review Committee at that point in which we totally re-examined the undergraduate program – not just the individual – but represented in NIU Baccalaureate Degree, whether it came in any college, any major and the like and that’s how the current program got set into operation. I would comment that one of the things is if the website does not say what it’s all about, it’s the fault of whoever put together the website because that program was so well-defined and so written and our catalogues carry – some of it in shorthand as to what it’s all about. If you read the early part of the catalogue it’s there. What is it about, what is it supposed to do, what is the nature of the Gen Ed, why are these required and it’s my understanding this is told to students when they come for the orientation session. That someone does in fact give the general opinion of what is the Gen Ed program about and why do we have it?

G. Long: If they do that, it’s not with any consultation from the Gen Ed committee.

L. Sons: That may well be true but what I’m saying that the Gen Ed committee ought to take it as their responsibility to see that the website really does have what it ought to have in terms of
Gen Ed. That’s one point I want to make because I really think it’s the responsibility of that committee to see that those kinds of things are appropriate on the website for our students and for the external world period, you know, and that’s no defense particularly of what was done as it is. This ought to be there, right?

G. Long: Correct.

L. Sons: The second point I would make is that you should not forget that we do have an Illinois Articulation Initiative and we are thoroughly engrossed in that initiative and there is a lot of fear maybe is the word – I’m not sure whether that’s the word – on the part of our community colleges about really being accepted and you don’t accept our Gen Ed program, you think we’re some lower quality, blah, blah, blah, - whenever we do an examination of this we have to be thoroughly concerned about how this impacts transfer students and how transfer students connect with our program.

G. Long: Absolutely.

L. Sons: The idea of adding stuff as juniors is possible, you know, in terms of Gen Ed and that whole articulation but it has to be a really good connection what is natives versus transfers and how they come together in the scheme of things and that is a very, very touchy issue ---

G. Long: It is.

L. Sons: and you just have to be super careful about it.

G. Long: And again and part of the – I agree with you fully because we’ve talked about that because it’s obviously a huge issue and how do we make it unique and how do we incorporate them and do so as seamlessly as possible. That’s one of the reasons in terms of talking about the overall design of this type, it would be crucial community colleges involved in, you know, some of the discussions to figure out are there things that we can do but yes, the articulation agreement is a concern for a number of people.

L. Sons: I would urge us if we’re going to do this, and I think it’s a good idea to review. The Gen Ed program ought not to just sit sort of as, you know, it’s forever there. I mean, it ought to be reviewed periodically we ought to go thoroughly through and say why do we have these requirements; what are they there for? Should it be better for this day, you know, how should things change so I’m certainly not against any kind of review when I make the comments I’m making. I think the Baccalaureate Program at NIU ought to be NIU’s Baccalaureate Program. It ought not to be, you know, this is lovely as to what they did at “x” institution – I don’t care, fill in the blank – whatever one you think is wonderful but the notion is it’s NIU students and NIU students are a unique set of people coming from where they do. They demographics of our students really have to be taken into account. At the same time that our degrees are all good quality degrees whatever the area is that we’re in and the Gen Ed program performs a foundation for continuing work. Right? The freshmen for the most part don’t understand most of what they’re getting in the Gen Ed program. They may be learning courses and doing well in the courses but they don’t understand really that they’re getting something that’s foundational for
going on and doing other things even when you tell them that repeatedly. As someone who has taught freshman courses many, many times right? Later they may understand that they learn certain things from their courses but they may well not. The assessment issue as to a student who’s a junior or senior who has Math 101 as to whether they learned how to do a certain kind of thinking in Math 101, they don’t even known. If it’s nicely seamed and they work and they learn, I agree with Kendall in that respect, one should be very careful about how you assess this kind of thing with the notion of is it or isn’t it coming out a Gen Ed program.

G. Long: Certainly.

L. Sons: So there’s a lot of big issues here.

G. Long: Oh absolutely. Without a doubt. And another way of thinking about it too that was recently brought to my attention was kind of an eye opener is the idea that when you think about General Education, there’s a certain philosophy that would say the General Education goals, the student learning objectives, that are part of General Education should drive the course and not the content drive the course. So if you’ve got a General Education course where you’re emphasizing writing or critical thinking or whatever your top learning goals are, that that becomes a primary force behind how the course is organized and assessed and then the content is obviously part of that as well, but more often than not, it’s the content that we all focus on and oh yeah, we’ve got to do writing stuff or we’ve got to do something to show the Gen Ed program that we’re doing the right thing.

L. Sons: That was the last point I was going to make. What should drive what’s in Gen Ed programs is what are the objectives? What are we really trying to have the students learn out of General Education? There are lots and lots of good courses in the university. It would be wonderful if the student took this course or that course or this course – they ought to know this; it would be nice if they knew that – but really one has to start with what are the objectives of the Gen Ed program and then you design and figure out which courses go or don’t go.

P. Stoddard: I think that’s the discussion Greg was trying to get started on campus. Bill and then I think maybe we should try to move on.

W. Tolhurst: One of the things that strikes me is that if there are things that are wrong, we need to think carefully about what they are because it may well be that there’s absolutely nothing wrong with the Gen Ed objectives but rather there’s something about the ways in which things have been implemented that are problematic and so it’s really important not to jump to reinventing wheels that really are quite viable and it’s just a matter of fine turning and how we implement them. The second thing though was about the articulation stuff. Is it true that we couldn’t decide to have an upper level tier of Gen Ed that was designed to build on a lower level? I mean, we would still have the lower level Gen Ed stuff that would get satisfied by an associate’s degree at a community college but I don’t see why we should be bound to let their program substitute for our upper level Gen Ed if we decide to have that tier.

P. Stoddard: And I think that as long as it applied to native as well as transfer students, there wouldn’t be any problem.
W. Tolhurst: Yeah.

P. Stoddard: Well, thank you Greg. Very good discussion. Glad you got it started for us.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Moving on, the item for Faculty Senate Consideration – I got a note from the Provost today and this also is related to the Strategic Plan. They are instituting, you may remember, a Board of Trustee Professorship and in order to do that, we need to select people who will be Board of Trustee Professors. This is supposed to be a very prestigious award and so the Provost asking for a Faculty Senate representative to serve on the selection committee. If you plan on going up for this award or nominating someone for this award, you probably shouldn’t serve on the selection committee. Otherwise, I think anybody on the Senate who’s interested I would ask that you forward your name to me quickly. The Provost would like the process of selecting professors by April 11. That’s going to be the first meeting. That’s a week from Friday or thereabouts. So if you’re interested in serving on that committee or if you think somebody else from the Senate would be good to serve on that committee – check with them first – and then forward me that name or your name and I’ll make a selection perhaps with the help of the Executive Committee if need be as to who to forward to the Provost. So I ask that somebody do it or I’ll just pick a name out of a hat and you got a committee – it wouldn’t be quite out of a hat; it will be a small hat. Any questions about that? Information about that award by the way is available on the Strategic Plan website. They do have a website. That’s www.NIU.edu/strategicplan/board/index.html.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Moving on, nothing to consent to.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: We don’t have a report from the FAC. We do have reports from the various Board of Trustees committees. We’ll start with the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee and I’m going to guess Ferald has the report.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hanson – no report

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report (Pages 7-8)

F. Bryan: Yes, thank you Paul. The March 6 Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee I think is of special interest to us as every year this is the committee that approves sabbaticals and it met with Vice-Chair Bob Boey presiding. It’s important to note that two years ago Committee Chair Barbara Georgi Vella encouraged the Provost to have sabbatical presentations in front of this committee. This is not something in the Constitution or Bylaws, this is something that the Chair of the Committee requested so this year,
in fact, before they moved to the action items of the Committee, that they heard two sabbatical leave reports from the previous year. We heard Professor Laurel Jeris from the Department of Counseling, Adult and Higher Education doing a summary of her research in Sri Lanka and Presidential Research Professor Donald Richgels from the Department of Literacy Education reported on his study of “Assessing Preschoolers and Kindergarteners on ‘Invented Spelling’”. I think it’s really interesting that the Boars seemed genuinely fascinated. They asked many good questions. They seemed really taken by these reports and of course at the end, acting Chair Bob Boey made his staunch defense of sabbaticals and I think that’s very important. He’s a good ally in terms of supporting faculty sabbaticals.

I think most of the university report action items are already familiar to most of you but I will mention that indeed, all 50 faculty/SPS sabbatical leave requests were approved. We approved new minors in Mechanical Engineering and new emphasis in Mechatronics and I still don’t know what that is. They approved a new specialization in Nanoscience and accept the Oral English Proficiency Annual Report.

Under Informational Items, I think the new Master of Arts in Teaching and Master of Science in Teaching degrees were in fact later dealt with in the Board of Trustees reports which we’ll hear from Paul in a few minutes. The fees for the Master of Arts in Accounting I think were also a little controversial later in the day and I think we’ll hear about that action item in a few minutes as well. They also received the Programmatic Budget Requests and Increment Summary Reports and also they heard and accepted the annual IBHE Report on Underrepresented Groups. I do have those full reports for you if you have any questions, I’d be happy to try to answer them. That concludes my report.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Ferald. Any questions? If not, moving on we have Finance, Facilities, and Operations. Is Nancy Castle here?

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Nancy Castle – report (Pages 9-10)

N. Castle: Okay, your Finance, Facilities, and Operations report is page 9 in your packet. Of interest is fees went up. A lot of it sort of out of our control. Health insurance is a negotiated thing and they kind of dictate what it’s going to be. A lot of the other fees that went up, the Committees that voted on doing that to make the recommendations to the Board included student representation and so all in all, while we’re sad to see this happen, you know prices are going up and so we have to to be sure expenses are met. Of particular interest to you all on page 10, should be that the parking lot in front of the HR building is finally going to be repaved so they requested a budget and the permission to move forward on that. The Proton Therapy Treatment – they authorized the ability to proceed with final terms of a development agreement which was really primarily grant funds and so that was kind of a pass through but because of the amount, the dollar amount, the Board of Trustees has to approve that so the subcommittee recommended to the Board to do that. The third thing, as was just mentioned, was that the Master of Accounting Science – it was recommended to the Board of Trustees and I believe Paul will talk about this in a minute, that permission be given to attach an additional $200 per credit hour for the 30 credits that make the difference between a Bachelor in Accounting and the Master of
Account Science. It is starting at $200 and by the year 2012 will be $275 per credit extra. It’s a differential fee; there was a lot of discussion about that. President Peters said he generally isn’t in support of differential fees but that the argument for this one was compelling in that it had to do with the ability to continue to attract outstanding students to maintain a program that has national ranking and the funds generated were really going to be turned back around and put back in to the program, hiring some staff to coordinate and so on. So there was a great deal of discussion about that. The new Trustee Butler, who was a student here many years ago, was a faculty member here many years ago, he asked a number of questions about that because there would be some sense of maybe setting a precedent and so there was lively discussion and they voted to approve it but remember this committee just moves stuff forward to the full Board. It’s the full Board that makes the final decision.

So that’s my report on FFOBOT.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you. Any questions for Dr. Castle? All right, if not then Legislative Oversight. It looks like Jay is ready to give that.

**D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – [report](Page 11)**

**J. Monteiro:** The report is on page 11. After the roll call was called it was determined that there was not a quorum for this meeting but we did go through informational items. I’ll just touch on a few of these briefly. In the General assembly Report they talked about a few of the House Bills. HB1434 – they’re looking to allow community colleges to offer 4 year degrees. As you can see, that’s led by Harper College in Palatine. HB4621 which will require universities to admit students from approved high schools if their grade point average is in the top 10% of that student’s high school graduating class. HB4625 which is an amendment to the Illinois Veteran Grant which will include a reimbursement for 50% of the cost of textbooks.

Moving down to the Fiscal 2008 Budget Update – the Governor has suggested a 4% across the board reduction for FY09 but that does not include higher education. In fact, it was mentioned that K-12 may have an increase.

The Congressional Report – they’re working on reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. It has passed both houses and is now in Conference Committee.

Down to the President’s budget – they’re improved an increase of $69 which brings the PELL Grants back up to FY07 levels. LEAP and Perkins Loan programs were eliminated but they expect that to be included in any budget that Congress approves later this year.

That’s my report.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you Jay. Any questions for Jay? Yes, Ferald?

**F. Bryan:** Was there any explanation for why there was the cut in the CHANCE program?
J. Monteiro: No, but they expect it to be reinstated.

F. Bryan: I would imagine at the State Senate level perhaps?

J. Monteiro: Correct.

F. Bryan: Okay, thanks.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions? All right, thank you again Jay.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report

P. Stoddard: Next is the report on the full Board. They met last Thursday. They approved everything that you just heard. Thank you. Before they did all that and they did all that in actually a very quick time with very little discussion about most issues. They did talk a little bit about the Master of Accountancy Science or Master of Science in Accountancy fee but that discussion didn’t last long. I think most of that was hashed out as Dr. Castle reported. Before they really got started though, and I think this is probably the last of the major press presence on campus related to February 14, but there was a fair amount of press there because this was the first full Board meeting since those events and Chairman Murer took the opportunity to comment on the events, on the university’s response to the events. She asked for and received a moment of silence in memory of the victims of that day and then went on, and I believe that’s the reason the press was there, to talk about looking in to the response of that day, the university’s response. She noted that the state of Illinois under Governor Blagojevich had already, in response to Virginia Tech’s tragedy, the one year anniversary of which will be in a couple of weeks, April 16, the state of Illinois had been looking at how universities should prepare for such an eventuality here and that taskforce has looked at and is looking at our response to February 14 and they are expected to present their results to our Board of Trustees for their June meeting. The Chairman however also called for an internal review by the university whose report is due to the Board of Trustees by their September meeting. So some of us I suspect are going to be busy this summer. There is already a group on campus looking at Northern’s state of preparedness in light of the Virginia Tech event. Virginia Tech of course after their event, the Governor or Virginia requested a report on how Virginia Tech responded, what they did right, what they did wrong and this group at Northern, Chaired by Chief Grady, has been going through that report recommendation by recommendation figuring out which of those recommendations applies to Northern – virtually all of them in some fashion if only tangentially do – whether or not we should follow up on those recommendations. I would say most recommendations we should based on what we’ve talked about and the pros and cons of doing so and then our status as to where we actually stand. I think as a result of that exercise, we actually did very well compared to what other institutions, well, there haven’t been too many others fortunately but compared to other places where things have gone on similar to this in the past. I mean in some ways, the event was very, very quick and Virginia Tech got into trouble because there was two different events separated by several hours and that created a very tricky situation for them. Our event was started and over in minutes but even after that, in terms of the response, the counselors that we had and how we dealt with, you know, classes and memorials and everything else, all of that went as smoothly as it did – not to say that there couldn’t have been improvements – but it went
as smoothly as it did because we had been thinking about this for the semester and a half before the event itself. I wouldn’t be surprised if a lot of that taskforce is called upon to extend their work and then look at what’s going to happen or, I’m sorry, look at what did happen here after 2/14. But anyway, there will be a board put together. The President will announce who those people are and they are to have their report to the Board of Trustees by September.

Other than that, as Nancy said, the Chairman also announced the Proton Facility had been granted a certificate of exemption by the state of Illinois. This is a major hurdle to be cleared; we did. We’re the only facility in northern Illinois to have cleared that hurdle so I know there’s some concern about a rival facility that’s being planned. They have not yet been issued that certificate and that means essentially we have two years now to get our first patient and so there’s a timeframe for you. Afterwards the President spoke a little bit about the impact of February 14. They then went into the business portion of the meeting. Most of that has been reported on already.

A couple of other things. We got a report from Mallory Simpson from the Foundation regarding the February 14 scholarship fund. This is something they are not actively pursuing. They’re not calling up people and saying please contribute to this. They just provide information to anybody who asks for it and collects checks from anybody who signs them and so far they have collected, or as of last Thursday, they had collected $219,000 from 975 donors to that. It goes into the general fund and is going to be used for scholarships. They’re looking for five endowed scholarships, one for each of the victims – in memory of each of the victims. She also talked about the True North Campaign which is a different campaign whose goal is to raise $150 million dollars. They’ve raised $118.6 million of that so far so they’re in good shape and if my notes are correct, they’re looking out of the $150 million, $31 million is to go towards a permanent endowment and they’re raised $17.6 million of that $31 million.

They also announced a new Dean of the Libraries has been hired and that would be Patrick Dawson. I don’t have a lot of details about him but they finally have had a successful search over there and so I know one person who will be happy about that and who wasn’t happy to be asked to do the job for a little while.

Anyway, that’s all I have from the Board of Trustees. I’ll be happy to take any questions anybody might have. Yes, Kendall and then Dr. Scherer.

K. Thu: Is this taskforce that’s being requested, is it going to attend to a kind of final university or police department report on the course of events on February 14?

P. Stoddard: I suspect it will be modeled after the Virginia Tech Taskforce report and that one worried about the chain of events, the actual – what happened, when did it happen, how quickly did people respond, how quickly was the university community notified of what was going on and so forth and then the more long-term response in terms of, you know, counseling and information, getting information out to the public which, you know, doesn’t seem perhaps as important but that was a major public relations nightmare for Virginia Tech. So it’s going to – they’ve worried about it a lot. There’ll probably also be some discussion about, you know, searching for red flags. Is there anyway, you know, this individual could have been identified as
a person of interest or a person of concern before February 14. Our situation is kind of unique in that this was not somebody who was here at the time and came back here to do what he did. But I suspect it’s going to encompass all of those things.

K. Thu: I think there has been some concern expressed about providing information about the course of the investigation in the aftermath of February 14 and I think it’s similar in kind if not extent, to what we talked in terms of the investigation into the racial graffiti last semester that occurred at semester’s end. We didn’t hear any follow-up to that investigation in the aftermath of that and I – there’s similar sorts of sentiments concerning the investigation as a follow-up to the February 14 tragedy.

P. Stoddard: These are two different types of events. I mean the first one, I don’t know if it’s ongoing, but, you know, a good rules of thumb when dealing with these things if you haven’t heard anything, that’s because there’s nothing to report. If they had somebody of interest or if they had suspects, you know, they’d be happy to tell you about that. But this is no longer, February 14, is no longer a criminal investigation. There is nobody to arrest, there’s no trial to worry about, there are no charges to bring. The only investigation really would be what motivated this individual which from what I’ve seen is going – that’s always a very difficult thing to determine but – and it’s not so much a police matter as, you know, I don’t know who else ---

K. Thu: Even if that stuff is open-ended, knowing why you don’t know it is very important as well.

P. Stoddard: Um-huh. Fair enough, fair enough. Dr. Scherer and then Dr. Miller.

D. Scherer: I was wondering whether the Board was apprised of the departure of Dr. Bose and if that was discussed at all?

P. Stoddard: They were apprised of that. People said thank you and good luck basically. There was not much discussion of it. It was a done deal, you know, they don’t have to approve it obviously and, you know, obviously there’s going to be a search for that position as well but I don’t know that that committee – I think they’re just beginning to form that search committee if I’m correct. So not too much mentioned.

B. Miller: My question has to do with the 2/14 issue and I’m not sure if the Board of Trustees’ taskforce would be the one that would deal with this or if there’s another entity on campus but I am wondering about feedback from the other perspective. I’ve heard people requesting information about Cole Hall. I’ve heard people requesting information for archives and a lot of sort of separate kinds of information but I haven’t heard people asking for information about how well we did in terms of student support, faculty support, how did people feel about the counselors being on campus and how well they helped the faculty? How were the resources and – but I have heard people talk in the hallways and behind the scenes – I have heard students talk about how effective it was or not effective it was and I don’t think there’s been any assessment of this process. It’s sort of like well, we did it and therefore it must be good and I think that in this process there needs to be some sort of feedback about whether this was useful, whether it
was beneficial and just simply saying we had 300 counselors on campus therefore we did the right thing is not sufficient. You know, it’s fine for public relations but I think there was, in a number of places, a lot of – a lot of places where there were holes and a lot of places where faculty attended workshops and were, to my best knowledge, instructed to say something. They were directed to acknowledge that there was an event but according to my students, and in one class – a Gen Ed class – I asked my students how many of them had faculty mention the event and 90% of my students said – and this was on Tuesday after they returned to class on Monday – their professors did not acknowledge the event. I find that discouraging and they were very upset so, I mean, I think there are a number of places where that regardless of what it looks like on paper, students and some faculty feel unsupported and I think having counselors on campus Monday and Tuesday during day classes and not necessarily there in night classes – classes that met for the first time and Wednesday and no counselors available on Wednesday and Thursday classes that met for the first time – nobody there. Counselors who sat in graduate classes – well, you’re graduate students. You’re adults; you don’t really need me here to be problematic and I don’t know where the place is for this feedback to go but I haven’t heard anybody asking for that.

P. Stoddard: I suspect, I mean, that is something the taskforce ought to be looking at. I’m sure they will address the issue of support in the immediate aftermath if they do their job correctly and that’s our job to make sure that they do, then they will be asking those questions. How effective were the counselors? How universal was their ability to help? You know, did people fall through the cracks, you know? And we ought to be asking even now are there people who fell through the cracks who still need some sort of service. I mean – and there are opportunities on campus both for faculty and students – and there is a long-term presence that’s supposed to be there. I mean, you know, we have our Wellness Center. We have various things on campus and as faculty I suppose we have access as adults with jobs, access to, you know, outside sources of counseling as well as do many students. But there are on campus things and so, but yes, you’re absolutely right and that is a point that we need to make with the taskforce is that they need to take a very critical look and we may come up – and I’ll get to you in a second – we may come up with answers that are going to be difficult. I mean I have a few questions of my own that are going to cause one or two people some hard feelings perhaps. Frankly, it was half an hour before I officially heard that anything was going on on campus. I had heard unofficially well before that. My mother had called me actually from Vermont before I had officially heard from campus what was going on. So that, you know, there are issues that need to be addressed. There are things that could have gone better and it’s important not to try to whitewash this because, as tragic as it is, we did as well as we did because we knew what happened at Virginia Tech. The next place this happens to will do as well as they do because they knew what happened here. So it is very important that we address those questions and I think that taskforce is the place where those concerns need to be raised.

B. Miller: Okay.

M. Morris: The question that I have – oh, sorry about that. The question that I have is for my colleague who just spoke. Lisa, my colleague sitting next to me, and I were both very surprised to hear that your students had not heard anything or had not been asked to share anything about the events of February 14 in your class and she didn’t know either. What department are you in?
B. Miller: I’m in FC&S and I teach a Gen Ed class so my students were reporting their experiences not in my department. They were reporting on other departments their experiences.

M. Morris: The reason I was so surprised was because in both in my classes where I did ask my students to speak about it, those – my students, many of them made references to comments that they had heard or exchanged with other students in other classes as well and so I was just really taken aback by what you said.

B. Miller: Yeah, and I know that, you know, it’s a selected sample and I’m not saying that that happened university wide but it was a Gen Ed; it was a cross section and those students had been in class the entire day before and ---

P. Stoddard: That’s an assumption. Most students arrange their classes to be Tuesday, Thursday or Monday, Wednesday, Friday.

B. Miller: Well, okay.

P. Stoddard: So, I mean ---

B. Miller: I mean, they had, you know, it was an 8:00 on Tuesday and they’d all been in classes the day before and they were reporting specific events and what had happened in their classes so, you know, and I know it’s not necessarily representative but the point is that there were 100 students who were, you know, or a sample of 100 students who had had negative experiences and I kept hearing it for two weeks.

P. Stoddard: Well again, there needs to be a mechanism and I ---

B. Miller: And I keep getting e-mails from people saying, you know, we want your information, your input about these other things. We want your archive information, we want --- you know, your e-mails and your class projects and we want, you know, this other information but nobody is asking what else happened and that’s why I think there’s sort of a disconnect about the real experience about what happened in those weeks after.

P. Stoddard: Right. Okay. Kendall?

K. Thu: Real briefly. Since I serve on the Institutional Review Board for the university where we review all research projects that involve human subjects, I can tell you there are at least two research projects that are in the works to study the aftermath of the events of February 14. I can’t remember the details but I believe there are issues in those studies regarding the responses and students’ experiences so those projects may illuminate some of the issues that you raised.

P. Stoddard: I guess while we’re on the subject I should also update everybody – I think everybody should have received an e-mail from me last week about Cole Hall and the future of Cole Hall asking for input. I received about 100 responses so far through the drop box, a few e-mails, we’ve had one discussion group which was not terribly well attended but was a good
discussion anyway and just to let you know where the trends are going. Most people seem not in favor of tearing the building down. A lot of people worry about the cost of doing this. A lot of people are still focused on that 40 million dollars however which is not a number that anybody should pay any attention to. That was made up at a ??? and it went away to where it came from. So, you know, whether or not Cole is torn down – my suspicious is that if it’s torn down, it will be only because it’s cheaper to tear it down than it is to totally renovate it if the decision is to totally renovate it. A lot of people did express concern about ever teaching in that building again, especially in the classroom, the specific classroom that was affected. I’d say maybe 20-25% of the respondents expressed concern about that. That’s just where we stand. There will be, you know I’m holding a couple of lunch sessions next week, Monday and Tuesday, at the Blackhawk if anybody wants to talk about it then. I’ll be bringing a crossword puzzle in case nobody shows up so --- don’t feel bad if you desert me. Otherwise, you know, it’s been pretty interesting reading all the comments and so forth but once we get that and the goal again is to get all that feedback both Bobbie who just left and Jay have been working on getting feedback from their constituent groups. There will be alumni feedback and so forth and then we’ll all get together and have a discussion and talk about responses we’ve gotten. We’ll formulate two or three proposals – tear down the building, build this, renovate and do this, whatever. Then Dr. Williams will price each of those out and then the final decision – I think the idea is to come back to our constituent groups, you guys, and get your opinions based on the prices and the specific proposals and then again, the idea is to make a decision before the end of classes in May – well, I don’t know – the end of classes – graduation in May at any rate. So that’s the process that’s going on there. There’s a separate process to decide on an appropriate memorial. I suspect that that and Cole Hall may or may not be linked. If the memorial is to go in Cole Hall then obviously the two issues are – if it isn’t, then they can be separate. Then there’s a third group on campus looking at the class space issue and I think class schedules – I know mine has just come out and I know I went from teaching Tuesdays, Thursdays at 11:00 in Cole Hall to teaching Tuesdays, Thursdays at 5:00 in Barsema Hall as a result of the classroom crunch. So this is clearly and 5:00 in Barsema Hall doesn’t bother me but I suspect it bothers a lot of students to meet at 5:00. This is clearly a situation that we really can’t let go on for a long period of time so some decisions have to be made about classroom space as well as the result of the Cole Hall lecture rooms. So, we are proceeding on those three fronts and again, the President wants all this handled as quickly but as thoroughly as possible. I mean obviously that first tear it down and build something really fancy for $40 million was a knee jerk reaction. It got all the attention it deserved and it went the direction it deserved which is away.

So that’s where we stand. Any questions on Cole Hall and related issues? If not, we do have a couple of things we need to do this afternoon and the first of those is a report from Professor Thu.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair – report (Pages 12-13)

K. Thu: Well I have a report on pages 12 and 13 from the Academic Affairs Committee. I’m back in the Mesozoic. We were assigned the task of addressing two questions which one was “how are multiple section courses coordinated within departments, schools, or divisions?” and
then “how are student course evaluations used in faculty merit reviews?” So to address those two questions we drafted and agreed upon a simple questionnaire that was sent out to departmental, division and school heads and the results are summarized on pages 12 and 13. In response to the first question “how are multiple section courses coordinated” we got a total of 17 responses from the 44 department chairs and division heads and I was hesitant to pester them too much but the general result is that the number of regular multiple section courses varies widely and the level of coordination varies as well and not surprisingly, the level of coordination is a byproduct of either professional certification requirements or the subject matter requirements. Nonetheless, all the departments have some level of coordination ranging from, you know, formal sharing of syllabi, requirements for certification being shared very closely to informal sharing of syllabi for Gen Ed courses that have similar content. So the general answer is that some level of coordination does occur across all classes with multiple section courses and that the level of coordination is simply a consequence of the level of required professional certification or course requirements.

The second question “how are student courses evaluations used in merit reviews across the university”? again we put together a four question questionnaire, sent it out to same chairs and heads. We got 16 responses. All of the departments and divisions indicated that they used student evaluations. In fact, the merit reviews, save one – although that one department said well, we’re interested in doing that after you’re done with your survey. The range of mechanisms used to incorporate student evaluations in the faculty reviews really varied. Some departments like Anthropology and Music had highly quantified mechanisms for incorporating them. Other departments were must more subjective. Nonetheless, all departments used student evaluations and provided them to the departmental chairs and the personnel committees and they used them as they saw fit. And so it’s not surprising that given the diverse range of teaching styles, the diverse range of subject matter across campus that there would be a variety of ways in which student evaluations are used in faculty evaluations and I think that’s appropriate. So the answer to the question is that student evaluations are in fact being used in faculty merit reviews. And I have to add that when I wrote this draft report, I didn’t have it signed off on by all of my Academic Affairs Committee members so if those of you who are on the committee want to add your comments now, feel free?

**P. Stoddard:** Any questions for Kendall? I had a brief one. You said 17 responded and 16 responded to the second?

**K. Thu:** That’s correct.

**P. Stoddard:** Do you have a feel for how much overlap there was? Was it the same 16?

**K. Thu:** Yes, a lot of overlap. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, so we know there are 16 departments we can go to for information. Moving on I don’t believe we have a report from Economic Status. We do have a walk in report from Resource, Space and Budget.

**B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair – no report**
C. Resource, Space and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair – report

L. Derscheid: C. T. is not here so I’ll briefly review what we had talked about. This was back on February 27 so after the February 14 event. That was the particular day and we sort of had the first rush of hey, there might be the possibility we might have $40 million worth to replace Cole and so it seemed sort of exciting at the time. Although we were still cautiously optimistic about it.

So Associate Vice President Albanese talked with our Resource, Space and Budget Committee about other issues besides the possibility of replacing Cole Hall. The Proton Therapy Center – at that time we weren’t quite sure if all the funding, federal funding, had gone through. Some discussion about how NIU has expended all of its budget for snow removal because of all the snow and at that time we still had lots of snow and there was concern was were there still going to be resources and money to handle all the snow and he said yes, because it has been a long winter, it was a long winter.

We also talked about the energy costs being saved through the performance contracts and since there’s been no state increase in budgets for operational costs including energy costs, this has been a big help to have these performance contracts. This summer they’re working on an energy saving project, a new chiller plant close to the Campus Life building for East campus since the one got flooded, I think they’re trying to think about ways to preserve that one. Next summer there are some plans for a demonstration wind project west of the Convocation Center. Plans for a parking deck with solar panels are also in the works, so thinking about how to make NIU more green I think.

Capitol improvement projects – Stevens is still at the top of the priority and hoping that the state legislature will finally recognize the importance of keeping our buildings safe for everyone.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. Any questions? All right. Moving on. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. I don’t think they have anything and Alan left. Rules and Governance – swinking violet – Nancy?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Alan Rosenbaum, Chair – no report

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – report

N. Castle: It’s like a cornucopia of Castle today. Actually, I have three things. The first is just that I have to officially put on record that at the next meeting we’re supposed to ask our Grad Council rep and our UCC rep to report so that’s just putting that on record.

1. Article 3 Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate – ACTION ITEM (Pages 14-15)

N. Castle: The other two things we have to talk about today, the first is a second reading of something that we passed the first reading at the last meeting and that had to do with committee
membership on the Faculty Senate subcommittees and if you look at page 14, our committee recommended an insertion that is there in italics. It really has to do with how we deal with the colleges that have three or four departments and schools in them when we’ve got something like a million subcommittees in the Faculty Senate and so you all passed this on the first reading and I move that we make the change to the Bylaws concerning the standing committee membership and I need a second so we can discuss it.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, we’ve got several seconds. Any discussion on the proposed change? All right. All in favor say aye. All opposed? Any abstentions? Anybody wishing to vote present? Okay, next.

2. **Placement of Statement of Professional Ethics (Pages 16-17)**

**N. Castle:** The second thing is our committee was asked to look at the Ethics statement that currently was passed in 2001 by the University Council and that as of now really only resides on the internet on the home page for the University Council and Faculty Senate and we were asked to look at this Ethics statement and to come up with two things. One, is there a better place to put this and two, what would be ways to kind of put some teeth into it. So we did review the Ethics statement and at Paul’s suggestion, I forwarded this question to Steve Cunningham in HR and asked him, you know, what teeth already existed and so what you have in your handout in that box is Steve’s very thought through response saying, you know, a lot of the topics are actually in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual and he gave the website for that. The things in the Ethics statement that you also have in your packet having to do with integrity and property and grievance procedures, a lot of these things do exist in a variety of places already accessible; a lot of them through the APPM or through HR and so I am bringing this back to the group but I will alert you that at the Executive Committee meeting we had a discussion about it and I think Paul is going to make a suggestion about what we might do with this information. So I open it for discussion. Paul?

**P. Stoddard:** Well, okay I guess that – um, this is located on our website, Faculty Senate does have one which is located off the University Council website. I guess my suggestion, you know, we’ve had this and then we have the appropriate links also listed on the website so that if there’s information about any of the individual things Nancy just talked about and you wanted to know – gee, my colleague is not behaving very ethically; who do I see about that or I’m not behaving very ethically, who do I see about that – links that would help guide you. Also anybody like the Faculty Personnel Advisor or Faculty Senate President or might have some concern about those types of issues would also have all that information in one spot or at least links in one spot. I mean, the original thought was where should this go, I mean, it doesn’t really belong in the Bylaws; it’s not a Bylaw per se. It might go in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual; I suppose it’s something of a policy and so – but nothing strong ever came out of that. Unless somebody has a strong feeling, you know, we can leave it as part of the Faculty Senate webpage. I don’t know, those are about as many thoughts as I had. Nancy?

**N. Castle:** Paul, don’t you remember the discussion we had about reinstituting a faculty handbook?
P. Stoddard: Oh yes, thank you! We need to reinstitute a faculty handbook. Last faculty handbook that was published came in 1989 which coincidently was my first year here so I remember this thing. It was, you know, a nice book about 8 ½” by 11” and a lot of pages and as I sat on more committees and see more things, it’s apparent that there’s an awful lot of information that faculty ought to be aware of and, you know, a lot of times you don’t even know that the information exists, much less where to find it if it did exist. So my thinking is that needs to be place where we can put all of this including the Ethics statement, policies, support, things like retention of grading materials, how long – nobody ever told me how long to hold that stuff – I still have scantron sheets from 1989 as it turns out. So how long – you know, all these types of bits of information that are scattered throughout various documents and websites and we should have someplace, Faculty Senate generated, for all this Faculty Senate information. I believe Operating Staff and Supportive Professional Staff are working on similar things – oh, they have already – such things and there’s a lot of redundant information in there so we might work with them. So I’m going to ask, not today, but for you to think about helping. What sort of information needs to be in this and if you know where to find it, let me know that. I probably know where to find a lot of it but just suggestions on the types of information and then sometime over the summer, over the course of next year, I’d like to actually get something put together. It doesn’t have to be finalized because it’s online and additions can be made to that continually. But at least get a first draft of something in there and then we can keep building on it as more and more bits of information becomes apparent that we need to have readily available. So just be thinking about that. I suppose the net time we’ll make a more formal call for help; anybody who wants to help put it together or who has information.

T. Fisher: So it’s ??? suggesting an electronic faculty handbook updated by the Faculty Senate? Is that what you’re ---

P. Stoddard: Yes.

T. Fisher: Okay.

P. Stoddard: Thank you.

T. Fisher: So that it’s pretty easy for someone in your – you have some resources to keep that up?

P. Stoddard: Yes. Bill?

W. Tolhurst: Real quick. Since it seems as though there is a lot of redundancy already I think it really is important that we take a look at everything that’s out there so as to eliminate as much of that as possible because it’s likely to lead to confusion.

P. Stoddard: We’ll generate a committee – a redundancy committee. Nancy and then Linda?

N. Castle: Waiting for you to make that suggestion, I was going to say that one of the comments that came back from my committee was that they felt that this information and information for faculty should be some place on the web that is not just connected to UC or Faculty Senate
unless there’s a reference to it in that many faculty if they are not members of UC or FS, wouldn’t think to look there for this information so I the idea of the handbook is a good place to put it.

**P. Stoddard:** Well what I’d like to generate actually is a FAQ for faculty. A page, you know, there would be a link to from the A-Z index and that might bring you to the faculty handbook eventually but I mean, even a faculty handbook with all this information might not be the most useful thing if it gets too big then it becomes unwieldy. You’d like to be able to just have questions – you know, you remember “Just Ask Jeez” you type in a question and magically the answer appears and hopefully it bore some resemblance to reality but, you know, I’d like to try to set up the same sort of system where there are frequently asked questions and you go and you look them up and they take you to links in this handbook or links elsewhere where you find the answers. Yes, I agree. It needs to be someplace other than just some little backwater on the website. Linda?

**L. Sons:** Two quick comments. One is I think that we should be sure that all of our new faculty know things like this. We have an annual we have to go through all this Ethics what not for the state. This kind of statement is what really applies to faculty. This is the thing that faculty really ought to know and new faculty particularly coming in ought to see that this is a document that’s there and this is what is really part of what we really subscribe to as far as ethics are concerned and its been agreed on across the university in the sense that it’s gone through the University Council. So there ought to be that kind of a statement and otherwise I think there ought to be a faculty handbook on line that people can look at and find this information. It probably technically comes out of the Provost’s Office from the standpoint that he’s the higher whatever of all faculty in some sense but there ought to be a way that everyone knows that the faculty handbook is there and this kind of information is in it and you can take the topics that are currently there in the old handbook and just start running down the list and seeing what has to be added.

**P. Stoddard:** I agree. That’s a good suggestion about the new faculty. I know Murali Krishnamurthi does a new faculty orientation each August I guess it is and certainly this is information that could be included with that. We don’t get all of our new faculty but, I mean, that’s one place to get this to and then whatever other packets new faculty get. I agree this is the type of thing that should be in there because this is more – this is what we came up with as a faculty several years ago. Beth?

**B. Miller:** At the risk of being ???, I’m wondering why the behavior of faculty to be ethically professional and ethical would not be a policy? You said it didn’t belong in the policy ---

**P. Stoddard:** I said it might not and it might.

**B. Miller:** Because it seems to me that when we read this that we have obligations to behave in the community of scholars – that we cannot exploit, harass other faculty members or staff, that we respect each other – these seem to me to be places where if we did behave this way we would be violating our policies and it seems therefore a place where we would ---
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P. Stoddard: It might be and we can reconsider that. When I look at the APPM, it reads more as Academic Policies and Procedures rather than Academic Policies or Procedures. In other words, everything in there has sort of a procedural and policy implication. We don’t have a lot of procedures in the Ethics statement. I agree with you; it is, I mean, it’s a policy ---

B. Miller: Maybe we should have a procedure if you don’t see this there’s a problem.

P. Stoddard: When the President actually – when I brought this up – we were talking about this – the President said well you need to give this some teeth. In other words, there needs to be some procedures when people don’t behave ethically but then that’s where Nancy’s group went off and found out that there are actually a lot of procedures already available, already in practice.

B. Miller: Well, maybe they need to be ---

P. Stoddard: So all the stuff over on this side are all those procedures for when things on the other side are not going the way they’re supposed to. So most of that I think does exist already and that’s why I’m saying that this little box and the statement itself needs to be linked somehow. Maybe the APPM is a good place to put it and we can certainly suggest that. That ends up having to be approved by the University Council and then there is a committee that decides where the appropriate place to put this is so that’s out of our hands or out of our hand.

B. Miller: I think then I think that if it were in the policy ---

P. Stoddard: The statement has been approved by University Council, not the placement of it in APPM and so, I mean, if we wanted it in APPM and, you know, the Senate is a perfectly legitimate place – it’s perfectly legitimate for the Senate to recommend that the University Council look at placing this in the APPM if that’s what the Senate wants to do. I mean that’s not a problem.

B. Miller: It just seems to me if the teeth are already there and we have already approved that this is the ethical guideline that we have agreed to follow, that what we need to do is to say that this is the university policy and these are the procedures that are already in place so that everybody knows and it is our academic guideline and we’re not really recreating the wheel. What we’re saying is that these are our wheels and this is the drive shaft and then every faculty member knows and every chair knows and every administrator knows.

P. Stoddard: Would you like to move that the Senate ---

B. Miller: I so move. You have a comment and then I’ll ask for a second.

M. Kostic: I think ethics is beyond the rules, beyond violation. Ethics is conviction and it’s basically something like a ??? so I don’t think, you know, ethics is more than rules.

P. Stoddard: It is more than rules I agree with you.

M. Kostic: You can’t just specify it explicitly. It’s a ??? in itself ---
P. Stoddard: It’s a statement of the way to behalf but, you know, if somebody choices not to behave in that fashion then rules are called for. How do you deal with someone who doesn’t behave ethically? Anyway, we have a motion on the floor. Is there a second? All right, thank you. Any further discussion on the motion? The motion is to recommend to the University Council that the statement of professional ethics as laid out on page 17 and the consequences of violation of those ethics as laid out by the links provided on page 16, be included in the APPM. Is that a fair summary of your motion?

B. Miller: Yes.

P. Stoddard: Everybody got that? Any further discussion? All in favor. Opposed? Motion carries. We will so recommend.

???: I’m opposed.

P. Stoddard: So it’s not quite unanimous. Thank you. Do you have anything else Dr. Castle?

N. Castle: That about covers me for today thank you.

P. Stoddard: Well, if you think of anything else let us know. We have no report from Legislative Oversight and Elections. No unfinished business. Any new business? Any comments or questions from the floor?

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

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Letter of Acceptance of Nomination from Paul Stoddard (Page 18)

P. Stoddard: Under information items, last week you were gracious enough to nominate me for this position for another year. I officially accept that nomination via the letter that’s on the last page of your packet. We don’t need to take any action on that. Thank you, thank you. You’re too kind. With that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Thank you. We have a second. All in favor get up and leave. All opposed, stay here.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.