FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPTS  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2008, 3:00 P. M.  
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


J. Hathaway attended for J. Novak; S. Tonks attended for M. Smith.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Let’s get underway. The meeting will come to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first thing I’d like to do is adopt the agenda. Any additions or comments? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye. Thank you. We have an agenda.

Earl Hansen moved; Cason Snow seconded. The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2008 FS MEETING (minutes will be e-mailed on Tuesday)

P. Stoddard: Next up is approval of the minutes. Professor Sons has pointed out a couple of typos which will be incorporated into the official minutes once they’re approved and will be posted with corrections. Are there any – everybody should have gotten a copy of these via e-mail. Motion to approve? Thank you. Second? Thank you. Any other corrections or concerns about the minutes? Not seeing any, all in favor of approving them say aye. Thank you, we have minutes.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
P. Stoddard: Next up is President’s Announcements. Where did he go? Oh, there he is. The first thing I want to announce is that apparently there is a vicious rumor going around that the Ombudsman’s Office has been closed. The Ombudsman assures me that that is not the case. This was apparently a PeopleSoft issue. It was untouched by human hands but PeopleSoft decided we didn’t need an Ombudsman, I don’t know. Sorry about that Tim. PeopleSoft isn’t. Well, maybe it’s afraid – well, anyway.

I don’t have anything else to report. I will go to a Parking Committee meeting tomorrow afternoon. I understand there are some parking issues that have arisen. They’ve been brought to my attention about over here mostly, as well as perhaps out at Monsanto and patient parking out there. I will raise both of those tomorrow and argue vehemently in favor of more faculty, more patient parking and so on.

I would like Gip Seaver to come up front here. He’s going to talk to us a little bit, very shortly, very briefly about the upcoming baccalaureate review that is going to be a campus-wide thing.

G. Seaver: Thanks Paul. Can I hold the hammer?

P. Stoddard: No.

G. Seaver: Oh, okay. Paul asked if I would come and at least talk a little bit about the baccalaureate review process that we are kicking off and that you heard about from the President last week. Let me give you a little bit of context and a little bit of history. As Paul knows, Paul sits on the General Education Committee, and there have been discussions for probably a good part of the last two years and certainly in response to the Higher Learning Commission visit that we went through about the goals of general education. There was a great deal of discussion because of the Higher Learning Commission’s response and they felt – they really didn’t, I would say, like our assessment plan and actually it was a focused response we had to make back to the Higher Learning Commission. Over the last couple of years, we’ve been talking more and more about the general education goals and we had a few members of our committee go off to various meetings to learn more about the general education goals and measuring general education goals and kind of get a feel for what’s going on nationally as related to general education. As individuals started to discuss that more, we decided that we would like to put together a committee made up of members from the General Education Committee and some others and send them off to the General Education Institute at the American Association of Colleges and Universities. AACU does a summer institute on general education. I believe this university did participate in it a number of years ago. So we agreed to put together a committee and we sponsored that group to go off to beautiful Minneapolis, Minnesota. While Minneapolis, Minnesota is a nice place to go, Paul and I got to share rooms right next to each other and actually shared the bathroom in the residence hall we stayed in for four days. When they say they want you to come to work, they mean it because they really do – literally, they put us in a residence hall for four days and so we had the usual chicken every mean, maybe, we think it was chicken. We had to prepare a proposal about how we were going to review our general education goals, what process we would use, what campus-wide process we would use. We submitted that proposal and it was accepted. Then at the Institute, we were assigned various
mentors that had been - in fact, our mentor was the former provost at Kent State University – he had been provost there and we did a lot of – a number of meetings and we had a lot discussion and did a lot of teamwork in terms of how we might modify our proposal and come back to campus and have a campus-wide discussion of general education goals. What became very obvious to us as well as our colleagues from the University of Illinois in Champaign who were there as well as some others is that one of the things that we needed to be able to address before we looked at general education bills was to go back and take a look at our baccalaureate goals. The last time the baccalaureate goals were reviewed on this campus was during 1982-83 in which a baccalaureate review committee, and there are some of you in the room who remember the old Council on Instruction, that charged – that was a government structure at that time. So we came back from that meeting with the decision to talk to the General Education Committee and others about doing a campus-wide review of baccalaureate goals. We’ve established a steering committee which is made up of individuals from each of the colleges and includes the members who went off with us. That steering committee has been working all summer to try to put together a plan, a proposal, to have a campus-wide discussion of our baccalaureate goals. That steering meeting is complete, meets at least every other week if not weekly to put together the plan. You’ve heard the President talk about it a little bit. A number of you – all of you – should have received from me an invitation both in e-mail and hard-copy invitation – for individual faculty to participate in that process. The response I would have to say has been very, very good. There are a number of faculty from all of the colleges who are saying they would like to participate in this activity. This will not be a faculty activity only. We also are asking supportive professional staff, we’re asking operating staff, we’re going to be asking students to participate in that task force as well. It will be a task force made up of I think it’s about twenty-four or twenty-five individuals which will include faculty, supportive professional staff, operating staff, and students. That task force will basically conduct the campus-wide review of our baccalaureate goals basically using a round table approach similar to the approach we used for the Strategic Planning to gather information from the campus and also from off-campus including, alumni, employers, partnership school districts, and any number of individuals to give feedback about baccalaureate goals. After we go around to all of you, we will be coming to Faculty Senate to hold that as well. I think Paul had talked about having at least one or two discussions trying to find out from all of you what should our students know. What should they be able to do, how should they act and try to develop then our goals off of that. We’ll take the goals that we have; we have other examples for people to look at. Once we get a draft of the goals, then we’ll send those out for review from the campus-wide committee and our goal was that once we can get some consensus on campus as to what those baccalaureate goals should be, is then just to work through the governance process starting, obviously, eventually with UCC for approval of the campus-wide goals. We’re hoping to do that – we have a very ambitious schedule – we hope to do that during this first year. The second year, 2008-09, it is anticipated that once we have baccalaureate goals that have been approved by the governance system of the institution, that we then would start to look at alignment. We start to then go back to the Gen Ed Committee and say, okay, let’s take a look at our general education goals, how do they measure up, how well do they fit in terms of the baccalaureate goals but then it is our intent to go campus-wide and ask departments and programs and majors to do the same thing. So if you’re getting an undergraduate degree, and I’ll use my own home department of Communicative Disorders, what are you and Communicative Disorders contributing to the achievement of these baccalaureate goals for Northern Illinois University. So the second year then we’ll be talking about alignment;
we’d be talking not only about alignment of our general education goals but also alignment of our goals that we have within our own particular departments and also talking about how this is all going to tie in with transfers as well. So it’s that second year that we’re going to then have more of an operationalising of this issue. That also will lead to a discussion about delivery. Is our current setup of general education – will that still work in terms of achieving the goals in the part that’s delivered by the general education component as well. So that’s basically a synopsis of our two-year plan that we came back from Minneapolis with. I don’t know if there are any questions or --- there’s still time to volunteer or to volunteer others. Some of you have been very good about nominating your colleagues and some of you have been very good about saying yeah, I’d like to participate in that. The heavy lifting of this – I’m talking about how often will people meet in this task force – I think the major component of the work will be later this semester. We’ll have some general meetings. We’ll be having a kick-off; I think we’re shooting towards the end of October, I believe the last week of October, to have a kick-off with the task force and the steering committee with the President. Part of that task force will – that orientation meeting will be to talk about here’s how we’re going to – we want to conduct this. There’ll be some training on the kind of questions we want to ask. We’re going to be very open ended with the discussions and we’ll spend some – and, I think Paul we agreed we’d try to hit the President up for some refreshments because it would be better than what we would be able to fund. So towards the end of this semester and the early part of the next semester is where we’ll be dividing the task force up into smaller groups and asking those groups to go out and meet with other groups to gain feedback and bring it all back and synthesize it.

Ferald?

**F. Bryan:** Do you want people who currently are heads of Gen Ed courses like English and Communication and Math? Do you want them involved in this task force?

**G. Seaver:** Sure, but not just those people. We want to include everybody that wants to participate. So certainly, those people who are participating in general education and have an idea about the contribution of general education to the achieving, you know, what it means to get a degree at NIU. So certainly people who are doing that, that would be expertise that we want. We’re still going to get the input from those individuals so even if people aren’t participating on the task force, we’re going to get the input when we have a draft set of goals and when we come back those people are going to be able to respond so we want this to be a very, very transparent process but after twenty-five years, it’s probably time to take a very serious look at it. The committee, the steering committee, was very impressed by that 1982-83 document and I think Linda, you were on that committee and so I think the people are very impressed by the work that’s being done. This is just really a review.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you.

**G. Seaver:** I tried to close the Ombudsman’s Office by rumor but it didn’t work, so ---

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, so once again if you or if you know of people who might be interested in thinking about these issues, please let me know and I’ll make sure your name gets forwarded to Gip on this. Otherwise, we do have some ideas of names and we might come call on you anyway.
V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. A representative from the Gen Ed Baccalaureate Review Committee will be here.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Moving on, we don’t have a Consent Agenda so that gets us to reports from the Advisory Committees.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen - report.

P. Stoddard: First off would be FAC to IBHE, Earl Hansen.

E. Hansen: ???

P. Stoddard: You have to use a microphone.

E. Hansen: --- Mattoon, Illinois, home of Lakeland Community College. Drove down in the morning of it and the most interesting thing that happened there they explained they had an interview program at the community college where they’re using tower windmills to generate energy for their institution. They’re also turning out technicians in that field that are looking for places to go for their baccalaureate degree and I thought that might be of some significant importance to somebody around here. The issues that came up were how to man a web page and put information out that would interest the faculty at the institutions within the state. I think they’re going to house that at the University of Illinois. They’ve been talking about it for five years and we finally got to vote on it this past year so it’s typical faculty meeting. They discussed funding and higher education in general from the community colleges, to the private institutions, to the state institutions and there was discussion also in delivering courses and having the technical whereabouts or skills to deliver those courses to the non-traditional students who is not normally on campus. The community colleges in particular that are in relatively remote areas of the state from a population perspective have difficulty with this as well as we do here ourselves. They were talking about the demographics of the student population at the universities and colleges throughout the state and they talked about two areas that there would be a shortage of majors. They were in health care in general and nursing in particular. That was basically the essence of the meeting.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any questions for Earl? We do have copies of some of the information especially about the environmental alternatives that they’re trying down there so if anybody is interested, we can get you copies of that. Contact Donna or me and we’ll do that. Thank you.

Moving on, the committees of the Board of Trustees did not meet so we won’t have a report from any of those.


E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report. (Page 3)

P. Stoddard: The full Board did meet back on September 18. A copy of that report is on page 3 of your packet. A couple of things I would like to highlight. One, we did get a report from the Illinois Campus Security Task Force. This was a group that was set up by the Governor in wake of the Virginia Tech shootings. They have been working on making recommendations for Illinois campuses when our shootings occurred and so they delayed their final report a little bit to incorporate our response into their report. They listed several recommendations, many of which we were already looking at or have already incorporated into our policies here on campus. Chief Grady was a member of the Illinois State force and so he was able to bring a lot of that back to campus so we were already well on the road towards looking at those things even at the time of February 14. They did directly address our response to that incident and commented that we were quick, efficient and effective in terms of their preliminary analysis of our response. So that, I think, was encouraging.

Moving on, two things that they approved or looked at that I think merits special note. One, again, was this maintenance fee that’s going to be added now – campus improvement fee I guess is what they’re calling it. This is again to replace the permanent improvement line that was permanent is no longer. That was eliminated by the Governor as part of the budget process. Most other schools have already lost that line so it was really only a matter of time before we were struck. Nevertheless, we do have things. We do have leaky roofs and things that do need to be fixed even if the state doesn’t want to pay for it. So unfortunately, once again due to decreasing state support, the burden falls increasingly on the students. This will be an additional fee of up to $75.00 a semester. It depends on the credit hours, I think $6.75 a credit hour up to 12 credit hours. Anyway, so that was approved. That figure of $75.00 a semester is a minimum compared to other schools across the state. I think now everybody but Chicago State has a fee like this and they range from $75.00 to over $200.00 so we’re at the bottom end of that scale.

The other thing is item #6 under Items of Note. Last June, Trustee Murer had raised some concerns about numbers of Ph.D.s in various programs. She was looking at specifically at economics. This was part of overall reviews and other such things. Anyway, we reported – the university, Virginia Cassidy I think, reported back about that and explained what’s going on over there and the Board of Trustees accepted that report with little or no comment so I think they’re okay with it but it’s something that we probably need to be aware of. I mean we did stress that all these programs are reviewed regularly as part of the normal process around here.

6
So that’s basically what went on at the Board of Trustees’ meeting. Are there any questions? Yes?

**D. Goldblum:** David Goldblum from Geography. So for this Campus Improvement Fee will the $75.00 per student per semester be total an amount equal to what we lost or is it more or less than we are losing.

**P. Stoddard:** Well it’s tough to say because I don’t know – if you went with 25,000 students times $75 times 2, that would be more than the $1.3 million but not all students of course are full time or here both semesters so I really don’t know. I think the target was to replace what we’re losing. Brigid?

**B. Lusk:** Could you elaborate on the statement by the Health Services people? ??? with salaries. Is there a problem recruiting?

**P. Stoddard:** Apparently they feel there is a problem recruiting. They’ve lost five positions which they claim is specifically due to not being able to pay competitive wages. I mean, some mention was made of you know, we have more favorable working conditions on campus than many of these folks would be able to find off campus but, there’s a balance so they had five chairs up front with posters on them that said “this is a position that’s not here”. So – other questions or comments? Okay.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, reports from standing committees. I don’t think we have too many but if I’m mistaken, let me know. Academic Affairs, no report. Economic Status, C.T., no report. Resource, Space and Budget, no report. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, not yet but we’ve got some ideas coming your way. Rules and Governance, Nancy?

A. Academic Affairs – Mari Valle, Chair – no report.


C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair – no report.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Fuerer, Chair – no report.

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

**N. Castle:** This is really more of an update than a report. At the last meeting our committee was asked to investigate a request to include a member of the Athletics’ Board as a non-voting member of the Faculty Senate and so we did do some exploring and clarifying and actually the request was for the faculty athletics’ representative to be a non-voting member and so we are working on language that is pretty parallel to what we – there are a number of non-voting, ex officio type things in the organization. So we did get clarification for the faculty athletics’ representative.
P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you. Any questions for Nancy?

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Cason Snow, Chair

1. Unity in Diversity Steering Committee – ballot will be distributed at FS meeting.

P. Stoddard: Moving on, we do have an election we have to take care of today so I’m going to turn this over to Professor Snow.

C. Snow: Thank you. Everyone, the walk in that you had today has the election on it. It’s the University Unity in Diversity Steering Committee. We’re replacing two members. We have a list of 7 to choose from so I’ll give you a minute to read over the bios and then we’ll take it from there. And once everyone has finished reading the bios, if anyone wishes to speak in favor of one of the candidates, please feel free to do so. All right, it looks like everyone is pretty much finished reading. Does anyone have anything to say in favor of one of the candidates? Okay if not, let’s get started. We’re going to do this by show of hands. You can vote for two of the nominees.

???

C. Snow: Let’s do that then. Circle the names of the people you want and then we’ll collect the walk ins.

???

C. Snow: Or just leave them on the table, we’ll get them at the end of the meeting. Circle two names. Chicago politics; you get to vote twice.

P. Stoddard: Chicago, the place where people are just dying to vote. Sorry. Please keep your eyes on your own paper as you do this. Okay, also I guess there is an information item. An alternate list for Faculty Senate and University Council so that’s on the back page of the packet. Just more information about the alternates for the Senate. That comes out of your department and for the Council, you’ve got a list of people from each college who can replace you should you need to be replaced temporarily. Yes, Linda?

L. Sons: The Department of Mathematical Sciences has once again grown to the size – we just sort of teeter on whether we are big enough to have two people or not in terms of members of the Faculty Senate, remember the Senate is based on once the size of the department is over such and such, you may have two representatives opposed to one representative so it is my distinct privilege to introduce my colleague, Hui Hu, who was elected and is then a new member of the Senate as of today.

P. Stoddard: Congratulations and welcome aboard.
IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

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

???: If you cannot make a meeting, have an alternate come in your place. We can refer this to Rules and Governance.

P. Stoddard: All right. Yes?

C. Garcia: Clerida Garcia from KNPE, and I have an issue that was asked by the faculty in my department to bring up to the Senate. Is this the time to do that?

P. Stoddard: Yes.

C. Garcia: Okay. The faculty in the department are having a lot of problem with finding parking. For some reason the parking that we used to have before disappeared so now there is no parking and really there is a fight about where to park. People will spend two hours, three hours and go back home. It’s not about coming early because many people can be here at 8:00 and there’s no parking, no blue parking. There is some yellow parking but no blue parking so they are really concerned. This issue has been brought up to the Parking Committee and to the President and to many other members of the university because the faculty is very frustrated about it and I understand it is not just the KNPE department faculty but others have been effected by this situation. Okay.

P. Stoddard: As I said earlier, I will be meeting with the Parking Committee tomorrow. I’ll raise the issue and if I could just get a show of hands of people who are upset with parking. Now I can go back to the Parking Committee and say the Senate is officially upset about parking.

C. Garcia: Yeah, I have two letters here ---

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you. Are there any other issues? If not, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. Thank you. All in favor, get up and leave.

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Alternate List for Faculty Senate and University Council. (Page 4)

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:37 P.M.