CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, let’s come to order we have a number of agenda items, some of which can take longer than we anticipate, so see if we can get started.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: First order of business is the adoption of the agenda. We have two walk in items, one of those is my report on the Board of Trustees meeting; the other is report on Resources, Space and Budget. I need a motion to adopt the agenda with the two walk-in items. Remember to say your name so we have it for the record.

D. Valentiner: Moves the agenda.

G. Bennardo: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor?

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstentions? We have an agenda.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2011 FS MEETING (sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is the approval of the minutes of the March 2 Faculty Senate meeting. I need a motion to approve the minutes.

B. Lusk: Motion.

C. Cappell: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any suggestions, corrections, omissions, changes?

S. Willis: I just noticed towards the end where it talked about you running again for President of the Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of the University Council, that the wrong type of council. It’s not exactly like it was misspelled, but it was c-o-u-n-c-i-l instead of c-o-u-n-c-i-l.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay we will correct that. Thank you. Any other problems with the minutes, corrections, changes anything like that? I think we also posted Steve Cunningham’s slides from his presentation and they are I think accessible through a link in the minutes. Is that correct? So those of you who have not looked at the minutes – I can’t imagine that anyone hasn’t – but we have a link in there to the slide show that Steve Cunningham did for us at the last meeting. People had requested the slides, we asked Steve for them, so that’s how you get to those. Okay? If there are no other changes, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

All: Aye.


IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I don’t have much in the way of president’s announcements. I again don’t want to keep beating the pension issues to death so I won’t. That was sort of highlighted in the president’s talk to the Board of Trustees. The president, as you all know, is very concerned about what changes may be pending to the pension and benefits for us. You have been encouraged enough times to contact your representatives if you feel the need to do that. So that, of course, is something we are keeping an eye on. We are posting what we can on that legislation button on the website. There’s not always something of import and you’ll all receive e-mails when there is something of importance. I have no other announcements other than that this is, of course, the next to the last meeting of the year and so hopefully we’ll all turn out for next meeting as well.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Online Student Evaluation of Instruction

A. Rosenbaum: I want to go to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. The first one is the online student evaluation of instruction. This is an item that we want to decide whether or not the Faculty
Senate wants to begin looking into this. There are a number of colleges, I think two or three of them, I think three that are requiring that all evaluations of teaching effectiveness be done online as opposed to the in-class paper and pencil format. In those colleges we’ve been getting reports from faculty members that the return rate is very low. Somewhere around 25 to 30 percent of students seem to be filling those in. At this point, we don’t have great data that indicates whether or not those people that are filling them in are representative of the class as a whole, whether they’re the people that are most likely to be disgruntled with the course or the professor. So we don’t know how that’s affecting things. We do know that a number of untenured faculty are concerned that this is something that weighs heavily on their tenure decision and it’s being based on a relatively low number. And so the question that we are raising is whether or not the Senate wants to give this to one of our committees to look into and, of course, we’d be looking into what these return rates are and what the implications of what these return rates are for the types of evaluations that faculty are getting. This being the next to the last meeting of the year, we have a number of choices. We can give it to a committee now and get it started. We could give this new policy a little bit of time to see if maybe students adjust to it and start giving us a little bit more data. It’s completely up to the Senate. So I am opening the floor for any discussion of whether or not we want to handle this online evaluation issue. Okay. Earl?

**E. Hansen:** As the Chair of our Personnel and Technology Department, I found it really absurd that only two people would respond electronically to some professors and there’s no way we can draw any conclusions positive or negative about that. I think we got more accurate ratings, whether they were biased or not biased one way or the other, when we did it with pencil and paper.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay.

**C. Nissen:** I was wondering what the advantages were beyond just time, which is only five minutes or so, and the use of paper. Are these the only advantages of using electronic?

**A. Rosenbaum:** It’s been suggested that since students are more likely to like online and web-related things, we’d be able to get more students involved rather than less and perhaps this would also enable them to get opinions of the students who never bother to come to class.

**C. Nissen:** But they put surveys out all the time and all the things people do online and people just routinely ignore those. I think it would be probably a habit to just ignore it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, well this is one of the concerns. We’re well able to sort of give this to a committee and take it on and come up with sort a of a recommendation. So if we’re not happy about this.

**G. Bennardo:** I have two questions. One is: Is there an attempt to standardize the evaluation tool or any department can still keep their own? And second: Is there any way to link the filling in the questionnaire for the evaluation to receiving their grade?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Probably not. Then we’d have to know which students had given what kind of evaluation so they might not buy that. The answer to your first question is as of yet, there is no effort to standardize, the only thing afoot is that the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual
requires a single standard question across departments and we have now have a question that has been developed by Pat Henry’s committee in the University Council and so there will be at least that one question most likely, but so far nobody is suggesting standardization. It may happen, the Dean’s will in individual colleges and that at some point that might become a little more widespread, but that’s not afoot right now.

**B. Henry:** I would just say that I think it probably should go to a committee. I’m not sure what committee it should go to but given the weight of the evaluations of faculty in the classroom and the possible limitations to getting such a poor response rate, it would seem to me either we have to think about other mechanisms or other measures in other to be fair to getting voices heard back and forth.

**A. Rosenbaum:** And we might think about this as, we approved, I think the University Council approved that it was okay to do online evaluations and so we never approved the idea that faculty should be compelled to do online evaluations. So that’s something that’s been added in by some of the deans. So we could certainly suggest that this be allowed but that it not be required – that faculty should have a choice as to how they want to be evaluated. If that’s what the committee decides to do, so that’s a possibility. Okay, other input on this? Yes?

**S. Armstrong:** With regard to benefits, it’s also been suggested that there’s a huge cost savings for people hours having to type up the student comments and also the length of time that these get returned to faculty is obviously much quicker. So those are two other possible benefits.

**A. Rosenbaum:** One of the non-benefits, I think though, now I don’t know – every department has different ways of doing this – but at least in Psychology, the dean has access to the parts of it that are done on scan sheets, but the individual comments from students to faculty members do not go to the dean. Once this is all online, deans will have access to everything that’s asked unless something is put in place to take that out of the evaluations before they are accessible by the deans. Again, this is going to be different in different departments and different colleges, but that’s something to consider as well – whether this will lead to greater access to the information and then perhaps faculty members will have control over that.

**B. Lusk:** I think actually the Personnel Committee does have access legally to comments. That was a decision by this body or University Counsel, I forget, a couple of years ago and we changed in the APPM, I believe, the criteria for student evaluation so everyone in PC and the Chair and the Dean can see, if they wish to.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, you know again I’d have to look at that, but I know the Dean in Arts and Sciences has not been getting the comments from our students, so whether he just doesn’t want it when he could have it, even though I suspect that that’s not likely. David, do you have any idea what the situation is with us? No, okay. Yes?

**M. Kostic:** Basically I’m concerned also about averaging results. In our department every variation some numbers in average and if average is based on two or three students who are angry that wouldn’t be a realistic evaluation. Maybe there should be done something about that too. Not left it alone to every administrator. If there is no majority of students who do evaluation they should be
thrown a variant and only comments given to the faculty to see what the problem might be or having everybody’s evaluation to be averaged and only those who like to contribute positive or negative to be included as such. Something has to be done. I think this is really of no great use to the University.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you also suggesting that we put this to a committee and get some action.

M. Kostic: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other comments on this? Okay, we need a motion to send this to a committee. We can send it, I would think, to either Faculty Rights and Responsibilities or Academic Affairs. Anyone have a preference for this besides the chairs of those two committees? No. I’m thinking Faculty Rights and Responsibilities was my first choice. Anyone have objection to that?

M. Kostic: Otherwise Academic Affairs. That’s meant for students too, not just for the faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: Are you saying you’d rather go to Academic Affairs?

M. Kostic: Right, that’s academic issue.

A. Rosenbaum: So you’d prefer Academic Affairs?

M. Kostic: Me alone, yeah.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, that’s okay. In that case somebody please make a motion to send this issue to either Academic Affairs or Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

G. Bennardo: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: So, the motion is to send this issue of online evaluations to Academic Affairs. Okay, I need a second.

A. Lash: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any further discussion of this? All in favor of the motion?

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Okay this will go to Academic Affairs. Congratulations Charles Cappell, another activity to look forward to. I tried to get it to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and failed miserably.

B. Joint Appointment Policy

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is also one that we want to consider whether to take on. Let me explain the history of this item. This was brought forward to the University Council by Chris
McCord in Arts and Sciences. Chris is concerned that the policy on joint appointments may be somewhat prejudicial against faculty members. Faculty members on joint appointments may be disadvantaged, especially with regards to promotion and tenure decisions. He’s particularly concerned about one paragraph in the APPM that says “If there’s a disagreement among appointing units on recommending tenure for a faculty member on joint appointments, the units recommending tenure may petition the relevant college to fully fund the position as either a tenured position within the recommending department or as an appoint within a recommending center. Resources permitting, tenure may be awarded to the recommending department.” What he’s saying is that, let’s say someone is in two departments, one department says “yes” to tenure, one department says “no.” The department that says “yes” can then assume the full salary of that professor and award tenure. His suggestion is that if that department doesn’t have the resources, then this faculty member would be lost and would not get tenure. He also expressed some concern that this would preclude the usual tenure appeals processes. So ordinarily a faculty member that is denied tenure would be able to appeal that both in the department and to the level above the department, etc. according to our appeals processes for personnel decisions. But he felt that this paragraph would preclude that from happening since it would sort of say okay if this happens then the department that granted tenure would have the option of picking them up but is not required to pick them up. I don’t know if I agree with that because there is a statement a few paragraphs down that says faculty members may obtain a reconsideration of a personnel decision by the department or center making the decision according to the reconsideration provision in the university. For some reason, Chris thinks this is not covered, I kind of think it is. At University Council, I argued that this is a faculty matter, that the faculty should have their hand in making decisions about this joint appointment and, therefore, this should go to the Senate rather that to the University Council and the Steering Committee supported that somehow. So it’s our choice as to whether we want look at the joint appointment policy and decide whether or not we want to recommend some changes either in the policy as articulated in both the Bylaws – and for those who are interested, this is Bylaw 5.33 and Bylaw 5.40. Those are the only parts that have language on tenured decisions in regards to joint appointments, and then the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual which has a policy on joint appointments. If we want one of our committees to look into the concerns that Chris has expressed and decide whether or not we think there is something to it and that we need to take some action, we can do that. I want to also emphasize that in doing this, Chris is apparently showing high regard for the faculty rights, so he’s not representing something that would be an administration issue but rather is concerned that faculty on joint appointments may be disadvantaged number one and number two, that we are increasing the emphasis on joint appointments either within the University or between the University and places such as Argonne National Laboratory, Fermi Lab, the Proton Centers and things like that. So this is a pro-faculty concern, this is not something that he’s trying to do to disadvantage faculty in any way. Okay, so that’s basically it. If you have questions or want to input into this, I’m opening the floor.

P. Henry: I do think this would be a good thing for especially faculty who have some opinions about joint appointments who have experienced either good things or bad things from it and it seems to me like this would be a Faculty Right and Responsibility committee concern and I would move that it be sent to that committee.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, that would be fine. Rules and Governance would also be appropriate, I think, so either one of those. We haven’t given anything to Rules and Governance this year so they’ve been sunning themselves out on the commons.

P. Henry: That’s true.

N. Castle: I have not.

A. Rosenbaum: I think we should punish Nancy Castle by sending this…no. Okay so we have a motion to send this issue to joint appointments to…..alright but we need to specify so anyone want to weigh in on this? Nancy, as an impartial observer, who do you think we should send this to?

N. Castle: If you send it to my committee, I can’t be in on the discussion.

A. Rosenbaum: Because you have a conflict of interest?

N. Castle: I can’t elaborate, but yeah. So I would recommend you send it to the other committee because it would be less complicated to do it that way.

A. Rosenbaum: Cleverly done. Okay as we all know, if the Chair doesn’t want to have anything to do with it, it will die in committee.

P. Henry: Keep it with Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

A. Rosenbaum: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Brad, are you here? He couldn’t make it. Well that makes it easier. We have a motion on the floor to send this issue of the joint appointment policy to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, I need a second.

N. Castle: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Nancy Castle is right on the spot. Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion of this? Alright, all in favor of sending this to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities signify by saying “aye.”

All: Aye

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay this will go to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and when Brad, if someone sees Brad, tell him that I have a packet of materials that Chris McCord has given us that articulates his concerns about this issue. Yes?

F. Bryan: Should this go beyond the Rules and Governance Committee of the University Council ultimately decides what the Bylaws mean, so it would need to go there as well and, if there were Bylaw changes, it would probably have to come out of that committee as well.
A. Rosenbaum: Yes, this would absolutely have to go to University Council. I just felt it should have the faculty’s hand in it before it goes to Council where other individuals, non-faculty, have some say in what happens. That was just my opinion.

F. Bryan: That’s good.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, whatever we do will be the faculty opinion which will then be sent to University Council and more than likely be sent to committee there as well. And it’s possible that the committee will look into this and feel that what we have is sufficient. So when I read it, I’m not that concerned that there’s a major problem here but, you know, different people are apparently reading it differently so it’s worthwhile to get some more eyes on it.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: We have nothing on the Consent Agenda.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – Page 3

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have reports from our advisory committee. The first report is from Earl Hansen, the FAC to IBHE and again, when we have, I don’t know whether we have limited time, but you all have the reports or most of the reports other than the walk-ins, so I don’t know that we want to recite the reports so much as just highlight any concerns or issues we want to focus on and then you can all ask questions if you have questions having read the reports. So, Earl.

E. Hansen: Sure, the meeting was at Kennedy-King College in Chicago and, in essence, the intent of the meeting was to make some headway with some of the top, as you talked about it today, policies and procedures and protocol in essence with tenure and promotion as there was a huge case that came before us for conversational piece about three or four meetings ago out at DePaul University on denial of tenure and policies, procedures and protocol that probably were not followed. So I think it’s extremely important, as does the Faculty Advisory Council, that the faculty at each institution plays a major role in making the decision as to what is tenure and what is not tenurable. Also, we need to be aware of the fact that John Q. Public basically has no idea what tenure is and why it’s out there and we as faculty have done a very poor job in presenting that in the intent of what tenure is so we might want to give some thought to that as we start to make discussions on such a topic. We were also trying to invite the IBHE Deputy Director and the Chair of the House Higher Education Committee to our next meeting which is on the eighth of next month. They are not going to be in attendance because the legislature is going to be there. This tends to be an ongoing problem in trying to get legislators in to talk to this particular group of people. The rest of the minutes are as they are there. There was some discussion becoming a – with the learning process going on and the higher education being cut drastically in the funding situation, we’re seeing a lot more online programs and that was discussed in some detail there and there was some discussion as to the University of Illinois at Springfield and they’re coordinating with other groups outside the State of Illinois, California and other places and it’s spread out in some of the state universities across the country and that’s just point of information.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Earl on the IBHE? Sue?

S. Willis: I had a question. Down in the fifth paragraph on the first page you talk about performance-based funding and the performance funding will be aligned with the public agenda. Performance will be like a contract. Could you give a little context for that? What exactly are they talking about? It says we need to be aware of it and so I am wondering what it is exactly that I should be aware of?

E. Hansen: I’m not really sure that the committee is aware of what they are talking about on that. They are trying to get a feel for what is the legislature trying to do in relation to this particular issue and they don’t have an answer. We have difficulty getting legislators to come to our meetings to get responses to questions. Now we get a response from one of the NIU alum, Ochang. He added that performance would be like a contract. It was said the faculty need to be aware of this once there is an understanding and a commitment. Well I’d like the citizens to know what the understanding is before we have a commitment and that’s how the Faculty Advisory Council feels. So in other words, I can’t answer your question.

A. Rosenbaum: I think this is based on a much bigger issue and that is the Department of Education is, I think, pushing all levels of education to be performance oriented so all over people now are having to sort of base funding and salaries and all of this on performance. This is one of the things that people are looking at in some of the task forces that we have and it seems like there’s not really any way around this. And there are a number of problems that come up because, for example, in the secondary education, schools are discouraged from taking disadvantaged students because it’s going to affect their abilities to meet the performance standards and they are not going to be funded. It’s a major initiative nationwide and my understanding is we have no choices. This is going to be put on us by the Feds by the Department of Education, whatever, and this is just the future of education. Earl?

E. Hansen: The State has a P-20 program. It’s in the following paragraph there. Basically, that was discussed as how are we going to evaluate what skills a student has coming out of a high school as they prepare to go to college. The question came up, “can this be a cookie cutter thing?” I don’t think so, but they have no idea where they’re going with this thing either. They’re looking at Kentucky and a few other states that have been going ahead with this type of activity. The concern that was voiced at the meeting was maybe we in higher education are at fault when we get students that are juniors and seniors and they still can’t write a complete sentence and do a bibliography correctly when we get them in classes. Maybe we need to look at ourselves a little bit on a four year level too.

A. Rosenbaum: Pat?

P. Henry: Just along the same lines, I wonder what the public agenda is. It looks important but I don’t recall hearing exactly what it was. Are there a set of guidelines that the public agenda means X, Y and Z in terms of proficiency in something or other or it should all be geared towards getting jobs? What is the public agenda?
A. Rosenbaum: Is that question for Earl?

P. Henry: Yeah.

E. Henry: The public agenda, as I understand it, is brought about by what the legislature is putting forward to the public so the public would hear it and see it. The questions that arise in our conversations is: “How do we as faculty members, whether we are at a community college or a private institution or one of the state institutions, get our thought process out to the public if that public agenda is controlled by a group that won’t let us put ours in there?” Then the comment is; “Let’s look at the newspapers.” But then we find that the newspapers many times seem to have a biased opinion opposed to where academia is going at times. At least that’s the impression that some people get. How you get on the public agenda, I have no idea and I think the Faculty Advisory Council is trying to find the same thing.

P. Henry: I wish them well.

A. Rosenbaum: Alright, other questions for Earl? Okay and that’s the queue to move on.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – report – Page 5

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the report on the Board of Trustees subcommittee on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel and, Ferald, I believe you are going to give the report?

F. Bryan: Yes, Thank you, Alan. The report is before you and I’ll only just highlight a few things. First thing I’d like to emphasize is that, even in these tough economic times, this particular committee is very much behind and seems to have a good, genuine understanding of, the sabbatical process. This is the time in the year when they always approve that, so even though they approved the sabbatical request, they also a few years ago requested a report from a couple of faculty members on their sabbaticals. So we heard Professor Bowers this time. They also had an extensive summary of the annual report on the outcomes of sabbatical. So those were formally requested by this committee and those were received. So after approving the sabbaticals formally, they also made the changes in the emphases and minors and specializations that you see there. And at the end of the meeting we heard a very lengthy presentation by Vice President Anne Kaplan on the newly renamed Division of Outreach and Regional Development where they are now emphasizing community engagement. That’s the highlight of my report. I’d be happy to answer any questions.


A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next report would be mine on the Board of Trustee Subcommittee on Finance, Facilities and Operations. I’m not going to give this report only because I would be repeating the same things in my Board of Trustees report because all of these items became action
items for the Board of Trustees. So you can read the report if you want to and then I’ll talk about it a little bit in my Board of Trustees report.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – report – Page 8

A. Rosenbaum: Okay next, Board of Trustees Legislation, Audit, External Affairs Committee. Jay or Todd, which one? Jay, okay.

J. Monteiro: All right, I’ll try to keep this short and sweet like everybody else’s.

A. Rosenbaum: Only the good news?

J. Monteiro: Only the good news so that will make it a short report. Trustee Murer started out the meeting by congratulating Lisa Freeman, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, on her recent appointment by Governor Quinn to the newly created Illinois Innovation Council. She also introduced the new general counsel, Jerry Blakemore. She also announced that NIU’s Accountancy Department had been ranked in the top ten in the Public Accounting Report’s 29th Annual Professors Survey. She also made an interesting comment that NIU’s Blackboard system is now used more than Facebook. It had more hits than our Facebook page. A lot of this you can read through yourself. During the 97th General Assembly report, Kathy Buetten, she pointed out some House Bills. One of note is HB180 and this was relating to conduct at funerals and memorial services and the thing that was special about that is it was originated from one of our own NIU sociology students. The congressional report was pretty dim so I won’t read you that. During the Intercollegiate Athletics report, it was reported that our athletics program was re-accredited with no conditions and, from what I understand, that’s very unusual. So we congratulate them on that. A PowerPoint presentation was given and it was highlighting the academic achievements of our athletic program. They pointed out that we have gone 11 straight semesters with a 3.0 GPA average. We had 89 athletic grads in 2010 and NIU’s graduate success rate in athletics is above the national average and NIU had two academic all-Americans. Our football team, they ranked 9th in academic progress towards graduation and then it was also mentioned that the football and volleyball teams both went to the MAC championships this year. Another important thing I thought was very good that he mentioned was that our NIU athletes have done over 5000 hours of community service and you can see listed there some of their charity partners. Down to the University Branding Report, Kathy Buettner gave out some information there. They are studying why people are choosing NIU. Why do you choose to come to NIU and as we know from earlier meetings they have come up with a branding theme, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow.” She also announced that a logo redesign is in the process and they’ve narrowed this down, I believe, to three logos and they are hoping to send these out for voting for the campus to look at sometime in April and the official brand rollout will be at the football game at Soldier Field this fall against Wisconsin. I think that’s probably the highlights of my report.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, one thing I would just like to add. First, let’s take questions. Questions for Jay, any questions? Pat.
P. Henry: Again, in Part III, I see performance-based funding and was there any other information given by Kathy Buettner as to what this is going to mean that colleges? University and colleges must incorporate performance-based funding pursuant to the report of the Board’s Higher Education Finance Study Commission?

J. Monteiro: It relates to graduation rates.

P. Henry: Oh … okay that kind of performance.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other questions for Jay? Sue?

S. Willis: Just in regards to that bill. That is a bill that has been proposed or it has passed?

J. Monteiro: Proposed.

A. Rosenbaum: Anyone else? Okay the one item I want to add is a positive item and I was speaking to somebody who’s on the search committee for our new basketball coach who you all know has been hired and is coming from Michigan State. And what I was told is that the thing that was the highest priority and was made very explicit to the candidates was that NIU has zero tolerance policy for any kind of recruitment irregularities or any types of these violations that we hear going on at other universities. So that was a very important point and it was good to hear the emphasis that we place on playing fair and not engaging in any of the shenanigans that we hear so much about lately on the news at places nearby like Ohio, for example. So I thought that was very nice. Anything else?

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: All right, next report is my report on the Board of Trustees meeting. The Board of Trustees meeting was held this past Thursday. At the beginning of the meeting, Chair Strauss emphasized his and the Board’s intention to support the President and to fight for money and support for NIU at the legislative level. The President’s report began with President Peters talking about the financial situation which I’m sure you all heard about ad nauseam. It’s the usual thing. We are owed a lot of money by the State. We haven’t gotten most of that. We spend a ton of money on unfunded mandates and things like that. The financial situation is grim. It’s been suggested during the appropriations hearings that the University prepare for another round of belt tightening and so we are going to tighten our belts. The Governor’s budget – apparently there’s a move afoot to try and cut $200 million off the higher education appropriation that is in the Governor’s budget. That hasn’t happened as of yet, but certainly our administration is very worried about the funding streams. This is one of the reasons why we have such an emphasis on the Vision 2020 initiative. By the way, the vision 2020 initiative is going forward pretty well I think. We had a meeting of the Steering Committee the other day and the committees are doing a good job of identifying needs and goals and setting benchmarks and so that seems to be coming together nicely. The Board considered and approved 26 action items. The ones that might be of interest to us are the student fee recommendations. Student fees will increase approximately 2.73 percent. The room and board rates will increase somewhat – 5.2 percent. All of these fees that are passed on to students are processed through the student representatives and they are on board with that. They approved the NIU
Foundation professional services contract. This is the money that is used to support the office that is raising funds for the University such as in the True North Campaign which just ended. They approved the FY12 student health insurance contract. As I think I mentioned once before, the electrical infrastructure of the university is crumbling as we speak, so we have to try and fix it. There is no appropriation from the state to do that. The university has to somehow come up with the money. They approved Phase I of the campus-wide electrical infrastructure improvement plan. As Ferald mentioned, they approved all of the sabbatical leaves that were requested. They approved several new emphases, Sustainable Energy, Environment and Health, and Health Promotion; and two minors, International Marketing and Deafness Rehabilitation. They approved the deletion of a specialization, this is I think again not something that faculty were not in agreement on. This particular specialization in Comparative and Developmental Administration apparently has not really attracted very many students and, according to the department, has fulfilled its usefulness.

Jerry Blakemore has now been appointed by the Board as the new Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel replacing Ken Davidson who retired in December. Just something interesting, Jerry Blakemore was in a similar position at SIU. He was also president of the IBHE for several years and was an aide or a I don’t know exactly what his role was to the Governor of Illinois many years ago. So he’s a prominent attorney and he has a very strong reputation in education law so we are considering ourselves lucky to have recruited him. Finally, an honorary Doctor of Science will be awarded to Eric Isaacs, a prominent University of Chicago physicist and Director of the Argonne National Laboratory and an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters will be presented to Leland Strom who is the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Farm Credit Administration. Those will be awarded at May graduation. There were a bunch of informational items but nothing of any urgency. So that’s the report, any questions? Yes, Brigid.

B. Lusk: I just wondered what Governor Jerry Blakemore had served under?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay the one before, who was it?

T. Latham: Jim Thompson.

B. Lusk: Not in jail.

?: Yet.

A. Rosenbaum: One of the non-jailed governors, excellent. Okay, that’s my report. No other questions?

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair – no report

C. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – report – Page 10

1. Guests in Class Policy Proposal
A. Rosenbaum: Next we have a report, well it should be from Brad Cripe. Is someone else doing that report? George you’re going to do the report? Okay this is from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee and George Slotsve is going to give us the report. George.

G. Slotsve: Unfortunately, Brad couldn’t be here today. I think it’s for good reason. He has summer research funding that he wanted to keep and that meeting was scheduled at this time. So he’s at a meeting to keep his money for research this summer. I forget exactly when it was, but it was earlier this year, the Faculty Rights and Responsibility Committee was asked to draft a policy on guests in the classroom. The issue basically was pointed out that it should be up to the instructor, the instructor should have the right to control who’s in the classroom. The Committee has met and in the boldface is the statement the committee would like to put forth.

A. Rosenbaum: This is on page 10.

G. Slotsve: Yes, on page 10. So only instructors have the right to allow guests in their classroom. When deciding whether a guest is appropriate, the instructor should take into consideration the effect the guest will have on the learning environment. The individuals present in the classroom should be limited to the instructor of record, students registered for the class and individuals invited by the instructor.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and would you like to move that we approve this and forward it to the University Council for consideration for the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. George?

G. Slotsve: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you are moving that this policy be approved by the Senate and sent to the Council?

G. Slotsve: Correct.

A. Rosenbaum: Good. I need a second.

C. Cappell: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Discussion. Nobody has any problems with the guests in class policy? I have one question. I’m sort of wondering, do we want to define “guests in class”? Do we want to sort of state what a guest in class consists of or do we just want to leave it at that? Did the committee consider whether we want to specify that any further?

G. Slotsve: As I recall we did discuss potentially defining it in a little more detail, but felt it was best to leave it a little broader.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.
T. Fisher: This, well I just want to highlight, what was the basic difference between what was in policy already from you new policy?

A. Rosenbaum: George, do you want to…?

G. Slotsve: As I recall there was no policy, was there?

A. Rosenbaum: There was no formal statement of that I believe.

T. Fisher: Okay, it was just in practice.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I think it was just an assumption more than anything else. But I think part of the reason we took it on was because it’s really not stated anywhere so an instructor could say, “no you can’t bring that person in” and I guess someone could say “well where does it say that?” This was whether we wanted to decide to be proactive and have a statement on the record or a policy on the record that says “it’s up to the instructor.” Yes, Charles?

C. Cappell: I just wanted to make a comment that emerged in the Executive Committee discussions about this policy that this is a pretty strong policy and allows total control of the classroom in the hands of the faculty. And the general sense on the Executive Committee was we supported that. One particular issue that came up was what about external evaluations of teaching or senior faculty visiting the classrooms of junior faculty and we felt that, even in that situation, the faculty should be in a position to grant permission or not to those people to observe the classroom. Of course, realizing what the real world consequences would be if they exercised that right, but nevertheless respecting it that faculty member control the classroom environment.


N. Castle: You know, I don’t really have a question but we have so many parents now that are going to school and occasionally daycare falls through or whatever and they are forced with either bringing a kid with them or not coming to a class and in my department it’s like a three hour class, I’m assuming that the instructor then, if the student comes and says “I have my four year old and I’ll do the best I can to keep him under control,” the instructor can say “no” and deny them access to that day’s class or “sure as long as the kid’s quiet and if he’s not quiet then we’ll figure out what we are gonna do.” I’m kind of a little concerned that, in an instance like that, what happens if that four year old falls and hurts himself and the instructor has said “yes, it’s fine” and he’s not disruptive until he falls and hurts himself. Is there a liability issue that we as an instructor are taking on if we say, “sure I totally get that you’re a single parent that you’re dedicated to class that you want to be here, you’re trying to make the best of a bad situation, I’ll work with you on this.” Is there a legal liability issue that we need to consider?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I think we raised that issue before we gave it to the committee. Did the committee consider that or was there any action on the committee with regards to the issue that Nancy just raised?

G. Slotsve: There wasn’t.
**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so one of the things we can do, we can send this along to the University Council which is what we’d have to do with it anyway and at Council there can be an issue raised as to whether or not we want to have it validated by the new general counsel that we now have just heard about.

**N. Castle:** That would be great.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Again, I don’t know that this is any different than the situation is now. The way the situation is now, people are doing the same thing. It’s not any different, but I guess your point is if the instructor says “yes,” does that increase the liability in some way? Okay. So we can leave that for the Council. One thing, when we originally introduced this “guests” word, we also considered human and non-human and one of the things we don’t want to leave up to an instructor is whether to allow, for example, a helping dog or a working dog into the classroom. So that’s why I was wondering if we wanted to define “guests” to not include working animals. Okay, I can see I’m getting nowhere with this. Alright, that’s fine. Any other comments, discussion? The motion on the table is to send the bolded section on page ten to the University Council and asked that it be placed into the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. Of course the University Council could decide to put it somewhere else, but that’s the motion. We have a motion that’s seconded. All in favor say “aye.”

**All:** Aye.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries we’ll send that to the University Council. Very good, thank you to the committee.

**D. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum and Laurie Elish-Piper, Co-chairs** – report – walk-in

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, the last item, I think, the last report we have is Resources, Space and Budget and David Goldblum will be giving us the report.

**D. Goldblum:** About an hour is what you’re saying then?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Keep it to an hour.

**D. Goldblum:** Fortunately, my thunder has been stolen by the other depressing reports so this won’t take long. We met right after we all received that e-mail from the President on the 25th so some of the discussion revolved around some of the comments in that e-mail. I’ll get to that in a minute. We had Dr. Williams with us as always and got the latest update which we’ve already heard about. He did mention that, from his perspective, there were three ways that the Governor’s budget plan is proceeding as far as rectifying some of the deficit issues. He said that some that the tax increase, there’s three prongs, the tax increase was effective as of January. The Governor wanted $6 to $8 billion in loans, which according to Dr. Williams, the Republican Caucus will not look too kindly on. So we’re left with a third option since the first option’s not going to cover too much of the deficit to reduce operating costs across the state which leaves us to most items below. We know that
we are owed a lot of money as was said. NIU representatives have been testifying at the state level about the University budget. We all know there are changes ahead, likely to be ahead, for not just new faculty but now current faculty and annuitants as well. We’ve heard this a number of times. The President has become a bit more active. He’s working with some other institutions across the state looking for ways to develop proposals to reduce the problem with some of the pension funding at the state level to try and present some alternatives that might be considered. There’s also an Ad Hoc Pension Advisory Committee being developed on campus here and Dr. Williams is gonna ask that one of the members of our committee is on that Ad Hoc Pension Committee. There are two areas that were of concern to our committee, the proposed cuts in tuition waivers for staff and faculty and also the mention of sabbatical funding was also in that e-mail. We didn’t really discuss that too much, but that was in that e-mail if you missed that. We also talked about the electrical problems on campus. I guess about almost $3 million has been requested and I asked Dr. Williams where that money is coming from and he has no idea but he said it has to happen fairly soon. And then firstly the committee, our Resources, Space and Budget Committee, would like to prepare a memo from the faculty and staff about what the budget priorities are for the campus and we’d like to present that to this body and the University Council final meetings. So if you have any input that you’d like to have us include in that memo, it would go through these two bodies and ultimately to the President, can you either email Laurie or myself, email addresses are there. We want to have a statement of what faculty think are the core concerns, economic budgetary concerns. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: And personally I want to applaud the committee for really asserting themselves into this process and trying to have a voice. And I particularly like the idea of us coming up with what are our ideas about what priorities ought to be, not telling the university how to spend its money, but just giving them the faculties position on spending priorities such that when there is money available that will be taken into consideration. Good job by the committee. Questions for David? No questions. Well thank you David and your committee as well.

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

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: The last item I have is just the informational item. I have been asked by Pat to call your attention to the fact that my letter of acceptance of your nomination is located in the informational items, is in the packet? Yes, it’s in the packet, so I wanted to call your attention to that and if you want to read it, be my guest. Do we have any comments or questions from the floor on anything? Yes.

T. Fisher: This one quick one and if there’s no other comments we might be able to handle it Alan. It was brought to my attention. I was in a faculty meeting today, and we have a new dean in the College of Education and one of the practices is being followed that the previous dean had and I just
didn’t know if it was a campus-wide type of thing that when there’s a search committee that the
dean prefers the pros and cons for candidates versus the search committee giving the dean a specific
recommendation for a hire. I just want to know if that’s pretty common practice for departments?
Does that make sense?

A. Rosenbaum: I think it’s more of a common practice in terms of a Chair position than it is for a
faculty position, but I know that deans sometimes reserve the right to appoint chairs so hiring at that
level would be something the dean might say, “just tell me what the pros and cons are,” but I’ve not
heard of that. Maybe someone else has as far as a regular hire of a faculty member is concerned.
Anybody hear about this? Yes, Rosemary.

R. Feurer: It was something that caused a hullabaloo at SIU Carbondale and it was really the
reason for unionization of that campus when deans started to do that sort of thing. It’s a big issue. I
think it’s something that we all ought to fight back against. It’s a main issue of faculty rights and
governance if we don’t object to this. So I encourage you to object to it fiercely and I think we
ought to pay attention to such things across campus if they are occurring. I hadn’t heard of
something that wishy-washy being proposed.

A. Rosenbaum: Now is that in the college’s policies and procedures manual?

T. Fisher: From what I just heard, I will double check because I didn’t know it was just reserved as
a common practice just for chairs.

A. Rosenbaum: Again, I don’t know. What I said I’ve heard of that being done with chair
positions; I haven’t heard it being done here with faculty positions was all I was saying. Sue.

S. Willis: I don’t have time to sort of thoroughly read the University Bylaws but I would be
surprised if this were not addressed in there. There’s probably something, I would be surprised if
the University Bylaws didn’t have something to say about that. Probably somebody should maybe
that’s a sort of thing that the University Council Rules and Governance Committee is supposed to
interpret (the University Bylaws) and so perhaps my committee or me or somebody should take a
look at them and see if that’s addressed.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, we can certainly take a look and see if there’s something there to be
interpreted.

S. Willis: Or not, maybe they’re perfectly clear and don’t need any interpretation.

A. Rosenbaum: Could be, so they could be perfectly clear and not being followed or maybe they
are. So we should keep an eye on this. Let’s not let it go, we’ll remain mindful of this. Okay, good.
Any other items? I don’t want to cut that off, did you have something else to add to that?

T. Fisher: No, I know where to check.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Nancy.
N. Castle: Do you want Rules and Governance to look at it? That I could do?

S. Willis: The University Council’s Rules and Governance. I meant that the University Council’s Rules and Governances.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, we’ll take a look at it and see if it’s something we want them to look at. We’ll take a look at that and maybe we can also take a look at the College of Education Policy and Procedures Manual and see if there’s something articulated there and we can keep an eye on it. Any other questions or comments from the floor?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Letter of Acceptance of Nomination from Alan Rosenbaum – Page 11
B. Academic Policy Council minutes – November 8, 2010
C. Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education minutes – February 7, 2011
D. Graduate Council minutes – October 4, 2010
E. Graduate Council minutes – November 1, 2010
F. Graduate Council minutes – December 6, 2010

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I’ll entertain a move to adjourn.

S. Willis: Motion.

P. Henry: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor?

All: Aye.

A Rosenbaum: Opposed? Nobody’s opposed. Okay, we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.