FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
Wednesday, March 7, 2012, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Faculty Senate / Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.


OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Gebo (guest), Griffin, Haliczer, Hansen, Latham, Quick, Streb, Sons (guest), Sunderlin

OTHERS ABSENT: Freedman, Prawitz, Small, Snow, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A.Rosenbaum: There are three walk-in items. One is a recommendation that comes from the Executive Committee to change the name of the Bob Lane Award and a little bit of its description as well. You should have my report on the Board of Trustees meeting which was held on Thursday. And the other walk-in is the report from Resources, Space and Budgets and that also includes the budget priorities statement that the Resources, Space and Budgets Committee is proposing.

J. Novak: moved adoption of the agenda with the three walk-in items. J. Kowalski: was second.

The agenda was approved with the three walk-in items and without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 15, 2012 FS MEETING
S. Willis: made the motion. D. Goldblum: was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: I would like to introduce Linda Sons and Dan Gebo. Linda is a professor emeritus and was a long-time member of our mathematics department and also a long-time member of Faculty Senate and University Council as well. They are going to talk to us about the Faculty Fund and some recent changes that affect the Faculty Fund. This was called to my attention by Michael Kolb who is the chair of our Economic Status of the Profession Committee and who made the arrangements for both Linda and Dan to come and speak to us today.

D. Gebo: The Faculty Fund has existed since 1976, and is a fund which provides scholarships for incoming students to recruit high-ranked students. Recipients are students with a 32 ACT, top five percent high school grade point average, or a 3.75 total GPA. We’ve increased the number we’re trying to support, usually four new students a year or 16 students overall. Our contribution, the faculty’s contribution, is $2,000 a year per student. The university puts up a $4,000 tuition waiver and a $3,000 cash stipend. So this is $9,000 to these incoming students. It ranks third in the scholarships for recruiting students. The university scholarships are $22,000, the out-of-state Huskies scholarship is $9,200 so it’s $200 more than ours, and then the Faculty Fund is at $9,000.

So one issue is: Can we support more students? And, of course, that means trying to raise more money. Currently only about 50 faculty on campus, including retirees, donate to this fund and yet we still raised over $27,000 last year. So we’re a little short in terms of supporting the $32,000 that we need, but this fund is in good shape. It has well over $100,000 in it. We can afford to lose a few thousand dollars as we try to get up to these 16 top students. One pitch here is to try to get more of you to donate, that would help.

The second part of this is that, over the past two years, the NIU Foundation is taking over more and more control of the Faculty Fund. Of course, the NIU Foundation is the bank, so all the money goes to them and they hold all of the addresses and they’ve taken over all the mailings and the labeling and addressing and stuff. And that’s great, that part has actually worked out and made it easier for all of us who used to stuff envelopes and help out in this process.

But then in the Fall, when I get all the donation information and so on I have, of course, tried to write thank you letters to all of these individuals who have donated, particularly some of the big donors. And this is where it gets tricky because, all of the sudden now, this information, all your addresses, is personal information and it’s been hard to get a hold of this information. Instead of having our separate mailing, as we used to have, now we are one out of several boxes in the form that they put out. Our letter goes out usually right after spring break. So we have a letter, we have the donation form, now we’ve been kind of lumped into other types of funding situations on campus.
My second question to you then is: What role do you guys want to play? Do you want to continue to let the NIU Foundation run a lot of this? Do you want to have a bigger role in this and go back to the old days where we would have to make the letter, send out, be more forceful in taking over the money, getting monthly reports, whatever we would like to do in terms of this? So one issue is total dollars; another issue is how to control the money or how it’s distributed. NIU Foundation has been very good. They come over and ask me how many students I want to fund. Can I take some transfers? There’s really no issue about that. We play no role in selecting the students. The university ranks all these incoming students and they go down this list. So we’re completely out of that part of it, but the actual mechanized aspect of it, of how to get the money out, how to make sure students are getting these funds, make sure that people are donating or getting some response back besides the NIU official little letter that they would get back and so on is I guess the question I bring to you. It’s not a huge issue, but I’d like to know kind of what you’re feelings are relative to NIU Foundation.

L. Sons: This fund was started by faculty, way back when, with the idea that we didn’t have scholarships for students to come into the university based on their merit and across the university. That is, these are students who are not necessarily committed to any specific program or major. The University Scholarship Committee receives the applications and they go down through that and the students that are supposed to go into the Faculty Fund are those that get these awards, are those that come right under the University Scholar Awards. Now I think you all know what the University Scholar Awards are, they are the full grant, four-year awards. We have very few of those in the university, and there really aren’t that many Faculty Fund scholarships either when you start thinking about it. So we’re trying to get and recruit top students through this. And through the years we’ve had quite a number of students who have come to the university and they’ve come to it based on the fact that they received one of these scholarships. Some of our very, very best students who came through Faculty Fund awards. When someone contributes to the Faculty Fund, every dollar that is contributed to the Faculty Fund, goes into student scholarships.

A. Rosenbaum: What is the problem with letting it continue to be handled by the foundation? Are we concerned that if we don’t do something that our Faculty Fund is somehow in jeopardy, that it won’t be administered the way we want it to be administered? Are we concerned that the foundation is taking over more and more of the operation of this. I had the sense I think that perhaps we’re concerned that we lose control over it or there’s a problem if we don’t somehow act to take it out of the hands of the foundation. Is any of that true?

L. Sons: I think the problem is exactly that. That the foundation wants to view it as just an annual fund type thing, so any old contribution isn’t necessarily going to specify enough for people to really see that Faculty Fund sitting out there. It’s, “oh well, I might as well give something to the library; oh well, I might as well give something to...and we’re not against those kinds of gifts, but when you put this as if it’s an add-on and it’s just part of one of 20 million things you could give to, if you will, which is sort of the way the annual fund is kind of set up, then it doesn’t stand out enough to be able to say, “hey, we really want to support students.”

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so the danger is that donations that are made by faculty might not get into this particular fund.
L. Sons: Yes, and we might not then be able to maintain this or increase it. It would be desirable to even increase it.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, well what would be the alternative? Would we be saying we’re going to collect the money, keep the money, give out the money, pick out the students?

D. Gebo: I don’t think we actually have to be the bank and keep control of the funds, but we need to have greater access to the mailing and the, how should I put it, the papers that go in the mailing in terms of making this more of an exclusive donation, separate from all the other types of donations.

A. Rosenbaum: And is the foundation not amenable to that? In other words, if we said that we want to approve the letters that are sent out, are they saying, “no you can’t do that”?

D. Gebo: In the past they used to provide the labeling and help out, but they want to subsume all of that into their annual fund.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, with the danger being that money that would normally go to the Faculty Fund may not get to Faculty Fund and then the scholarships would be in jeopardy. But whatever does get to the Faculty Fund, that will still go to the scholarships, there’s no problem with that?

D. Gebo: No.

A. Rosenbaum: Does anybody else have any questions or thoughts on this?

D. Zahay-Blatz: I was just wondering if there’s any provision in the fund for doing mailings? Can we use the money that comes from the fund to send an annual mailing on our own if we got the labels from…?

L. Sons: Well we’ve always tried to avoid that. Some of us have absorbed some of that cost at times historically, but what we’ve tried to do is since the foundation does, in fact, get some monies out of whatever we have that there that isn’t used at a given time, is to let that fund simply absorb what represents the mailing as opposed to our taking it out of the dollars that could otherwise go to students. The Faculty Fund has always been set up with the idea that every dollar you contribute goes to scholarships.

D. Zahay-Blatz: It sounds like we need to ask the foundation to do an annual mailing where this is highlighted. Yes? Would that be the ideal solution?

D. Gebo: I’m not sure they’ll go for it, but that would be great.

D. Zahay-Blatz: Well, I don’t know what the next step is procedurally; do we make a motion that we ask the foundation?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I think prior to a motion, I guess we could make an inquiry with the foundation and find out if it requires a motion. Maybe I can ask them to do what we’re talking
about and then we will at least know whether there is a problem. Perhaps I could make an inquiry with the foundation and see what we could do. Would that be satisfactory?

A. Lash: I think more investigation to understand what’s going on would be a good idea.

A. Rosenbaum: Because it probably would be easiest to get them to do what we want them to do rather than us having to do it ourselves.

C. Nissen: I was just wondering, are there other funding separate entities that handle funding or is everything, for similar things, is there any precedent for creating a separate kind of a sub-committee of the foundation that would take care of this?

L. Sons: Not that I’m aware of.

C. Nissen: So this would be something almost new?

A. Rosenbaum: Any other questions?

S. Willis: This is more in the sense of a suggestion, but it sounds like part of the issue would be to keep the solicitation separate from the general annual fund solicitation. It occurs to me, that at least for faculty on campus, that that’s something that could be done through campus mail or e-mail or something like that and that’s perhaps that’s something could be run out of, say, out of the Faculty Senate office if we can’t get the foundation to keep it separate.

A. Rosenbaum: I think that’s a good idea. The thing that I had been told was that a large amount of this fund comes from emeritus faculty, who are not on campus and we’d have to get that mailing list which we, at the moment, don’t have access to. But we could ask for that. We can certainly look into that and we can certainly handle the mailing through the senate office.

J. Kowalski: Either a separate mailing or when the annual sort of appeal comes out, which I respond to, I don’t remember seeing anything that focused my attention on the Faculty Fund as a special entity, I’m sure it’s there, but I think you’re right, that it slips under the radar. If there were some way to include a piece or some enclosure in that that would direct faculty to the availability of giving, that might help.

A. Rosenbaum: I’d also like to remind you again that in Faculty Senate we have a representative of every department so it also wouldn’t be a bad idea for people to mention this at department meetings and make sure their colleagues are aware of it. And we also now have Faculty Matters in which we can include a reminder about the Faculty Fund and to make sure that people check the Faculty Fund box on the forms.

A. Rosenbaum: Thanked Dan Gebo and Linda Sons for coming. Okay, prior to our meeting today you were all aware of the town hall meeting on pension reform that was held by President Peters and Steve Cunningham. I was able to listen to about an hour of it and they streamed it live. That is apparently being archived so you can listen to it at your convenience. Essentially, Steve Cunningham outlined the mess that we are in pension-wise and also spent a great deal of time talking about the IGPA plan which is the plan that came from the professors at the
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign which I mentioned at our last meeting. This is an alternative to Senate Bill 512 and it is worthy of your attention. I think the administration, Steve Cunningham – people who are involved with the pensions – seem to feel that this is something that’s worth backing so that we can avoid more draconian plans that may be coming out of the legislature. President Peters sent everyone the IGPA proposal and we posted it on the Senate Blackboard. If you are having trouble getting it, just let us know and we’ll get it to you.

Okay, the last thing I’ll mention before we move on is the mission statement. We went over the mission statement at our last meeting and we got a lot of suggestions from the senate. I took those suggestions back to the Mission Statement Committee. Several of those suggestions were incorporated as changes to the mission statement. That mission statement went to the Board of Trustees for a first reading at the March 1 meeting and there was some discussion. The Board of Trustees had some questions and they sent it back to the committee for further revisions. The Board of Trustees was generally positive about the mission statement. They made a few suggestions that the committee will have to consider.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. University Faculty Workload Policies and Guidelines draft – Page 3-14

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next item you were all alerted to is the university faculty workload policy draft that was sent out. You may recall that this was developed by the Blue Ribbon Committee on Workload and that the Faculty Senate had a representative to that blue ribbon committee and that was David Wade. At a meeting early this year, David reported that he was concerned that the draft that had been sent to the provost had somehow been changed in ways that the committee had not intended. He really wasn’t sure of that because he was getting no feedback and it had sort of just disappeared. We’ve been waiting for this draft of the faculty workload policy and we have finally gotten it and now, hopefully, you’ve all had a chance to look at it. I posted both the policy and David Wade’s response on the blackboard community. My take on David’s response was that he felt that, with a couple of minor exceptions, it was essentially what the workload committee had proposed. He apparently didn’t feel there were any major changes. He thought there were a couple of ambiguities, but essentially that was what the blue ribbon panel had proposed and again, the blue ribbon panel largely consisted of faculty. So we had a lot of faculty input into that. The provost, as I mentioned, feels that this is an academic policy that he can impose without UC approval. This is our opportunity to provide feedback to the provost regarding what we like or don’t like about the workload policy. This does not replace an existing policy; it is all new policy. This is finally putting down, in policy form, what has essentially been the practice at the university but which has not previously been articulated as a policy. The floor is open for questions and comments.

L. Elish-Piper: I have three big questions. One of them is, “Did the committee look at the financial ramifications of this?” After reading this, I looked at some of the different ways that course loads might be reduced or increased and realized that it would significantly impact the way the workload is assigned, not only in my department, but in multiple departments in my college. So I was wondering if there was any taking of that into consideration in terms of how
this might play out in terms of allowing reductions in courses that might make it difficult for
departments to cover all of the courses that they need to offer.

Another one was that I anticipated when I read this that it would be more on ways that we would
differentiate assignments. But it really surprised me on how specific it was, especially the
formula of this equals that type of reduction. It just seemed very likely to create a lot of
confusion in terms of operationalizing it so that I could see faculty or department chairs sitting
down and accounting for people’s time but not necessarily looking at what the priorities are in
the department and are we addressing the most important aspects of the department? I was
surprised that, rather than a broad-based tool that would allow us to think about differentiating
assignments where some people might be focused more on teaching and others might be focused
more on service or scholarship or any combination of things, that it seemed much more like a
checklist or an accounting list.

And then the third one was that, in the absence of a statement at the college level, this statement
would be used. But it didn’t seem clear as to how a college would go about creating its own
document. We’ve had some of that discussion in my college. Would it go through our college
senate? Would it go through college council? Would it go through both groups? What would the
procedure be at the college level for creating a statement and how would that college statement
have to relate to this one? In other words, are there certain aspects of this one that are non-
negotiable, or could we create an entirely independent, very different kind of statement?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I can’t answer the question since I wasn’t part of that committee and our
representative is not here today. So we don’t know whether they did consider the financial
implications of the policy.

H. Bateni: I’m just trying to transfer a concern of some of our faculty members when they heard
that workload policy is being discussed today. They wanted to know whether they would have a
chance to review it and provide some feedback.

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t think this is going to be brought up in an open forum so the vehicle for
expressing feedback would be through you, or possibly through your chair as well. We don’t
have to come up with final recommendations right this minute, so it’s perfectly reasonable for
you to go back to your departments, talk to people, and send us things that you are concerned
about. I don’t know how quickly the provost wants the feedback. But I think that this would be
one vehicle for them to express their feedback: through the Faculty Senate representatives.

A. Lash: One question came up. We already have a workload policy established and approved
by the faculty and the college council, which is a little different than what we have here and the
question is: Is our policy going to have to be changed to conform to this?

A. Rosenbaum: Again, I feel like I’m answering for the provost or the committee and I don’t
really know for sure. My reading of it was that the expectation is this will be revised frequently.
That it talks about annual reconsideration by departments and colleges and so I imagine that it is
being viewed as a dynamic document. I didn’t see anything that would suggest that existing
policies would now have to be vetted through some chain. What I’ve been told is that this should
not result in wholesale changes going on, that essentially these are guidelines for departments to
develop policies, that those policies would then have to be approved within their college. So if your college has already approved that, then you have already met those requirements. I don’t know that there is going to be some requirement that departments all reconsider their workload policies. I think there was some concern, especially in your college, about whether faculty were consulted in developing the workload policy. And this is firmly stating that faculty need to be consulted.

A. Lash: If you look at page nine, there is a statement about newly-hired tenure-track positions. This is significantly different than what we have. Right now our untenured faculty do not teach more than two courses for six years. Here it is reduced to first two years. So I think that’s where the concern was if somebody new or old can come in and say, “Okay, that’s really significantly different than what the work policy is here,” and then new untenured professors could be teaching within two years, three and three rather than two and two.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, but again the language says, “should receive a reduction of at least one.” It doesn’t say “a maximum” of one. There’s nothing in here that would preclude a department from extending that benefit. So again, it seems to be a very low bar and allows a lot of variability across departments. It seems like there would be nothing in here that would prevent your department from giving course relief for more than the first four semesters.

D. Goldblum: I think another thing to consider too is that this is a public document that is meant to inform legislators and the general public about what we do on a daily basis and why we shouldn’t all be teaching seven/seven loads and why we may not be in our office 40 hours a week or in the classroom 40 hours a week. So I think this also describes for a larger audience what we do and that’s an important part of this document as well.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, thank you. That’s a very important comment because I think that is part of the impetus for sort of putting this policy into place because the university and our representatives at various levels, including the FAC to the IBHE, spend a lot of time educating legislators every year as to what faculty are doing.

S. Willis: I remember when this first got started that there was a survey done of doctoral intensive research institutions or whatever it is that we are and there was some variation in the standard workloads from about two/two to about three/three and I was disappointed then and I’m still that we pegged ourselves at the top end of that. However, I think there’s enough flexibility in the credit hour equivalencies that we can accommodate a wide variety of activities. I did have one sort of nit-picky thing on page 11 or 12 which is actually page 13 of the agenda here, where it says “teaching of large and small sections.” This is about three quarters of the way down in the table – the summary of workload or equivalents. It says, “small section enrollment below minimum levels,” and over there on the right it says, “greater than or equal to .75 CHE,” and then it says “less 1.0 CHE.” I suspect they mean “less than or equal to.” It would appear to imply that, if you’re teaching a small section, that you can’t get three hours of credit for doing a three-credit-hour course. I don’t think that’s what they mean because it’s not what they say right after that, but to a math person, that’s what it says.

C. Cappell: I’ve been an advocate of lab-based teaching and I try to teach in a laboratory because I think pedagogical research says hands-on teaching is more beneficial. If you look on
the same page, at the very first line of how laboratory course hour equivalents are treated and how engaged learning (which I think is yet to be determined what that is) is treated, it seems like a four-hour lab course actually gets equated as a three-hour CHE and some undefined engaged learning actually gets inflated, can be inflated from one up to 1.24999 with only three students in it. It seems that’s – I noticed that and it bothered me and I think that’s – just consistent with the theme that was mentioned first that this is awfully nit-picking and almost direction from above as to how faculty should be allocating times and what they will benefit from if they pursue certain objectives defined outside of the department versus not. I think my general comment is I do appreciate the need for some kind of quantification of workload and communication to external audiences, but I’m not too thrilled with this detailed formulaic direction.

A. Rosenbaum: Earlier in the document it talks about departments creating their own policy and developing their own equivalents and then saying if a department doesn’t do that, then the default is to this. So that would seem that, if you are a department that values lab teaching or whatever, you could define it however your department wants to define it. But if your department chooses not to develop a workload policy, then this would be the default. It would seem like they are not saying this is the way departments have to do it, but rather if departments choose not to do it otherwise, you’re stuck with this. That’s my read of it, but I’m not necessarily right about it.

C. Cappell: I appreciate that and the footnote does say these are to provide guidance, but then in the first paragraph it says, “all workload assignments are to be consistent with this.” So it seems that the court has two languages it could use.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so to summarize your concern is that we need to find out whether these equivalents are what departments have to follow or can departments develop their own equivalents and these would be the default if, in fact, a department chooses not to.

C. Downing: Sometimes the problem with some of this stuff in our culture is that yes it’s guidance, yes it should be considered, but once it makes it through and sits around for 10, 15 years, whatever some undefined time period, then it kind of becomes law, you know, where somebody says, “well it’s in the workload guidelines,” so it slips through on a this is guidance, this is guidance, this is guidance, we can do it and then new people take chair positions, dean positions, whatever and they grab this document and they say, “check the workload guidelines. I want to follow on Sue Willis’s nit-picky comment, unless I’m having a brain-lock, same page, sorry right above the “teaching of large or small sections,” she commented on the small section. I have a question on the large section right above it. It says, “less than or equal to 1.25” and then for an example a three-credit course has a workload of no more than 4.5. So, to me, that should either be “less than or equal to 1.5.” I’m hoping that’s 1.5 since I teach large sections, but it reads as 1.25. One of those two has to be wrong, I think.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we’ll call that to their attention. It’s also interesting that we want to be a student-centered, research intensive university, but we’re rewarding large sections as opposed to smaller, more intimate classrooms. That might be something the provost should note also. As for the policy becoming more than it’s intended to be over time, that is certainly a concern.
M. Kolb: Just to continue with that, comments from my department where we do teach a lot of gen-eds with large sections, I think the major complaint again in terms of nit-picking was the threshold of 100 students and should that not perhaps be maybe longitudinally spread out a little bit, maybe in smaller increments and/or including large increments. I think that was the main point. Why that that threshold of 100?

R. Feurer: I have just a general question. It’s clear that it’s the chair of departments that’s going to allocate and differentiate faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: What do you mean allocate and differentiate?

R. Feurer: Well, in other words, if you have this workload in your department and your chair basically suggests whether you’re fitting into this schema right, that’s how it’s going to work? I guess the upshot is: Does this document make it grieveable if there’s a problem with the way the chair assigns?

A. Rosenbaum: I would assume that it does. Chairs have the prerogative to assign workload, it’s in the APPM.

R. Feurer: Does this give faculty more leverage to dispute what they feel is an unfair assignment?

A. Rosenbaum: I would think if it’s done inequitably that faculty would be able to grieve that. That’s my feeling, that’s always been the case. If your chair assigns you to teach four courses and someone in the same position as you is teaching three, then you could grieve it. So I don’t know if this gives us any new powers, but I guess you have a document now that you could hold up.

J. Kowalski: Nobody formally mentioned it, but just going to the comments that were submitted by David Wade, I’d just like to say that I endorse or certainly recognize his concerns and that some of the language that he pointed out that was either unclear or somewhat ambiguous I think does need to be looked at a second time.

B. The Bob Lane Award – proposed changes and nominations – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Many of you who have been in the senate for a while know, we have for a long time had the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Award. In recent years, we have had an occasional nominee, but not a nominee every year. At the Executive Committee we discussed the possibility of changing the name of the Bob Lane Award so that we could recognize, not only faculty members who had been a thorn in the side of the administration, but also faculty members who had really gone above and beyond in terms of their service to the faculty, either within the Faculty Senate or I guess in some instances outside of the Faculty Senate.

In order to do that, the proposal would be that we change the name of the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Award to the Bob Lane Shared Governance Award and that we change the nature of award to recognize a member of the senate for their exceptional service. This would include serving either as a chair or a member of a particularly busy committee, serving as a faculty
senate rep on a university-wide committee, search committees, blue ribbon panels, etc. and also including the watchdog kinds of activities that the award was originally designed to honor. What we would be doing is broadening the award and changing its name and recognizing that part of shared governance is also being a watchdog and being vigilant. The motion is that we change the wording of the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Award to the Bob Lane Shared Governance Award and that we change some of the language as I have suggested in the walk-in item.

**R. Feurer:** I would suggest a different name. How about Faculty Advocacy? I understand what you’re saying and I think that most of the content I agree with, but, “shared governance,” it’s not something I’d want to put on my wall. I was a winner, in a previous year and it’s proudly displayed on my wall, but I sure wouldn’t put up “shared governance” because the meaning isn’t as clear I think.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so your suggestion is that we call it the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award? I have no major investment in the “shared governance award” title. If the Faculty Senate prefers the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award, that’s fine with me.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** I second that we change it to faculty advocacy. It’s short and it’s concise and I think it gives the meaning of what we want to give to.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, that’s fine. I accept the friendly amendment.

**S. Willis:** I have a certain fondness for the eternal vigilance title having come up with it in the first place, but that’s okay. But it made me think briefly, which is getting rarer and rarer these days, that vigilance is something we need not only inside the institution but externally with all this talk of pension reform and all that kind of thing. I like the “faculty advocacy” title. I think that’s good, but perhaps in the description we could include being a watchdog not only internally but externally to things that would affect from the outside as well. I don’t know that that’s particularly specified in there.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Perhaps add some of that language to the description which is not really part of the award. Any other thoughts on this? We don’t have to change it, by the way. If you’d like to leave it as the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Award we can do that.

**A. Lash:** I like the word, “vigilance,” so it sounds good to hear Bob Lane Faculty Vigilance Award.

**A. Rosenbaum:** The main reason was that we also wanted to have the option of nominating faculty who perhaps were serving the faculty in some other way. That eternal vigilance is not the only way by which we serve. We have chairs of our committees that have done enormous amounts of work and we might want to recognize that. It was just to broaden out a little bit so it wasn’t just eternal vigilance but it was vigilance and also service and recognizing that there are other forms of service to the faculty. But the senate doesn’t have to go with that.

**J. Kowalski:** Well, I’m old enough and been around enough I don’t really care, I’ll stir it up a little bit. I’ll just reiterate and reaffirm what I think you were trying to say, Alan, and that is that there may be in a certain year someone who has done exemplary and above-and-beyond service
on subcommittees or other sort of ad hoc or special committees that are connected with representing faculty interests but in a way that might not wind up being overtly confrontational or might not even fall under the heading or carry the connotations that advocacy sometimes does for people. If we found a way to say something like Faculty Advocacy and Service Award or something of that sort that made it clear that there’s a possibility that somebody might get this award who wasn’t speaking truth-to-power, although I certainly think there’s many occasions when that needs to be done and that’s sort of what the original award was devised to recognize, but maybe we could expand it a bit.

M. Kostic: Milivoje Kostic from Mechanical Engineering. The way I read it is really about being a watchdog and not doing just a very fine service in general. It is something to emphasize faculty basically advocacy which is opposite from doing fine service which should be another award and then there should be an award for a very good service in general. So I wouldn’t expand it to the service award also.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, as it stands now we don’t actually have a separate service award but certainly that would be an option. So if you do not want this award and title change you would vote “no” and then we would leave it the way it is. And then, if someone wants to introduce another award, we can do that. We’ll start out with the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy and Service Award. If you vote “no,” we can then introduce a motion to change it to the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. And if we vote that down, it will remain the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Award.

1 – YES – 9 votes
2 – NO – 27 votes
3 – ABSTAIN – 0 votes

A. Rosenbaum: It stays the same for the moment. The next vote is whether to change it to the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. In other words, we’ve taken off the word, “service.” Again, if you vote 1, we change it, if you vote 2, it stays the same and this time it will remain the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Award.

1 – YES – 26 votes
2 – NO – 10 votes
3 – ABSTAIN – 0 votes

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the motion passes. The award has been changed to the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. Thank you. Next, we have to take nominees for said award and the nominees will be considered by the Executive Committee as per our rules. The Executive Committee will then take those nominations and decide who should get the award. We’re now open for nominations for the renamed Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award.

R. Feurer: I want to nominate Charles Cappell.

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to thank Rosemary because Charles is, I think, someone who should be nominated for this award. He has really carried a heavy workload and done advocacy work as well here. Strong candidate.
J. Novak: I would like to nominate Laurie Elish-Piper.

C. Downing: I would like to nominate Sue Willis.

A. Rosenbaum: This is great. We’ve never had so many nominees. If there are no other nominations, I’ll close the nominations. The Executive Committee will consider those and in our next meeting we will announce the winner at our next meeting.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – Pages 15-17

A. Rosenbaum: Okay we’re on to our reports from advisory committees. First let me say this, it’s 10 after 4, if people are going to say the same thing that’s already in the written report, let’s just really leave it at the written report and not add much, but we can take questions. First report, Earl Hansen, FAC to the IBHE, Earl.

E. Hansen: It is the same report. The only thing I would add as a sidebar is that the issue on credit hours taught for workload has been kicked around at the Faculty Advisory Committee and it basically comes up as a department decision across the state. The only two points I would want you to look at would be on page two, the fourth paragraph about the Kankakee Community Colleges and 94 percent of the freshmen not ready to be in college. On the third page, the third paragraph down, if you have some things that you think we as a public university should be going to the senate with or the legislature with as an issue and it’s not on that list, would you please get it to me.

B. Student Association – Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 18-19

A. Quick: I will keep it as brief as I can. Unfortunately, we have a few things that were after this was printed. First and foremost, I want to let everyone know, the Student Association passed a resolution this last week to force both the university and the city to look at our implementation of the new HB43 law that was passed in Illinois which is the stopping for pedestrians in crosswalks. It is a law. Unfortunately, our busses, our police and many of our university personnel and citizens are not following this law and every day we see students, faculty, staff and pedestrians get close to getting hit. As I’ve mentioned many times, 173 people were killed last year in Illinois alone in crosswalk-vehicle related accidents. We want to be ahead of this issue.

Next, we are currently working with University Relations [and ITS] regarding the Huskie bus application. I know there are some faculty members and staff members that utilize our bus service and this past year we dedicated about $50,000 to redo the map system so it’s actually real time, you can actually watch the bus. We’re having some issues right now with the Huskie app; they created their own product. It’s sub-par because they are the ones who decide if you get to keep an app or not. They are the ones who are kind of putting their heels in the sand. We are
going to keep fighting. We want something that’s actually a good quality not just something so a department can get credit for it if it’s not good.

Next thing, any club sports, we are moving those along where NIU club sports are no longer going to be funded under S.A. We’re going to have them under a separate fee. So these are your NIU ice hockey, men and women’s rugby, those things. We are going to create a full-time position through campus rec to service these areas. This is another area where the school has not done a very good job of understanding the liability the school has been put in. When these teams travel, very often they are not signing waivers. There’s a lot of things that are not being done and, again, it’s one of those things that, if something bad happens, the university is going to have a lot to deal with.

We did pass a resolution which will be coming up to you this week showing support for the position of the ombudsman. It was a lengthy discussion and debate. In the end, it was a unanimous vote that we feel that at this time, the only outlet for students currently is the ombudsman’s office. And, because of that, we feel it’s a necessary thing and we would like to see the school recognize that because of the work that he’s done and previous ombudsmen that it is an important outlet for students and faculty and staff for that matter. So I hope you also would show your support in that regard.

Next thing, and this is something that actually involves the faculty a great deal, it’s been brought to my attention on numerous occasions, and we are looking at a way to respond to this, that there’s a lot of issues currently with HIPAA violations in the classroom, the CAAR office specifically with people with disabilities. I had it myself happen where faculty members make comments and references to people’s disability and their standings, if you will. It’s an issue that’s happened numerous times. I’ve spoken with a few different faculty members on ways to look at ensuring that we don’t have this again. As you know, it’s an extremely sensitive issue for some people but it’s a situation where a faculty member will say, “hey how did this go?” something like that in front of another student, in front of the class and make reference to it. Not being mean, but just saying it and that in itself is a violation as well. I know I mentioned it at Steering Committee the other day and we’re going to look at ways to combat that and maybe hopefully, at the college level and your department level will have trainings or something to make sure you are following the HIPAA guidelines for privacy.

The last two things I have, we’re still fighting the fight to keep university vehicles off our sidewalks and our grasses. As you know, it’s been a hot-button issue for me this year. I’m glad there is some attention being brought to it. I literally get inundated with text messages and e-mails from people now with different cars. We’ve spent a lot of money, I know you have all discussed the rising costs in parking fees for this campus. One of the purposes of those fees is to replace sidewalks and we have vehicles parking on cement that’s not built for them and it causes a lot of strain that creates more costs.

The last thing that really doesn’t affect you, but I want to keep you aware of, currently the Student Association is working with the City of DeKalb on their liquor laws. It was brought to my attention recently that when a group of students wanted to go to Fatty’s that they were turned down. I actually went and met with the manager the other day and discussed with her what had happened and she said that, technically, anyone under 21, if you’ve taken your children there,
that’s illegal. You can’t technically, even during the day. Just because you don’t have someone at the door, it’s not legal in the City of DeKalb. And they said this summer, in the middle of the afternoon, the City of DeKalb sent police officers in there and carded every single person at every table and they got like a $3,000 fine. Of course, at seven o’clock at night and on, usually they have a bouncer there that checks IDs. But, because of the strict liquor laws in the City of DeKalb and the liquor commissioner in the city is the mayor who dictates all these rules, there’s a lot of areas where students aren’t able to go to. We talk a lot about giving our students outlets and things to do. If you go to a local restaurant or a local establishment, 68 percent of that money, the taxes of everything you pay, stays here. If you go to a chain restaurant, 38 percent of your money stays in this community. So we’re taking it not from a “we want to go to a place where people can drink,” but “we want to keep money here local.” We want to support that, so I hope this is something you as faculty and members of the community can help support us and try to create new ways and outlets for our students here on this campus. That’s something that continually comes up when we talk about the perception of safety and the perception of giving students something to do. We need to find outlets. We want this community to be very friendly to our students and I ask for your support in that regard.

C. Cappell: I’m just curious if students are satisfied with the pedestrian and bike path access around campus and integrating with the community and if this is on your agenda. Last year in the senate there was discussion, I think in the Resources Committee, about the problem of making this a more bike-friendly campus, and it seems like that’s something that could really be a mutual interest for both faculty and students. Is that a topic in your organization?

A. Quick: It is, and I know we’ve talked about creating bike lanes and all these things and I keep getting told its funding and the places we want to build them are City of DeKalb and, of course, you know the city can’t even give us money to put stop for pedestrian signs in the road. I definitely would support that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and we’d be remiss if not mentioning Pat Henry who for years advocated in both senate and council for more bike paths and greater bicycle use.

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report

D. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report

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

A. Rosenbaum: You have my report, I’m not going to elaborate on it. The things that are of most interest to us were that the sabbatical leaves were all approved by the BOT and also that the salary increment was also approved by the BOT.
D. Goldblum: It says here, “Phase II of the salary stabilization program.” How many phases are there?

A. Rosenbaum: Two.

D. Goldblum: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: I guess if they can somehow come up with money, there will be a Phase III, but I think the latest word from the president is that this will probably be it for a while; that unless things improve dramatically in the state’s financial situation that there probably will not be another one coming.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – report

R. Feurer: I’ll be as brief as I can. One thing I wanted to ask fellow senators: Our committee is starting to look at the FMLA policy and its implementation at the university level. This comes from faculty who are concerned about it. And so I’m asking people, if you want to have any input or have any comments about the FMLA policy, if you have information to share with our committee, please direct your comments to me.

We’re working on a number of issues. As you know, we are trying to find out what the administrator-to-faculty ratio is. It is one of those issues we have often times gotten different information. The one that has come that I have been trying to get Steve Cunningham to respond to might be of interest to everybody, is that comes from the Salary Equity Committee, of which I’m a member. And I have written to Steve Cunningham several times to ask him if he can verify if this is true but if that information is correct, we are basically at a one-to-one ratio at this university and I think people might be interested in that statistic. We’re going to continue to look at how we compare to other universities.

B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – report

C. Cappell: Just points of information – the committee has met regarding the online evaluation procedure and we’ll have a report hopefully at the next senate meeting and Steve Martin and I met with the two reps from APASC on the grade change and that process is not yet resolved.

C. Economic Status of the Profession – Michael Kolb, Chair – report

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Economic Status of the Profession, Michael.

M. Kolb: One quick note – the PowerPoint from today’s forum on benefits will be posted on the budget and pensions Web page so you can access it there. Secondly, our committee has met a couple of times now and we’re trying to get a handle on a couple of key issues on which I’d like to keep everyone informed. Our discussions have also likewise turned to salary and we want to undertake two overall goals.
The first: We began to look at the university-wide study of faculty salaries that was published in 2008 by Joe Grush and our sub-committee looked at that report. We came up with a number of concerns, one being with the qualitative and the quantitative analysis. We’ve begun a dialog with the provost’s office regarding some of those data and what they really mean.

Second of all, again trying to get a grasp on issues of salary, we want to implement a general university-wide survey or poll on salaries. We are hoping we can execute that in the next few weeks and just ask some basic questions to all faculty concerning their general view towards salaries and basically how happy people are. So we’re open for any comments or concerns that anybody might have.

A. Rosenbaum: Does anyone have any comments? The senate should be aware that the report that Michael is referring to was the report that was generated in response to concerns about gender equity in salaries at the university. That report again found that there was not a problem. The committee is looking into this in the name of the senate, so the senate needs to be on board with the idea that this is going on. If we are okay with the committee reopening this issue, that’s fine. If we are not, then we should make sure that that is known.

R. Feurer: I applaud this and for those who don’t know, you can see that report, right, online?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, it’s on provost’s website I believe.

R. Feurer: Right, so you could go look at it and I think from what you’ve said, it’s a concern about the data points?

M. Kolb: Yes, that is correct. We have some issues regarding the quantitative analysis and maybe I can’t speak the best because I’m not the most expert of statisticians, but we’ve listed a series of bullet points that we would like to ask Dr. Grush to clarify and to detail. Like I say, it has to do with basically the qualitative analysis. There’s also a discussion about some qualitative analysis that a sub-committee did, but there was no report and so we’re trying to get some information on how that data was collected, if it was actually implemented, and if there were policies that were the result of that report.

A. Rosenbaum: I guess what I would like the Faculty Senate to be aware of is that this is a potentially explosive area. There are concerns I think that that will be raised about us going into this and, if we are agreed that if we want to do this, that’s fine. But I think it’s only fair to let the senate know that it’s potentially an area that there could be some contentiousness around.

R. Feurer: Can you say why it’s explosive, that’s kind of a very powerful word.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I guess because there are also lawsuits that are pending around this issue and so the university is defending said lawsuits and information that is brought up questioning the report may raise some concern within the administration. I’m not saying we shouldn’t do it. I’m saying that we should be aware of what we are doing. There are faculty members who prefer not to rock the boat in certain areas and that’s a perfectly legitimate position. There are others that would choose to do that, but I just want the senate to be aware that by going into this, we are potentially rocking the boat. And if we choose to do that, that’s fine, but we should be aware of
what we are doing. I’m not sure if people have enough information for us to vote on this at the moment, so why don’t you take a look at that report and I’ll open up a discussion thread on the blackboard community and people can weigh in with their feeling about this and if we seem to get a preponderance of negative comments then we’ll have to put it to a vote at some point and decide whether or not we want to authorize economic status of the profession to continue in this vein. Unless someone would like something more immediate, that would be what I would suggest.

S. Willis: Would you include a link to the report?

A. Rosenbaum: We could certainly do that. It’s right on the provost’s website, but if you’d like, I’m sure we can do that.

R. Feurer: I know we’re running out of time, Alan, but I just have to say one more thing that there were a number of people that I know personally who were on that committee who ran into brick walls when they requested information, so I don’t want it to look like Michael and his committee are stirring up trouble. This has been an ongoing concern of faculty members including those who served on that old commission.

A. Rosenbaum: Absolutely, and if I made it sound like he’s stirring up trouble, that’s not what I meant. From our perspective, it’s not stirring up trouble, but we should be aware that it may be viewed by others as stirring up trouble. I just want the senate to be aware of the potential ramifications of this line of inquiry. Not to say that it isn’t a good thing to do or an important thing to do, but just that we know what we are doing.

M. Kolb: Yes, one of the other things that we could do too is we could also include our exchange of memos maybe on the web link if you want. We could do that too so that people have some history not only of the report but also some of the concerns. We would try to detail them now, but they are very lengthy.

A. Rosenbaum: Anything from your committee that you would like to be put on Backboard can be sent to Pat.

D. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum, Liaison/Spokesperson – report and Statement of Budget Priorities – walk-in

D. Goldblum: I’ll just highlight that there’s a house bill going through to eliminate the 50 percent tuition for [children of] employees which you may or may not have heard about. I got it from Dr. Williams and it’s now quite public. On the back of the sheet there is a statement of budget priorities that we’ll submit. Pretty much the same issues as last year.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, now are you soliciting comments from the senate on those priorities?

D. Goldblum: We can do that. We are also meeting April 5 with the president and provost to discuss budgetary issues related to the faculty. So if you have anything you’d like us to bring up
at that meeting, you can e-mail me or Laurie and we can bring those up. Any suggestions for these budget priorities can also go to us in an e-mail too.

A. Rosenbaum: If you have comments or you have some concerns about the priorities that are being put forward, e-mail them either to Laurie Elish-Piper or to David Goldblum.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

1. Nominations for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of Faculty Senate – See list of University Council Members eligible for election – Page 20

Letters of acceptance are due in University Council office by noon Friday, March 23, 2012.

T. Arado: I am opening the floor to nominations for the position of Executive Secretary of University Council, President of Faculty Senate position for the 2012-2013 academic year. The list of people eligible to hold this office is on page 20 of your agenda materials.

A. Rosenbaum: Ibrahim.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Electrical Engineering. I would like to nominate Alan Rosenbaum for Executive Secretary and Senate President.

T. Arado: Anyone who is nominated needs to have a letter of acceptance in by March 23 to the University Council office by noon.

T. Arado: No more nominations, okay I will close the nominations.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed change to NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 4, Operating Procedures of the Faculty Senate – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Pages 21-22

A. Rosenbaum: This item is the second reading of our action to change the agenda template.

1 – YES – 24 votes
2 – NO – 1 vote
3 – ABSTAIN – 1 vote

The Senate bylaw change passed as per the vote above.

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS
A. **Minutes**, Academic Planning Council
B. **Minutes**, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. **Minutes**, Athletic Board
D. **Minutes**, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. **Minutes**, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. **Minutes**, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. **Minutes**, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. **Minutes**, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. **Minutes**, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. **Minutes**, General Education Committee
K. **Minutes**, Honors Committee
L. **Minutes**, Operating Staff Council
M. **Minutes**, Supportive Professional Staff Council
N. **Minutes**, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
O. **Minutes**, University Assessment Panel
P. **Minutes**, University Benefits Committee
Q. 2011-2012 **Meeting Schedule**

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

A. **Rosenbaum**: I want to remind you that the April 4 meeting will be in the Regency Room.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.