

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we will call the meeting to order. A couple of quick reminders that, first of all you all, should have a voting devise. I’d also like to remind you that you shouldn’t play with the voting devise. That we seem to have a problem that until we’re booted up and ready to vote, if you press any buttons it changes the channel and, if you change the channel, then your vote doesn’t get recorded. So you should really not do anything with this until we are ready to vote. You don’t have to turn it on. At the time that we vote you’ll just have to press one, two or three and it will vote. You don’t have to do anything else to it. If you can resist the urge, just let it sit on the desktop until we’re ready to vote. Also, let me remind you that, before you say anything, to make sure you have a microphone in front of you and if you would wait a second to make sure the mike is turned on because, if you start speaking before it’s turned on, we don’t get it on the transcript and it makes life difficult for us. If you’re going to say something, no matter what it is, whether it’s to make a motion or anything else, wait a second, make sure it’s on, say your name and then whatever it is that you have to say.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, first item that we have is the adoption of the agenda. You should have three walk-in items. One of the walk-in items 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. We also going to, later on today, see if we have any nominations for said Bob Lane Award. 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 putting forward. So those are your three walk-in items. I’ll take a motion to accept the agenda with the three walk-in items.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, second.

J. Kowalski: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Jeff Kowalski. Okay so we have Novak on the motion, Kowalski on the second. All in favor of accepting the agenda say “aye.”

Senators: Aye

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposition? Okay, any abstention? Alright the agenda is approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 15, 2012 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the approval of the minutes of the February 15 meeting. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

S. Willis: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Sue Willis. Second?

D. Goldblum: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any changes, adjustments, additions, subtractions, corrections? You love them the way they are? Okay, all in favor of approval of the minutes say “aye.”

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed, abstention? Minutes are approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: The first thing before we do anything else, I’m going 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 at least Faculty Senate if not University Council as well. And Dan Gebo both are going to talk to us about the Faculty Fund and some recent changes that affect the Faculty Fund. And when we hear what those changes are we might want to take this matter up and do something about it. So this was called to my attention by Michael Kolb who is the chair of our Economics Status of the Profession Committee and he made the
arrangements for both Linda and Dan to come and speak to us today. So I’ll turn the microphone over to them and they will explain the situation.

D. Gebo: All right, the Faculty Fund has existed for, how many years, 20 years, since 1976, and this is a fund which is put into scholarships for incoming students to recruit high-ranked students. So these are students with a 32 ACT, top five percent high school grade point average, or a 3.75 total GPA. We’ve increased the amount, 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 or $32,000 for the year. 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, 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 two years 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 batch out of several boxes in their 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? Or is this not such a big issue in terms of getting top students to come to NIU and to try to raise this up to 20 students, 25 students, whatever we can get in terms of total funding?

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? Can I do this, can I do that? There’s really no issue about that. We play no role in selecting the students. So 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 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: Let me make a couple of comments, Linda Sons here. 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, “I’m gonna do accounting or I’m gonna do education or I’m gonna do X.” That is, they’re scholarships that go to students that come in across the university.

They’re picked by the University Scholarship Committee, let me say. 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, let me say, and there really aren’t that many Faculty Fund scholarships either when you start thinking about it. So what we try to do is maintain a scholarship that has the flavor at least of the university scholarship in that. It goes to a student, irrespective of what that major happens to be, but based on their merit. It has nothing to do with financial need. It is based on merit for entering students. 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, that their merit was recognized and they’ve gone on and been some of the very top students that we’ve had. I know when I served with a set of them on the University Council that they were some of our very, very best students who came through with Faculty Fund awards.

The nature of it is to involve more people with contributions to this, to think of the university as a whole as being a little bit more important, maybe, in some ways, then your own particular corner. We have, in fact, brought in through this, students who were undecided and an awful lot of freshmen are undecided anyway, even if they come in and say, “I want to be a blah,” they often are not ready to really be a “blah.” They don’t even know often what that really encompasses because they haven’t been exposed to that much stuff yet. So as they come to the university and they get a much greater breadth of what the university is all about, they suddenly decide, “well maybe I’ll do geology. I never had any geology in high school,” or some such thing. I’m just picking that out, obviously, but what I’m saying is this is the truth of the world. We have an awful lot of young people who are very bright, very able, have done quite well in high school, and that little recognition that comes from saying, “here’s the faculty giving you this award,” is a difference that might bring them here. You’ve looked at the Northern Star in the last couple of days as to what happens with those ACTs and so forth. We’re talking the top-of-the-line type student here that we’re bringing in.

When someone contributes to the Faculty Fund, every dollar that is contributed to the Faculty Fund, goes into the Faculty Fund for student scholarships. Where the Foundation gets anything out of it – that is, any kind of payment if you want to call it that for doing letters for us or something of this sort – comes from whatever they make on the money that we still have sitting here that isn’t going to students, if you understand what I’m saying. They’re investing that and
making a few bucks on it and that goes into the Foundation and is kind of pay for whatever they do for us. So it’s not that they’re doing it out of the gratis of their heart, they’re getting the bucks that come from whatever the fund has at a given time that’s invested.

I appeal to you to consider seriously, across the board kind of thing and the good students that we would all love to have in class. I mean there is no question about that. They make all of your classes better because they are in there working away, they contribute ideas, they’re responding to things, these are the top and it’s a four-year award. As long as they maintain good scholarship, they have it for the next year, so we continue them on for the four years. I’ve said enough.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, are there any questions for either Linda or Dan? I have a question. 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 about, you sort of mentioned over the last two years, 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 domain.

**L. Sons:** Yea, 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? What would we, would we be saying we’re going to collect the money, keep the money, give out the money, pick out the students? Would we have to do that in order to…? No, what would we have to do?

**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 get 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: That would be great, 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 we can ask them to do what we’re talking about and then we will at least be able to come back and say, “no they won’t do it, yes they will do it,” and then we can see what the next step is. Perhaps it would be easier, before we made a motion, if the Faculty Senate is in favor of us doing something, 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. Does that sound reasonable? And we can call on you for feedback on whatever it is they tell us I would assume? Okay. Does anyone else have questions?

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?

L. Sons: There are lots of individual scholarships now that exist in the university. One named in honor of so and so, but those are usually choices made by a particular department and they are usually specified for a particular department so the foundation doesn’t have anything but the dollars that just run through their books, if you will, that they do nothing other than run the scholarship through their books.

C. Nissen: So this is something a little unusual?

L. Sons: Well, this is different, but it was started differently and it is across the university as I say. It’s run in one sense, just like the University Scholar Awards are.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, anyone else have a question? Jeff?

J. Kowalski: Yeah, as I hear this my thought is that, well never mind, I’m not feeling well. Sorry guys.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other questions? Yes, Sue?

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. Just an idea.

A. Rosenbaum: The, 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, is that true, which are not on campus and we’d have to sort of 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 single department so it also wouldn’t be a bad idea for people to mention this at department meetings or make sure their colleagues are aware. And we also now have Faculty Matters which we can put a message into and get out an edition of that that includes sort of a reminder about the Faculty Fund and to make sure that people check the Faculty Fund box on the forms. So those are a couple of things we can do as well. Michael?
M. Kolb: So we don’t have that list of emeritus faculty e-mails for example for Faculty Matters, right? That does not go out to emeritus at all?

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t think we do have emeritus on that list. Have we asked for emeritus? We could ask, we might be able to get that. We could certainly ask for that. Okay, any other thoughts?

L. Sons: Thank you folks.

A. Rosenbaum: Thanks for coming and calling our attention to this. Okay, other not minor matters, but things to call to your attention. Prior to our meeting today you were all aware of the town hall meeting on pension that was held by President Peters and Steve Cunningham. I was able to listen to about an hour of it on, they streamed it live. That is apparently being archived so you can listen to it at your convenience. Essentially, Steve 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 and I mentioned this to you at our last meeting. This is an alternative to Senate Bill 512 and it is worthy of your attention. I think the administration, Steve – people who are involved with the pensions – seem to feel that this is something that’s worth getting on board with so that we can avoid more draconian kinds of plans that may be coming out of the legislature. So if you know about it, the president sent out that document. I think we posted it on the Faculty Senate blackboard community. If you are having trouble getting it, just let us know and we’ll get it to you. But it’s worth getting involved with that are getting familiar with it, I should say, and you can also listen to the town hall as well.

Okay, the last thing I’ll mention before we move on is the mission statement. We went over the mission statement, we got a lot of suggestions last time, we took those suggestions back to the Mission Statement Committee. Several of those suggestions were incorporated as changes in 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. So that’s still in the works. Essentially, the Board of Trustees was generally positive about the mission statement. They made a few suggestions that the committee will have to consider. Some of the things they suggested were things the committee had already considered and actually thought that it had addressed. We’re still in a sort of evolutionary state with the mission statement.

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 the university faculty workload policy draft that was sent out. You may recall that this was done by the Blue Ribbon Committee on Workload and that the Faculty Senate had a representative to that Blue Ribbon Committee and our Faculty Senate representative 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 that.

Just a piece of information, I did post both that and also David Wade’s response as our representative on the blackboard community. My take on David’s response was that he felt that it was essentially, with a couple of minor exceptions, essentially what that workload committee had proposed. So he 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 was largely consisted of faculty. So we had a lot of faculty input into that. The provost, as I mentioned, is considering this to be a prerogative of his; a prerogative of the provost, it’s an academic policy. So he is not viewing this as something that has to approved by the University Council. Our opportunity to provide input has to come from us saying this is what we like, this is what we don’t like, this is what we’re concerned about. It is now our opportunity to provide feedback to the provost regarding what we like or don’t like about the workload policy. I tried to get this out as early as possible. It’s a rather lengthy document. I wanted people to have a chance to look at it. I also mentioned that this does not replace an existing policy. This 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 been previously been articulated as a policy. So everything in this that says it has to be approved by the University Council Personnel Committee, has to be approved by the provost, all of that stuff, is all new writing. And so, hopefully, you’ve had a chance to look at it and I’m going to open the floor now for concerns, comments, discussion; anything that you would like, that we would like as a group to transmit to the Provost. The floor is open for questions and comments.

**L. Elish-Piper:** Laurie Elish-Piper, Literacy Education, 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 kind of 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 then to cover all of the courses that they need to offer. That was one issue.

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 kind of 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 kind of surprised that, rather than kind of 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, would 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? So those were kind of my three big puzzlements as I read this document.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I can’t answer the question in the sense that 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 it. I can’t address that.

H. Bateni: Hamid Bateni, from Physical Therapy, 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: Your department?

H. Bateni: Yes, faculty members all over.

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, I would think, 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, he hasn’t set a deadline as far as I know for when he wants the feedback. But I think that this would be one vehicle for them to express their feedback through you, through the Faculty Senate representatives.

A. Lash: Ayhan Lash from Nursing and Health Studies. 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 that going to be changed, should that come to subject to a change, discussion or anything like that or if we leave it alone, we’re expecting a new chair and dean so we’re kind of concerned about 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 image that it is being viewed as sort of a dynamic document. I didn’t see anything that would suggest that existing policies would now have to be vetted through some chain, I don’t know that. 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 policy, but my impression, we had this discussion in our department and our chair expressed very little concern about it. In fact, he felt that looking this over that the risk might be that people got reduced workload, that there would be a lot more people sort of suggesting that things that they are already doing should count toward their workload which would get at Laurie’s question which is: What are the implications of that financially for a department. But again, a department knows what its need are. They are not
going to approve workload policies that mean we have no one to teach any of the courses. So there seem to be at least some safeguards in that because the department has control of what goes on in the department. The college seems to have some, at least, right of approval. There is a statement in here that seems to indicate that faculty need to be involved at all steps. I think there was some concern, especially in your college Ayhan, about whether faculty were consulted in developing the workload. And this is firmly stating that faculty need to be consulted. Of course there’s nothing in there that says if they’re not what happens but that’s typical of policies anyway.

**A. Lash:** Well, if I may just follow up for a second, 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 faculty, untenured faculty, do not teach more than two courses for the entire like 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” or that…

**A. Lash:** No, it doesn’t.

**A. Rosenbaum:** There’s nothing in here that would preclude a department from extending that benefit. So again, it seems to sort of be a very low bar and allow a lot of variability across departments. Of course, we never know what the word, “should,” means. It should but unfortunately not, who knows. It seems like there would be nothing in here that would not permit your department to give course relief for more than the first four semesters.

**A. Lash:** It’s just things happen.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Exactly. We have no real guarantees that this won’t be, that’s why we’re sort of vetting it, we’re sort of trying to look at this and say, okay is there some way that this could be problematic for faculty?

**A. Lash:** Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** David.

**D. Goldblum:** David Goldblum, Geography, I think another thing to consider too is 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 an awful lot of time
educating legislators every year as to what faculty are doing. They seem to feel that spending six hours in a classroom, “well what do you do with the other 34 hours?” They don’t seem to grasp that. One of the comments that I heard recently that was the best, would be to say to them, “how many hours do you spend in the Statehouse in the average week and what else are you doing to earn your salary?” I don’t know how that would fly in the legislature. Sue?

S. Willis: Okay, I have one sort of general comment which was that I remember when this first got started that there was a survey done of doctoral intensive research institutions or whatever it is, they keep changing the name of whatever it is that we are and I cannot keep up. But in any case, there was some variation in the standard workloads from wanting a continuum 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, in fact, a wide variety of activities. I did have one sort of math geek, nit-picky thing on page eleven of twelve which is actually page thirteen 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.” Like I said, it’s a very nit-picky, math-ity thing. 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, yes, Charles.

C. Cappell: I want to echo the nit-picking theme, so I thank Sue for opening that up. 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 at the, on the same page, if you look 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: I am sort of wondering though, 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 you 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. We need to find that out. Anybody else, yes?

C. Downing: Chuck Downing, College of Business, a quick comment on that comment since it was just made. 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 at least implicitly 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 come in, new people take chair positions, dean positions, whatever and they grab this document and they say, “this is what it is deal with it, check the workload guidelines.” Just a side comment. I want to follow on Sue Willis’s nit-picky comment, unless I’m having a brain-lock, right below, 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 sort of more than it’s intended to be over time; that is certainly a concern. If it’s like most of the other documents around here, no one will be able to find it after three years though, so we may be okay. Okay, other comments? Yes, Michael.

M. Kolb: Yeah, Michael Kolb, Anthropology, just to continue with that, comments from 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?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so I guess one of the general comments that we could pass along is that we have some concerns about the way these are sort of developed and whether or not they’re accurate or whether they should even be in here. Rosemary?

R. Feurer: Rosemary Feurer, History, 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 suggest whether you’re fitting into to this schema right, that’s how it’s going to work? I guess the upshot is: Does this document make it grievable if there’s an arbitrary? I’m not saying there is or that anybody anticipates that there’s arbitrary, but do you think that’s what this will mean, that faculty who then feel that their chair is not giving them the workload assignment that they meet, does that make it grievable?

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

R. Feurer: Does this give faculty more leverage? In other words, to dispute what they feel is an unfair….

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 sort of hold up. Yes, Jeff?

J. Kowalski: Nobody sort of 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Okay, any last questions, we have a large agenda so unless there are other major issues we can move on. Anyone else?

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next item, hopefully this is not a huge item, but as many of you who have been in the senate for a while know, we have for a long time had something known as 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 perhaps 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, and again, this is not something that is a formal constitutional or bylaw thing, but 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 really 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 Bob Lane Award to the Bob Lane Shared Governance Award and that we change some of the language as I have done underneath on page one and you also should have had I think the original Bob Lane language – it’s on the back? Okay so the Eternal Vigilance Faculty Spokesperson Award language is on the back. That’s the proposal. Rosemary you had a comment?

R. Feurer: Yeah, 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

R. Feurer: I was a winner, and it’s proudly displayed on my wall, in a previous year. But I sure wouldn’t put up shared governance because the meaning isn’t as clear I think.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you’re suggestion is that we call it the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award?

R. Feurer: Right, because it is given by the Faculty Senate, right and you’re still thinking that it would be a faculty member, right?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes.

R. Feurer: That’s my other problem it doesn’t then say what you’re – anything about faculty in there.

A. Rosenbaum: Just the idea that you’re contributing. It’s okay, 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. Any other comments about this? Yes, Ibrahim?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Electrical Engineering. 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. Okay, Sue?

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 that I think 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: Okay, so we can 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. Ayhan?
A. Lash: I like the word the word, “vigilance,” so it sounds good to hear Bob Lane Faculty Vigilance Award.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, 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 certainly, chairs on 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.

What we’ll do is this, we’ll vote and the vote will be, if you vote yes we will change the name to the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. If you vote no, it will remain the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance award. Jeff?

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.

A. Rosenbaum: Faculty Advocacy and Service?

J. Kowalski: Something like that, I’ve said my peace.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Yes, Millie?

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. Okay, so any other comments on this, otherwise we’ll vote.

The motion is that we change it to the Bob Lane, why don’t we do it this way. 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. Does that make sense? Okay, the first vote, we'll use the uh, are we booted? Are we ready to go? If you would like the name changed to the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy and Service Award, press 1. If you would not like it changed to that, press 2. In other words, if you vote 1, if you press 1, if we get the votes, it will become the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy and Service Award. If you vote 2, if you press 2, then it stays the way it is and we'll introduce a second motion. Okay, 1 will change the name, 2 stays the way it is for the moment, 3 you can abstain. Everyone clear? Alright, please vote. You should see the little number that you voted in the screen. If you are not seeing the number your thing is not working and you didn’t listen to me and you played with it. One more minute, less than a minute, a few seconds, everyone voted? Okay, what’s the vote?

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

A. Rosenbaum: It stays the same for the moment. The next vote, don’t vote yet, don’t touch it otherwise we have another glitch. Okay, the next vote is 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.

??: But does the content of the award stay the same?

A. Rosenbaum: The content – everything will remain the same. What?

??: The old language.

A. Rosenbaum: The old language will remain the same. So if you vote 1, we are changing it to the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award and we’re keeping at least some of the language with some minor changes that we were talking about. If you vote 2, it stays the same and if you vote 3, you’ve abstained. Ready? Okay, 1 changes the name to the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. Vote. Another few seconds make sure everyone’s voted. Pat?

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 and so these are just nominations, the Executive Committee will then take those nominations back to Executive Committee and we’ll 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.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have Charles nominated. Charles, anyone? Yes, George?

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.

A. Rosenbaum: Very good, excellent. Do we have any other? Yes?

J. Novak: I would like to nominate Laurie Elish-Piper. She doesn’t know I’m doing this.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, excellent. So we have Laurie and we have Charles. Do we have any other? Yep, okay.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Sue, we now have three nominees. This is great. We’ve never had so many nominees. Okay are there any other nominations? I’ll close the nominations. The Executive Committee will consider those and in our next meeting we will announce the winner of the newly named Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. Very good.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS


A. Rosenbaum: Okay we’re on to our reports from advisory committees. First let me say this, it’s 10 after 4, we have a couple of other things to do. Essentially, we 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 ask 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.

A. Rosenbaum: So that was the FAC’s?

E. Hansen: Well, it wasn’t necessarily an argument, it was a discussion and that’s about it. 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, comments or questions for Earl? Good. Thank you for keeping it brief.

B. Student Association –Austin Quick, Speaker – [report] – Pages 18-19
A. Rosenbaum: Next, Austin, please keep it brief.

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, I know some of you have already heard, 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 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 University Relations regarding the app for 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 they are no longer going to be, if approved, 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.

Next thing, I’m moving quickly, 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 – of course, we’ll look at it in the future – but 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 – and we’ve spoke with President Peters to urge him to keep that position and look into and to thank Tim Griffin for his work here – but to realize 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, not being negligent in the sense of trying to get someone in trouble or trying to hurt someone’s
feelings or make them look stupid, but make comments and references to people’s disability standards 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 faculty, not faculty excuse me, to keep university vehicles off our sidewalks and our grasses. As you know, it’s been a hot-button issue for me this year. It’s something 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. I get phone calls, I guess I’m now that guy that gets to hold that banner. But it’s something that I feel that’s important. 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, and I say that loosely, in their liquor laws. It was brought to my attention recently that when a group of students wanted to go to Fatty’s – Fatty’s is a good place, we like it, right, it’s a good place – 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 that are students aren’t able to go to. We talk a lot about giving our students outlets and things to do. Well if you can’t even go to the most popular restaurant in the city, local, local, restaurant. In one of the areas, and the way I’m trying to take this, is not a liquor issue, is the fact that currently, 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. That’s all I have.
A. Rosenbaum: On the positive side, it means faculty can now go back to Fatty’s and enjoy Cajun potato salad. It’s not all bad.

A. Quick: If we can’t do it, we’re closing it down.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you Austin

C. Cappell: Can I ask Austin a question?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, sure be my guest. We have questions for Austin. Be careful, you won’t get the award.

C. Cappell: I am advocating for students. 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 about 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 the fact the run the Huskie bus, I have went and I have attended many meetings of the regional mass transit committee which involves multiple different agencies and that was something on their sites as well and something I agree with that I have been told on numerous occasions is its funding and creating funding. 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. I think it’s another one of those areas I’m all about keeping our students and our community safe so definitely supportive.

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. Okay, any other questions for Austin?

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: Okay, next we don’t have any of the sub-committees but I have a report on the BOT meeting. 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. That was all positive news. David?
D. Goldblum: It says here, “Phase II of the salary stabilization program”?  

A. Rosenbaum: Yes.  

D. Goldblum: 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 that the president has put out 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. That’s it. Any other questions on the report? You have the report there so I don’t want to belabor it.  

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES  

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

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have some comments or reports from each of our committees. First, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Rosemary do you have anything?  

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 FLMA 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, administration-to-faculty ratio, trying to find out what it is, is one of those issues and we have often times gotten different information, we have points of 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 is correct, 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, so that’s it for now.  

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Rosemary?  

B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – report  

A. Rosenbaum: Next up Charles do you have anything?
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.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s entering its trench warfare phase I think.

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 page so you can access it there. Secondly, our committee has met a couple of times now and we’re trying to get a grapple on a couple of key issues that I’d like to keep everyone informed. We’re, of course, open to input and so on. Our discussions have also likewise turned to salary and we want to do two overall goals or undertake two overall goals.

The first: We began to look at the university-wide study of faculty of salary that was published in 2008 by Joe Grush and our sub-committee looked at that report. We came up with a couple of number of concerns, one being with the qualitative and the quantitative analysis and so one. And we’ve begun to open a dialog with the provost’s office regarding some of those data and really what they mean.

Second of all, again trying to get a grasp on issues of salary, we’ve also begun, or we’ve discussed, and 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 concerned on their general view towards salaries and basically how happy people are. So that gives us, yea okay we might know what the answer may be, but it would be nice to get some quantitative data by which then we could maybe pursue this issue. 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. So 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 one. The senate, 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. Rosemary?

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 has to do with, again, 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 perhaps. 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 not report and so we’re trying to get some information on perhaps how that data was collected, if it was actually implemented, and if there was 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 sort of area. There are concerns I think 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. Rosemary?

**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 that the university may be using to defend those lawsuits could be something that raises 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. So I’m not sure if people have enough information for us to sort of 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 sort of 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. Anyone have any comments on this?

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

**A. Rosenbaum:** We could certainly do that. It’s right on the provosts 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 may 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 you would like from your committee to be put on, Pat can do that. Just send them to Pat and we’ll see that they are posted within they are posted within that Blackboard community and we’ll let you know where to find it also in the Blackboard community. Okay. Mili?

M. Kostic: I’m kind of confused not really of all of those issue but what I heard is confusing. And I’m wondering, do we stretch those ethics things that we filled in for the state? We are after the truth whatever it is, right? Long run it will help us. Not by saying we have to keep our mouth shut or something. I personally don’t think it’s the way to do.

A. Rosenbaum: Right and that certainly is an opinion and I’m not saying it’s right or wrong, I’m just saying that there will be faculty who will be averse to the idea of doing this. That’s all I’m saying. Anyone else?

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next Rules and Governance. I don’t think Rules and Governance has anything, right Gretchen.
G. Bisplinghoff: No, nothing at this time.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Resources, Space and Budgets, David?

D. Goldblum: Nothing other than what’s written here. I’ll just highlight that there’s a house bill going through to eliminate the 50 percent tuition for 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 as last year, 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 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: All right, so either to Laurie Elish-Piper or to David Goldblum. If you have comments or you have some concerns about the priorities that are being put forward. Questions for David?
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.

A. Rosenbaum: Next item, Therese Arado. Is Therese here? Back there okay I can’t see you, someone is in front of you.

T. Arado: We are, we need to have nominations for the executive secretary of University Council, president of Faculty Senate position for I guess it’s the next academic year. The list of eligible people to hold this office is on page 20 of your handout materials here and we are accepting nominations from the floor that has gotten significantly smaller as we’ve been sitting here.

A. Rosenbaum: Ibrahim.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Electrical Engineering. I would like to nominate Alan Rosenbaum for the secretary and for the senate president.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you. I accept your nomination.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other?

T. Arado: That’s it from me.

A. Rosenbaum: So you want to close the nominations?

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

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: The next item, we have one item, this should not hopefully be a very long item and then we can leave. The item is the second reading of our action item which is we’re changing the agenda items and this is just a housekeeping item. We do have to vote on this with our device. If you are in favor of this, please press 1; opposed press 2; abstention press 3. Please vote now. 1 yes, 2 no, 3 abstain and this is on the agenda that will be in our bylaws. Quickly, 1 yes, 2 no, 3 abstention. Last call. What do we got.

26
1 – YES – 24 votes
2 – NO – 1 vote
3 – ABSTAIN – 1 vote

A Rosenbaum: Someone didn’t want us to change the agenda? It passes and we now have a new agenda.

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 next meeting will not be in the Sky Room. Our April 4 meeting will be in the Regency Room because we were not able to book this room. Someone booked it two years in advance. I have no idea what for. So we will be in the Regency Room on April 4. Try to remember that. It will be in the agenda, we will remind you. I need a motion to adjourn.

Senators: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Everyone moved it. Anyone left to second it? All right we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.