FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Wednesday, April 4, 2012, 3 p.m.
REGENCY 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.


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Arhnart, Azad, Blecksmith, Brandt, Calvo-Byrd, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Frank, Greene, Gupta, Holt, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kapitan, Kostic, Lee, Lenczewski, Mackie, Mirman, Mogren, Munroe, Onyuksel, Pitney, Poole, Rollman, Shortridge, Thu, Von Ende, Walker,

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Griffin, Haliczer, Hansen, Latham, Peritz, Quick, Sunderlin

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

D. Valentiner: made the motion. R. Lopez: was second.

The agenda was adopted as written without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2012 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

D. Valentiner: Made the motion. S. Willis: was second.

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

A. Rosenbaum:

o Informed the senate of his discussions with Mallory Simpson and Alberta Solfisburg regarding the questions raised at the previous senate meeting about the Faculty Fund. The main problem seems to be the form that is included with the solicitation letter and the fact that it is a general form that includes options other than the Faculty Fund. Although they did not discount the possibility of developing a more specific form in the future, they felt that the materials for this year had already been produced and it was too late to make any changes. We will continue to pursue this issue between now and next year’s campaign.

o Reported that the senate’s feedback regarding the workload policy was transmitted to Provost Alden. The senate was asked if there was any additional feedback either from senators or their constituents and there was none.

o Reported that the Executive Committee met to decide on this year’s recipient of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award and in doing so revised the process to be followed next year. The call for nominations will be made to the senate in January. Anybody wishing to make a nomination will have to submit a letter detailing the reasons for the nomination. These will be included in the February agenda and the full senate will vote for their choice at the February meeting. The award will be presented at the March meeting.

o Informed the senate that the University Council, at its March meeting, voted to continue the office of the ombudsman on the recommendation of its University Affairs committee. The nature and composition of the search committee was explained. The Faculty Senate gets two representatives on that committee. A. Rosenbaum self-nominated and asked for additional nominations. After some clarifications of the time commitment, only G. Long volunteered and the senate confirmed both as members of the search committee.

o Thanked Pat Erickson for her work on the Bob Lane award and noted that a plaque is being made which will include the names of all recipients going backwards and forwards and will also note that previous recipients received the award under its previous incarnations (the Bottom of the Deck award and the Eternal Vigilance award).

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award

A. Rosenbaum: presented the Bob Lane award for 2012-2012. Our recipient this year is Charles Cappell. Charles has been a member of the Faculty Senate since 2008. He has chaired Academic Affairs since 2009. He was a member of the Faculty Development and Instructional Design Committee from 2003 to 2005. During the past year, Charles has served the faculty and the senate as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, charged with working out disagreements between Faculty Senate and the APASC Committee on the issue of plus/minus grading and that is also an issue, by the way, on which Charles’ committee worked very hard last year. If you remember, Charles presented us with that very thorough report on plus/minus grading that I think
formed the basis of the groundswell of support for plus/minus grading that had been very often lacking in the past. At the same time, Academic Affairs has been working on the issue of online evaluation of teaching effectiveness, which is another labor intensive task. While the Academic Affairs Committee has been working on these issues, Charles had devoted an enormous amount of time and effort to the Raise Equity Committee. As a member of this committee, he has been instrumental in the data management, data analysis, and the report writing. Because of his selfless efforts on behalf of the faculty, the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate felt that Charles was deserving of our recognition and gratitude in the form of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award.

I should mention that we also recognized the important contributions of our other nominees, Laurie Elish-Piper and Suzanne Willis. Although the award can only go to one person, Laurie and Suzanne are no less deserving of our thanks for their continued hard work and important contributions.

So, it is my pleasure to present the 2011-2012 Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to Charles Cappell.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – Pages 3-4

A. Rosenbaum: Earl, we thank you for your work, and we’ll certainly have an opportunity, hopefully at the last meeting, to formally thank you for your work as our representative to the FAC.

B. Student Association – Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 5-6

A. Quick: Just a couple of things I wanted to make you aware of. I met yesterday with Sandi Carlisle, the director of Recreation Services, and she let me know that faculty and staff have been asking for more hours of open swim in the pool. I know there are many of you that have memberships and go over there. We are looking at funding that better next year. I guess currently you’re only allowed to swim during lunch and I think they open maybe one hour afterward. We’re going to try to have a little bit more time during the day; that’s been a request from the faculty and staff I was told yesterday.

A. Quick: We are looking at a way to work with the administration to dedicate a fee, a specific fee for the rec center. Currently, the way the rec center is funded is through multiple organizations and I think that we have enough interest from our student population and hopefully from our faculty and staff to create a dedicated fee. Our rec center needs to be at least three times the size that it currently is for the number of students and faculty and staff that utilize the facility. And at a time when the president is asking us to increase enrollment, one of the areas we keep hearing from students as to why they don’t choose NIU or why they leave is the rec center and the opportunities we provide for them there. They have a lot of problems with the facilities; they are run down, they’ve had problems with the equipment and, although we’ve made
improvements in that, we definitely want to find a way in the future to make this a marketable campus regarding the Recreation Services. One of the ideas that has been mentioned is creating a wellness center so you have the counseling center and all those things inside one facility and having it be a state-of-the-art place. It is one of those things that a lot of students are saying that they want to see on their campuses and a lot of our other competing universities have state-of-the-art facilities. We need to make the right moves to make us marketable in that regard.

The next thing, I went on the other night, two nights ago, I met with Dr. Hemphill and Dr. John Jones, and a member of the university facilities to look at lighting issues on campus. That is one of the issues that have been brought up numerous times in meetings, and we went around between 8 and 10 p.m. the other night and looked all over campus to see where lighting could be improved. We found that for the most part, the campus was pretty well lit. There were a couple of places behind DuSable and back where the campus daycare is that needs more lighting.

Next, I met with Dr. Williams yesterday in regards to a couple of my concerns that I brought up at the last meeting of the University Council. We are working on a crosswalk issue, and I was assured that actually the issue of parking and driving on university sidewalks is being pursued. They’ve had meetings at the top level, and they’re looking at ways to hold university employees responsible and accountable for breaking university policies. So, we will hopefully have something more for you in the future in that regard.

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 – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report

B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – report

C. Cappell: There is a report circulating in my Academic Affairs Committee on the online evaluation process. We’re waiting for feedback. We have a draft. To give you a little bit of a heads-up, most of the report is going to be a fact-finding document and an advisory. I don’t, at this stage, anticipate that there will be actionable recommendations, but we have not heard from all members of the committee, so that could change.

Professor Martin from physics and myself are meeting with APASC, on April 18, to negotiate the plus/minus grade system, and we will have a report at the last Faculty Senate meeting on anything that comes out of that meeting.
C. Economic Status of the Profession – Michael Kolb, Chair – no report

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

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair – report

1. Nomination letters for the position of Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor; Faculty Senate will vote at the April 25, 2012 meeting.

   Letter – Paul Stoddard – Page 7
   Letter – Debra Zahay-Blatz – Page 8
   Letter – Robert Fleisher – Pages 9-10
   Letter – Toni Tollerud – Pages 11-12

T. Arado: All right, this is just a point of information. The nomination letters were received for the position of Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor that David Wade is leaving and they are all in the packet of materials you received for this meeting. The vote on this will take place at our last meeting of the year, so on April 25. So, between now and then, if you could take a look at the letters that are in here, read them and then come ready to vote.

A. Rosenbaum: This is a very important position for us, both for our faculty and for SPS and we have excellent nominees. So, read the letters carefully.

J. Novak: I had a question about the position. Is it a full-time position or something they’d do just while they’re teaching?

A. Rosenbaum: It’s something that they do in addition to the teaching. There is no teaching relief associated with the position, but there is a stipend.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Authorization of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession to continue review of the salary equity study – see comments/minutes – Pages 13-15

A. Rosenbaum: We have one item of unfinished business, and this is an item that I called to your attention at the last meeting. Our Economic Status of the Profession Committee has begun looking into the salary equity report that was done by Joe Grush and is published on the provost’s website. This committee has some concerns about that report. Michael Kolb is chair of that committee and can update us.

M. Kolb: We’ve met a couple times in the past month and looked over some of the details and statistics regarding the provost’s report on the faculty salaries in terms of the university, which was published in 2008. We posted a number of items related to this on the Senate Blackboard page. We felt that a number of the variables used to determine the salaries were minimized in
the statistical report. What we would like to go forth with is to request either some re-analysis or perhaps to obtain some of this data just to see if, indeed, there is a disparity based on ethnicity, gender, or age. So, we’ve begun to do that and we’ve drafted our key concerns, which are on page 13. We say it’s a big can of worms and maybe segues from the other salary and equity report that is being done. Salary is obviously very important and our committee has taken it very seriously.

A. Rosenbaum: And when he talks about the website, we have posted a number of materials that Michael has asked us to post on our Blackboard community. What I informed the senate about last time was the fact that when you look into this type of information, it is potentially problematic. You find some things that can be upsetting, and not that we shouldn’t look into it, but that the senate should be aware of what we’re doing. So, I asked people to think about it, and to weigh in on the Faculty Senate Blackboard community. I opened the discussion thread for people to be able to talk back and forth. Apparently, there wasn’t much interest in doing that, and we have had no comments on it. My assumption is that people don’t have an objection to Michael’s committee going forward with this, but I would like to have a voice vote to authorize the Economic Status of the Profession Committee to continue looking into this. I’ll make that motion that we authorize the committee to continue looking into this.

J. Novak: was second.

A. Rosenbaum: We have a lot of seconds. I’ll open it for discussion. Would anyone like to comment on this? We’re just authorizing the committee to continue to look into the report. They’re going to ask Dr. Grush to perhaps do some additional analyses or provide some data that the committee can analyze themselves.

The senate voted by voice vote to authorize the committee to continue looking into the salary equity report.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Replacement for Earl Hansen on FAC to IBHE

See excerpt from NIU Bylaws, Article 16 – Pages 16-17

Letters of self-nomination due in Faculty Senate Office by Monday, April 16.

A. Rosenbaum: Earl alluded to the fact in his report that he is retiring. He is in the third year of a four-year term as the representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. The IBHE is a fairly important body. The most recent issue is performance-based funding and of course, the IBHE is involved in developing the criteria that will be used for the performance-based funding. This is very important to NIU and consequently to the faculty as well. So, this is a rather important committee. The FAC is the only faculty input to the IBHE and so we want our voice heard. We are always trying to inform legislators about what faculty do. The FAC to the IBHE represents our interests. It’s a four-year term, but right now, we are looking for somebody to fill out only the last year of Earl’s term. Next year, we will elect someone to a new four-year term.
Sonya Armstrong is our current alternate, has been doing a great job, and she is very interested in this position. We looked at the constitution and we cannot just allow the alternate to fill out the term. The constitution is very specific about this, and we are required to elect Earl’s replacement using the same procedures that we used to elect Earl in the first place. That involves us notifying the faculty of the availability of this position, taking nominations, and voting on those nominations. So please announce this opening to your departments. We’d like the letters of nomination, either self nomination or other nomination into the Faculty Senate office by Monday, April 16. So, if any of you or anyone in your departments has interest in being considered for this position, we need these letters. The letters will be in the agenda for our last meeting of the year, and we will have a vote.

**R. Feurer:** Is Sonya going to remain the alternate if she is not elected to this? Is there going to be an alternate selected too at the same time? Because if not, then whomever is selected needs to be free on Fridays.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I think Sonya probably would remain the alternate because she has been elected to that position. She would prefer to move into the representative position, but I would have to ask her to be certain.

**R. Feurer:** What I am asking is: Does she have a schedule that would make her available for meetings?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I don’t know the answer to your question, but we can check.

**D. Goldblum:** Is there a link on your website of the responsibilities of this position or a description of the position that we could attach to an email for distribution to our departments?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes, there is a description in the constitution.

**P. Erickson:** It is Article 16.5 of the bylaws, and it’s also embedded in your agenda.

**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. Letter of acceptance of ES/P nomination – Alan Rosenbaum – Pages 18-19

A. Rosenbaum: I will point out one informational item to you and that is that my letter accepting the nomination as executive secretary and president of the senate is located on pages 18 and 19. And, again, that election also will take place next month at our last meeting.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

R. Lopez: made the motion. S. Willis: was second.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.