
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

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible

D. Valentiner: Move.

R. Lopez: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible

Members: Aye

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible

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

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible

D. Valentiner: Move.
S. Willis: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible

Members: Aye

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: inaudible . . . and sort of asked if it was possible for us to have our own form so that we’ve got the Faculty Fund letter, the form that came with it would only go to the Faculty Fund. They were not completely opposed to the idea, but they were concerned that it was too late in the game to do that this year. So, this year, everything had already been prepared and so it went out as you saw. They seemed to be agreeable to my continuing discussion with them over the next year between now and the next appeal to see if we possibly can work out the issue of making sure that it’s very clear that, in order to donate to the Faculty Fund, you have to check the Faculty Fund box. But again, I want repeat that the foundation was not at all contentious about this. They are agreeable to working this out as well as possible that faculty still remain actively involved in what goes on with the Faculty Fund and that all of the money that goes to the Faculty Fund is still used to provide scholarships, as it is intended to do. So, that seemed to be, at least a reasonable response, I think, to the items that were proposed to them and again, over the next year, we will try and see if we can get that pledge letter, pledge form fixed so that it really is much more clearly identifying the Faculty Fund as a fund that faculty are contributing to. We even offered to print up the forms for them with the gigantic budget that the University Council office has. So, if they can’t use the foundation’s limited money to print up those forms, we can certainly help out with that. But they didn’t ask us to do that. So, that’s just something we talked about. Any questions about the Faculty Fund or my interactions with the foundation?

Okay, the next item, last time we solicited feedback on the workload policy that Provost Alden is considering. I sent him a letter including all of the feedback that came from the Faculty Senate. So, we spelled out everything that was in the transcript, and we told Provost Alden, and I sent him that information. I also told him that we had given Faculty Senate members the option of going back to the departments, thinking about it, and perhaps soliciting additional input on the workload policy. As of today, I have not received any additional input from anyone on the Faculty Senate or otherwise. I still can send additional information to Provost Alden so again, if you have anything more to say about the workload policy, send it to me as quickly as possible. But that’s where we stand right now; I’ve not received any additional information. Anyone have any comments on the workload policy?

Okay, lastly at the Executive Committee meeting this month, we did as we said, and we took the three nominees for the Bob Lane Award, and we discussed and voted on awarding that this year, and we’re going to present the Bob Lane Award in a few moments. But, in the process of that discussion, we also came to some ideas regarding how we want to do this in the future. So, what we came up with, the Executive Committee came up with, was that next January at the Faculty Senate meeting, we will announce the call for Bob Lane Award nominations. We will also
request that anyone making the nomination, write a nominating letter that articulates the reasons for nominating this particular person for the Bob Lane Award. At the February meeting, we will include those letters of nomination in the agenda packet so that our Faculty Senate members have an opportunity to read it over and think about it and then at the February meeting, we will decide on the awardee by a vote. So, it will no longer be the Executive Committee making a judgment; it will be before the Faculty Senate reading the nominees and their reasons for the nomination and then we will take a Faculty Senate vote. The Bob Lane award will be then presented at our March meeting, which will be the next-to-the-last meeting, though next year, we’re having a meeting a month in the spring. We’re normally going to have this kind of double meeting sometimes. So, we’ll award it at the March meeting so that way, it will be a more inclusive process of selecting the winner of the Bob Lane Award. Okay? So, that will be the procedure that we will be following next year.

Next, the next item of business is the presentation of the actual Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award and you can see the award here; we had it on the back table for a little while. It’s a very nice award. I think we owe Pat a thank you for her fine graphic work and producing the award for it. It’s now much more worthy looking than our previous award. The other thing that we decided to do right away is we are preparing a plaque similar to the plaques that you see both here and in the Holmes Student Center and also at the Sky Room. We’re going to have a permanent plaque for the recipients of the Bob Lane Award. We’re going to do that both going backwards and going forwards, so we’re going to include all the winners. We’re going to have little brass plaques created for each of the previous recipients of both the current Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award but also for the previous awardees and again, originally it was the Bob Lane “Bottom of the Deck” Award and then modified to the Bob Lane “Eternal Vigilance” Award. So, we will note on the plaque those previous names of the award and also the new name and everybody who has ever received the award will have a little brass plaque, not a very expensive one, but a little brass plaque on that, and we will display that either outside the Sky Room or here in the Holmes Student Center. We haven’t figured out what would be the best venue so that faculty will be able to view that award.

Well, actually before we present the award, I have one more item that is important, and that is at the University Council last month, the University Council meeting, the council voted to continue the office of the University Ombudsman. Tim Griffin, of course, is retiring and we gave the University Affairs Committee the charge of deciding whether or not the constituent groups of the university were in favor of continuing to have an Office of the Ombudsman. The University Affairs Committee voted to continue that position and, if we look at the constitution, it specifies the creation of a search committee which is conducted, the search is conducted under the auspices of the University Council. That search committee includes three student undergraduate members, two graduate student members, two representatives of Faculty Senate, one member each from Operating Staff Council and from SPS Council, and a representative named by the president, a representative of the administration named by the president. So, we do have two Faculty Senate representatives on that committee. Now, the president, at this point, has not given the final go ahead for the search, but he has authorized us to start collecting the names of the people who would like to be on that search committee. Now, as I said, when we vote for two Faculty Senate representatives, I would like to place myself on that committee with the consent of the senate. And if the senate is agreeable to that, we would need one other representative. So, what I’m asking for now is anybody who would be interested in serving on the ombudsman
search committee. Now again, if someone has an objection to my being on that committee, that’s fine and you should raise that now. Okay. So, and now I need at least one other nominee, somebody else who is interested or if more than one person, we can have a vote of some sort, but anybody interested in serving on the search committee?

**D. Valentiner:** Can you give a little bit of fact, you say, perhaps I missed it, are we using our current ______?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes.

**D. Valentiner:** And what does the process look like? What is involved _____?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, I can address that in principle; in practice, I’m not 100 percent certain. But the constitution calls for a national search and so assuming that the president approves the search as articulated in the constitution, it would be a national search. We will try and advertise with Tim’s help, we will try and locate an ombudsman. They apparently have their own newsletter or, Tim, what do we have? So, there are venues in which to advertise for the ombudsman and then it will be a standing search. It will be just as you would search for any other faculty member or administrator. We will solicit applications; we’ll have to write a job description, solicit applications, conduct on-campus interviews and then reach an agreement. Again, it seems that the University Council has authority on this, so the recommendation, I believe, will go the University Council and then that’s about what I know of that. Any other specific questions?

**D. Valentiner:** Is Tim retiring?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Tim is retiring, yes. I don’t know if we, I think we announced it at senate. We did announce it at council as well. Yes, if we haven’t announced it at senate, let me both publically acknowledge the great work that Tim has done, thank him for his service, and tell you that he is now going to retire and enjoy some years of leisure. So, we are greatly indebted to Tim for his work, and there will be a celebration, I believe the president announced, he hasn’t announced the day, but he has talked about having a reception for Tim and so when we know when that is, Tim’s making a face, what, is that going to happen?

**T. Griffin:** Not if I have any say.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Not if he has any say. Okay, yes Jeff?

**J. Kowalski:** So, will the bulk of the work of the committee then take place in the fall semester rather than this semester?

**A. Rosenbaum:** We are still hopeful of being able to get an ombudsman in place, which means time is very short, but if the president approves the search, we will hopefully get the search committee together and begin doing the work and hopefully get it done over the summer. So, I guess we will be faced with a bunch of problems such as if an ombudsman is already committed for next year, it might be more difficult. We will probably face some of the same problems that
you face with other administrative searches. But, the hope would be that we would not have to go very long without an ombudsman or that the president will provide some kind of a stopgap measures, perhaps somehow convincing Tim to continue post-retirement as is very often done in other areas in the university. So, but we will try, you know, again, you know how difficult it is to do these kinds of things. As soon as we get the search approved, we will get going on it and get an ombudsman in place as soon as we can. Any other questions? David, have I answered your question? So, again, is anybody interested in serving? Who do we have back there?

G. Long: Greg Long.

A. Rosenbaum: Greg Long is interested. Okay, anybody else? If you don’t raise your hand, you’re going to get Greg Long. Okay, nobody else? Okay, I don’t suppose we have to have a vote. Do we have to have a vote? No, we don’t need to have a vote. Okay, so Greg and I will represent the senate on the search committee, and we will keep you posted on how the Ombudsman search goes. Thank you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next a very exciting item, the presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award in its current beautiful form. 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 as a member of that Ad Hoc Committee on the issue of plus/minus grading and that is also an issue, by the way, that Charles’ committee worked very hard on last year and if you remember, Charles presented us with that very thorough, extensive 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. Charles has continued to work on that. At the same time, Academic Affairs has been working on the issue of online evaluation of teaching effectiveness, which is another major task, very labor intensive. 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, the data analysis, and the report writing. I can’t tell you how many hours have been spent, especially by Charles and some of the other people who have been doing these data analyses and interpreting the data analyses and continue to spend because we still have not reached a final resolution and so they’re continuing to work on this. 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 recognize 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. Charles? Take good care of it.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

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


E. Hansen: I made this as short as I could and put it in about ten small paragraphs. To highlight, the first paragraph talks about the senate bills and the house bills and kind of gives you an idea of what they are. The Senate Bill 59 and 3804 is off the table. The biggest discussion we’ve been having on this is that we need to have faculty sitting in on the Board of Higher Education and some of the decisions that are being made by the legislature for higher education. We’re trying to find a way to do that out of our group, and that’s a real issue.

The College Completion Report Card is in the fourth paragraph and is supposed to provide a consumer data snapshot on institutions with some kind of a dashboard for administrators and so forth. We don’t think that, we don’t think snapshots are a good way to look at some of the things that we do in higher education. That’s just the consensus of the people, the Faculty Advisory Council, at this time. If you’ve got any input on that, I’d be more than happy to share it with them.

Going over to the second page there, there are three bullets. The three that we have are community colleges, public universities, and the private universities all pretty much fall in the same boat. Community colleges are concerned about the articulation, transfer, and position papers that have been drafted in regards to that and the PBF implications of a 60-hour cap when transferring in from community colleges to a four-year institution ___more than that now. The public universities are looking at just how easy it is for other state institutions from out of state to come in the state and do their thing online and whatever, and the privates are looking at, they’re concerned about how education is viewed by the business model as compared by the three missions of teaching, research, and service, and there is a tendency to see the Legislature move towards wanting to have a more business approach to the way we deliver our deliveries. HB 5671 sets aside $50 million for MAP fund for a second round of grants and 75 percent of that money will go to college students.

That pretty much sums it up. I’m going to make one comment though. I started doing this thing years ago when they didn’t pay you to do it. I know you’ve got some new business coming up here because I’m retiring, and you got a person now that, Sonya does a real good job when she gets down there, she goes on her own at times. When you pick a second person to work with her, make sure their academic schedules are not on the same day because you’re going to have to go down on Thursdays nights and then be down there on Friday and then like the IBHE joint meeting is on a Tuesday. Well, I have a three-hour class Tuesday night and two-hour 15-minute
class on Tuesday morning. There’s no way that I can miss my classes and go to these meetings and neither can anybody else. So, I think you need to give that some consideration when you put two people in there. You need to have some give and take.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So, we need a faculty member that doesn’t work Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday?

**E. Hansen:** I am just saying that it depends on what your schedule is or you don’t. I don’t know. That’s what happens, that’s the reason I took it because ___ going all the time and they couldn’t just do it ___ that’s impossible, so I volunteered to do it. We’re here to teach, supposedly. Some people might want to argue with that, but for instance, in the classroom is relatively significant and I just think you need to give some thought to the process of who can miss what. If you’ve got a full load on one of those days, it’s pretty hard to do. Oh, and I hope you enjoy driving all over the state of Illinois.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so we need someone who doesn’t work Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday and enjoys driving all over the State of Illinois. So, we’ll get to the nominees.

**E. Hansen:** ____27 years ____.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any questions on the FAC report from Earl? 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. Rosenbaum:** Okay, the next report is from the Student Association and presenting the report, we have Austin Quick, fresh off his stellar performance at the University Council two weeks ago. Here he is for a brief report from the Student Association. Austin.

**A. Quick:** Thank you, thank you, thank you. 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 there has been a lot of faculty and staff asking for more hours as far as 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 so that it will be a lot more, 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 during the day; that’s been a request from the faculty and staff, I was told yesterday.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Don’t you have to wait an hour after lunch to swim?

**A. Quick:** I think so. I think they forego lunch and just go swimming. So, that’s something hopefully you will be excited about, for those of you that swim and with that segment regarding Recreation Services, 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 and ask you to support as well, to create a dedicated fee. Not necessarily more money on top of tuition and fees, but findings areas, and I know there is, we
can take a little bit from, and other fees to dedicate to our Rec Center. 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 of 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; it is run down, the equipment, they’ve had problem and we’ve made improvements in that, but 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 and now, you know I’m not the best candidate to speak about health and wellness, but 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 has 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 there are areas where light could be improved. I don’t know if you know this, but currently, they are changing the previous lighting systems that they had to these Q-tips they’re called. Those are those nicer ones, Barsema has all of them outside of there. They throw out more light; it’s a little bit more aesthetic looking. So, we went around and looked at places. We found that for the most part, I was surprised that most of 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. And a lot of, we were surprised how many students were walking through when we were there, but behind the Barsema Alumni Center. A lot of students cross there to go to their apartments and things. But hopefully, that’s something you, as faculty is that also those of you who teach night classes, we are trying to get improvements and the university is helping out with that.

Next, I did meet with Dr. Williams yesterday in regards to a couple of my concerns that I brought up at our 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 and the grass has been, 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. Other than that, I have nothing else.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Austin? Okay, thank you 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 – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

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

B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – report

A. Rosenbaum: Our next report is from Academic Affairs. Our newly awarded Bob Lane Faculty winner, Charles Cappell is our chair of Academic Affairs. Charles, what do you have for us?

C. Cappell: Charles Cappell, sociology, just a quick verbal report. 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.

We are meeting with APASC, Professor Martin from physics and myself, 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Charles?

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

A. Rosenbaum: The next item of business, we have our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, Therese?

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and again, this is a very important position for us, both for our faculty and for SPS. So, read them carefully, and we have excellent nominees. I think we really have four outstanding nominees for this position. Remember it’s a two-year term. The first term is, I think, a two-year term, and so we will vote on that at the last. Yes?

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. So, there is no teaching relief associated with the position, but there is a stipend associated with the position. Any other questions? Okay, so we’ll have that vote. Again, well, all right, you have the letters and so I’ll leave it at that.

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: Next we have one item of unfinished business, and this is an item that I called to your attention at the last meeting. Michael Kolb and the committee, who is the chair of the committee on the Economic Status of the Profession, and this committee has begun looking into the salary equity report that was done by Joe Grush and is published on the provost’s website. Mike’s committee has some concerns about that report, and I actually should let Michael speak for himself rather than to tell you what those concerns are. Do you want to say a word about that? Michael will thank me for surprising him and asking him to speak.

M. Kolb: Okay, Michael Kolb, anthropology. We’ve met a couple times in the past month and like we say, we’ve 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. The materials we posted on the website, and we’ll take a minute so I can just briefly kind of go over. We really felt that, in many ways, a number of the variables really used to determine the salaries were sort of 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 exactly if, indeed, there is disparity between ethnic or gender or age, and that’s kind of what we want to figure out. So, we’ve begun to do that. Like I say, we’ve drafted our key concerns, which are on page 13, as you can see, and we would be happy to answer any questions regarding that. 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 serious. Like I say, I thank the committee for doing this.

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. So, if you want to see those
documents, they are posted. What I wanted to just inform the senate about last time was the fact that when you look into this type of information, that 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, what I asked for is people to think about it, and we did not get any chatter on the discussion board. I asked people to weigh in on the Faculty Senate Blackboard community. I opened the discussion thread, and it was for people to be able to sort of talk back and forth. Apparently, there wasn’t much interest in doing that, so we have had no comments on it. So, 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. So, that would be, I’ll make that motion that we authorize the committee to continue looking into this. I need a second.


A. Rosenbaum: We have a lot of seconds. Okay. Now, I’ll open it for discussion. Would anyone like to comment on this? Any discussion on this issue? We’re just authorizing the committee to continue to look into the report. Everyone is aware of that? We’re not going further than that; they’re just going to continue to look at it. They’re going to ask Dr. Grush to perhaps do some additional analyses or provide some data that the committee can do some analyses on. I know how easy it is to get data. We’ve learned that lesson but we keep trying. No comment? All in favor of authorizing the committee, signify by saying, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstention? I hope the committee will continue to pursue your concerns. Thank you.

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: Okay, we have one item of new business, and that is Earl eluded 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. Over the years, I’ve been, every time something important comes up, you hear the IBHE gets to decide this or the IBHE gets to decide that. So, the most recent issue is this issue of 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 really to the IBHE and so we want that voice heard. We are always trying to inform legislators about what faculty do. We always hear things like, “Faculty spend six hours in the classroom. What the hell are they doing with the other 34 hours?” They constantly have to be educated regarding what is involved in a faculty position. The FAC to the IBHE is always in their face, explaining what it is that faculty do and representing our interests. So, it’s an important position. It’s a four-year
term, but right now, we are looking only for somebody to fill out the last year of Earl’s term. Next year, we will elect someone to a new four-year term. Sonya Armstrong is our current backup to Earl; it’s not really called a backup, what do you call it? Alternate. And she has been doing a great job, and she is very interested in this position. We looked at the constitution and, unfortunately, we cannot just say, “Okay, as the alternate, you can fill out his term.” The constitution is very specific about this, and so we are required to elect Earl’s replacement using the same procedures that we used to elect Earl in the first place. And that involves us notifying the faculty of the availability of this position, taking nominations, and voting on those nominations. So, what I’ll ask you to do is to, if any of you are interested, to express your interest. If you have people in your departments that are interested, let them know or let your faculty know that this position is available right now, and we have a deadline. 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. And, again, we have an alternate who is interested, who has expressed interest in that position, but we are obligated to disseminate the availability of that position so that others can apply. Rosemary?

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 whoever is selected needs to have that Monday/Wednesday schedule, right?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, whoever, yes, someone has to be available Friday. This is correct. As to what Sonya, I think Sonya probably would remain the alternate because she has been elected to that position, so she is not being booted out of it. She would prefer to move into the representative position, but I would have to ask her to be certain.

R. Feurer: What I am saying is that she would, does she have a schedule that would make her available as, in other words, what’s her schedule?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, and the only answer I can give you to that is she has been able to attend some of the meetings. I don’t know if the others, the one’s she hasn’t attended is because of schedule conflicts or whether she hasn’t attended them because as the alternate, there are not really supposed to be two people there. We’ve sort of pushed that envelope a little bit and they sort of mentioned to us that we’re supposed to have one representative, not two. So, 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. What, is it Article 16 or 19?

P. Erickson: It is Article 16, and it’s also embedded in your agenda.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, it’s in the agenda and Article 16 in the constitution. It’s a pretty brief description. Article 16.5 of the bylaws.
D. Valentiner: If Sonya is elected to this position, will that create a vacancy in the substitute position that will then be filled sometime next year?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes and no. The alternate position, I think, is one that we actually created. I don’t think the constitution provides for that, does it?

P. Erickson: Correct, the FAC to the IBHE asked us to identify an alternate.

A. Rosenbaum: So, we actually created that alternate position without changing the Constitution. We were asked by Earl to provide an alternate. So, it’s not technically an official position and so we could or could not select an alternate. It would be up to us whether we wanted to select another alternate to that position, but it’s not required. The only requirement in the constitution is the representative to the FAC. Okay, any other questions about the FAC position? Yes?

C. Nissen: What was that date again for the deadline of nominations?

A. Rosenbaum: April 16 and then again, we will vote on it on the next, at our next meeting. Okay, so that is the end of our 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. 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, so you can look at that if you wish. And, again, that election also will take place next month at our last meeting. It could be a blockbuster meeting, we’re going to allow you to bring
sleeping bags if all the things that we have coming up actually come up. We could be here for a while. So, come with energy drinks or whatever.

A. Rosenbaum: Anyone have any comments or question from the floor? Any questions, comments?

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Motion to adjourn?

R. Lopez: Move.

A. Rosenbaum: Rosita? Second?

S. Willis: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Sue Willis. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Okay, we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.