
VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Briscoe, Bujarski, Deng, Giese, Khoury, Lee, Lenczewski, Martin, Mogren, Mohabbat, Moraga, Munroe, Onyuksel, Plonczynski, Riley, Rosenbaum, Schneider, Schwartz-Bechet

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Brockett, Bryan, Cole, Collar, Dechene, Gilbert, Haliczer, Klaper, Levin, Martin, Mass, McCord, Monteiro, Mueller-Fuertes, Reynolds, Rigg, Sanchez, Stafstrom, Streb, Young

OTHERS ABSENT: Doederlein

I. CALL TO ORDER

W. Pitney called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

W. Pitney noted one amendment to the agenda: move up our unfinished business to be item V. G. Slotsve moved to approve the agenda as amended, second by R. Siegesmund. Motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2014 FS MEETING

R. Siegesmund moved to approve the minutes, second by T. Arado. Motion passed.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

W. Pitney announced the next Faculty Club lunch for October 21 in Ellington’s.

A. Guest Presentation: Career Satisfaction and Gender Among NIU STEM Faculty – presentation – Pages 4-15
   Chris McCord, Principal Investigator/Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
   Brian Coller, Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
   Amy Levin, Chair, Department of English
   Jeffrey Reynolds, Director, Academic Analysis and Reporting, Office of the Provost
   Lesley Rigg, Vice President for Research and Innovation Partnerships
• Study funded through the National Science Foundation ADVANCE grant that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology received in 2010.

• The point to the proposal and the resulting research data was to examine or to do a climate survey on campus and determine how we would go about achieving career satisfaction at NIU and what the temperature of these two colleges was in regard to their own, the individual faculty’s, satisfaction with their career and their career progression and what aspects of their career were satisfactory and which ones needed improvement.

• Agency and respect was a key finding from the study. Having a sense of agency and respect both from your peers, your colleagues, your students, your researchers outside of campus, leads to job satisfaction. And so issues associated with agency and respect are crucial at retaining a productive and satisfied faculty.

• Gender marginalization and equity, that notion of being treated fairly, was a key finding as well.

• Science faculty, regardless of gender, tended to report less family/work balance.

• At NIU, the women reported that they are not quite as satisfied as their male colleagues regardless of discipline in terms of their career progression.

• This study was a climate survey. It was not fundamentally driven by a goal of identifying policy recommendations or identifying actions steps. Its purpose was to understand the current situation and then to use that as a basis for forward movement. However, there is a lack of clarity on some policies that govern what happens if somebody is on intermittent FMLA leave and are not clear.

• Women reported that, when they felt excluded from department networks, they often felt also overlooked for leadership roles and opportunities to develop necessary skills and that they felt this was holding them back. Again, we recommend the continuation and expansion of informal alternatives and networks. We also believe that this is a step that the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women can help take up. Can we move to the next slide?

T. Arado announced the upcoming Open Access Week to be held in the Sky room the week of October 20-23.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Evaluation of Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor and Evaluation of Executive Secretary of University Council/President of Faculty Senate – revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 7 – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Page 59

W. Pitney provided a background related to this second reading. G. Slotsve moved to approve the suggested changes, G. Long seconded. It was determined that a total of 46 senators were in attendance. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes – 36
No – 3
Abstain - 5
VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of alternate to FAC to IBHE representative
   The Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE meets monthly on Fridays at various
   university locations across the state. Travel reimbursement is provided. The alternate
   would attend meetings only if NIU’s representative, Sonya Armstrong, is unable to
   attend.

   P. Soddard self-nominated for this position. J. Novak moved approval of Paul Stoddard
   as the FAC to IBHE alternate, M. Haji-Sheikh seconded. Motion Passed.

B. NIU PLUS – General Education – report – Pages 16-51

   G. Slotsve moved to endorse the concept and framework of the PLUS task force report. S.
   McHone-Chase seconded the motion.

   • W. Pitney discussed that the PLUS program was presented at the Association for General
     and Liberal Studies. The program was identified as impressive, forward thinking, and
     innovative.
   • The NIU Student Association passed a resolution in support of the program.
   • The General Education Committee voted to endorse the program’s concept and
     framework.
   • P. Stoddard raised a concern about the Knowledge Domain Studies and articulated that
     the geology department faculty is very concerned with the six hours in nature and
     technology. The current model requires students to take a science lab because seven
     hours are required, which means a student is encouraged to take a science laboratory
     course. The geology faculty feels very strongly that the laboratory requirement should be
     maintained, not only because of its important science content, but this may also mean a
     drop in teaching assistantships.
   • G. Long stated that there will likely be a letter coming to the PLUS Task Force to have
     diversity as a Knowledge Domain.
   • W. Pitney shared information from M. Kolb about the science labs: 1) from semesters
     2009 to 2014 the number of distinct students who take non-lab science courses is 57
     percent; 2) This is greater than the 50 percent that they would expect of students
     minimized their efforts and took one three- and one four-hour course to fill the minimum
     of seven hours required to satisfy their general education science area requirement. This
     suggests non-science students are preferring to take three different, three-hour science
     courses than take a four-hour science course. Also M. Kolb reported the number of
     students taking four-hour science courses in the general education program has dropped
     20 percent over six years compared to 11 percent drop for three-credit science courses. P.
     Stoddard responded by suggesting that they just require seven hours and not give
     students the option of not taking of taking three non-science classes. M. Haji-Sheikh
     commented that the waive is going to be higher than you think because in electrical
     engineering you have to take many more science classes that they’re taking three physics
     classes and then a chemistry.
• **J. Stafstrom**, a member of the PLUS Task Force, provided the following general comments: 1) his desire to have biology as part of our curriculum for every educated student was weighed against other conflicts and needs for our students; 2) the task force proposal is striving to help students matriculate the general education program efficiently and to lower barriers; 3) every constituency can probably identify some courses that would be helpful to students. There are a couple of open forums coming up: All this information is on the [PLUS web page](#).

• **D. Macdonald** expressed concern about the speed of implementation, particularly as it relates to the idea of a second-year writing course, but this will have an impact on staffing, room assignments, lab assignments. Other aspects of implementation were also raised.

• **M. Haji-Sheikh** expressed concern about assessment as it relates to the junior college transfers, particularly the conflict between community colleges and NIU if it isn’t managed properly. **J. Stafstrom** commented that the task force is certainly aware that NIU will work with partners to make this clear.

• **R. Moremen** raised concerns about the implementation as it relates to departmental advisors and the plan to educate them about PLUS. Another concern related to rolling out the pathways.

• Concerns were also expressed as to whether the program can be changed if, after implementing it, challenges are identified.

• The PLUS Task Force benchmarked other issues.

W. Pitney requested postponing the vote on the motion. **P. Stoddard** moved to postpone and **J. Novak** seconded. Motion passed with two abstentions

**VII. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – [report](#) – Pages 52-53

• The Faculty Advisory Council of the Illinois Board of Higher Education met last Friday at Illinois State University. First of all, the link that you can see up there and on the report to the [Faculty Fellow Program](#). This is a program for faculty members to have the opportunity to do research with the IBHE or for the IBHE. If anyone has a sabbatical opportunity coming up, I’m happy to give more information on this. So far, the only Faculty Fellows, I believe, have been from UIC, so NIU needs to get in there.

• NIU is not involved in the [Midwest Student Exchange Program](#).

• Former Illinois State University President Al Bowman was very frank about his criticism of much administration in higher education in our state.

B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – [report](#) – Page 54

• Human Resources is working through the legislation regarding retirees returning to work.
• Retirees can continue using Groupwise and there is a trial group for the beta test of Office 365 e-mail.
• Human Resources is coming up with a plan on how to deal with employees working 30 hours or less that are ineligible for state benefits. This is with other universities.

C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – no report

D. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – no report

E. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – no report

F. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Dan Gebo – no report

G. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Greg Waas – no report


• The Board of Trustees meeting from September 18
• The Board of Trustees created two ad hoc committees, one on enrollment, a second one on governance.
• President Baker did cordially thank faculty and staff for their work and involvement with the Welcome Days for our students.
• The BOT approved the authorization for President Baker to take the necessary steps to implement the Smoke-Free Campus Act here at NIU.

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report

B. Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report

C. Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair – no report

D. Rules and Governance – Robert Schneider, Chair – no report

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – report – Pages 56-58

• Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb is the current chair of RSB.
• A focus on this meeting was on how to visualize, conceptualize and operationalize our role in the budgetary process.
• Dickeson’s text on Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services was distributed to committee members.
• Space, as an asset, was discussed.
• Mike Mann provided information related to the Illinois Higher Education budget final action for the fiscal year ’15. The whole university system, was down .22 percent in general funds appropriations and our change was a little bit lower than that at -.24 percent. The next table showed that it was a comparison of state general funds appropriations from 2002 to 2015 and for all universities it was 18.2 percent decline with a 21.1 percent decline for NIU which was the highest among all universities.
• The list of compiled questions based on Faculty Senate’s input from the last Faculty Senate meeting was discussed.
• The flow chart presented by the committee was briefly discussed.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair – no report

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Faculty morale

A structured discussion of faculty morale was initiated. That issue came up from a planning session with the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate and well as the Steering Committee of University Council. The issue also emerged as a concern with the SPS Council.
• Morale has been an issue in some colleges. In engineering, for example, the class sizes are increasing, and few faculty are being hired. This workload tends to weigh heavily on the faculty.
• The faculty’s perspective that there seems to be less and less transparency that’s available is leading to less morale. There seems to be decisions being made without a lot of faculty input or notification. So that’s very concerning.
• Consultants are being hired, but not faculty.
• Morale is linked to issues of shared governance and concern that shared governance as we all know, places tremendous burdens on us in terms of expectations of time and our commitment to working collaboratively on issues, but that as decisions go higher up in the administrative structure, there is less faculty involvement so that we’re all actively engaged in committees and other kind of work, but then decisions are made that don’t necessarily seem to connect to that work that we’re all doing.
• One factor to morale is the lack of salary raises.
• An emphasis on vocational college with a business agenda rather than a focus on our students and their liberal arts education is lowering the morale.
• Facilities have a demoralizing aspect.
• Some are disturbed that we were even talking about faculty morale and that we should kind of keep quiet and not make President Baker feel like we’re not supporting him.
• What would be the symptom of low faculty morale? Perhaps these need to be identified.
• Shared governance starts at the department budget. You have the ability to make a decision at some point that affects your class and your colleagues have and it affects the
department. That starts at your budget. When you don’t have a budget that is workable, you have no shared governance. Shared governance is more than just us sitting around and talking. It’s having some share of the finances and control the finances of the university to some extent within our small little sphere.

- Shared governance might come down to maybe two components, one being that maybe somebody has given authority over a piece of something. For example, on our campus I’d like to think that the curriculum is in the hands of our faculty at the department, college and university level. We can decide, for example, to be behind something or not to approve a course or so forth. I think for a lot of campuses that’s often how they operate. The other piece is at least having a voice in part of a process.

- Faculty are supposed to govern the university. And for those of us who value that history, I think you have to recognize that it’s a rich history of the university. And it’s the same that sociologists or others can discern that education is driven by a market, market versus faculty who share values and knowledge and we may some of those issues and concerns about. But I think the other thing we can look at is the present times. Some faculty across the country can name their presidents or can take down [inaudible] and it’s that kind of power that they basically feel that level of governance. We don’t have that here at all and I think that we have to be aware of this. That is a value to some of the faculty across the country.

- Professors, particularly tenure track faculty, are not respected by colleagues. I would like professors to be respected and we are here, we are all professors, no matter whether you are a faculty member or you are promoted to administrator. We are all professors. That’s why we are here.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Alternate Policy – Page 60
B. Annual Report, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
C. Annual Report, Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor
D. Annual Report, University Benefits Committee
E. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
F. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
G. Minutes, Athletic Board
H. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
I. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
J. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
K. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
L. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
M. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
N. Minutes, General Education Committee
O. Minutes, Honors Committee
P. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
Q. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
R. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
S. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
T. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
XIII. ADJOURNMENT


Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.