

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, March 25, 2015, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Azad, Baker, Brubaker, Bujarski, Campbell, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chung, Conderman, Demir, Feurer, Fredericks, Grund, Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Jaffee, Konon, Koren, Lenczewski, Mackie Manning, Martin, Millis, Montana, Moremen, Naples, Newman (for Macdonald), Novak, Patro, Pitney, Rush, Ryan, Ryu, Sagarin, Shin, Slotsve, Stoddard, Than, Tonks, Un, Xie

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Arriola, Bateni, Briscoe, Chen, Chmaissem, Deng, Giese, Hedin, Henning, Irwin, Khoury, Lee, Long, Macdonald, Markowitz, McHone-Chase, Mogren, Mohabbat, Moraga, Plonczynski, Riley, Schwartz-Bechet, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Stephen

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Doederlein, Haliczzer, Falkoff, Klaper, Liu, Schalkoff, Stafstrom

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Armstrong, Gebo, Monteiro, Shortridge, Streb, Waas

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**G. Slotsve** moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded. Motion passed.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES](#) OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2015 FS MEETING**

**J. Novak** moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. The motion passed.

**IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**A.** House Bill 403 – Repeal of University 50% Tuition Waivers

**W. Pitney** shared letters from both President Baker and the leaders of NIU shared governance councils opposing House Bill 403.

W. Pitney provided an information item from the Academic Policy Committee of the University Council regarding a proposed university-level curriculum committee structure change that will be presented at the UC for a first reading at its next meeting. The proposal consolidates the CIUE and the CUAЕ into one committee. Also, the proposal consolidates APASC and the CUC into one committee to create a cleaner, more streamlined curricular process. At the university level we would still have the General Education Committee, the Honors Committee, they would give

reports to a new Baccalaureate Curriculum Council. The proposed Baccalaureate Curriculum Council would address the work of the previous APASC and CUC and, thus, would eliminate the former UCC's level of coordination. **V. Naples** thanked the members of the Academic Policies Committee because they came with a lot of enthusiasm and were extremely well-prepared and had very worth-while discussions about the changes. She commented that an initial concern was ensuring that faculty had a sufficient opportunity to provide input into the curricular process at all different stages and the idea was not simply to consolidate or streamline things and remove people's opportunities to contribute. There will still be lots of opportunities for people to serve on brand new and/or revised committees. The change will make for a smoother process and a faster process. She noted that a faster process is important because of the institution of the PLUS program.

**W. Pitney** announced the next Faculty Club lunch dates and times.

## **V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to George Slotsve

**G. Slotsve** was presented with the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award.

## **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report  
[February 20, 2015](#) – Pages 6-7  
[March 20, 2015](#) – walk-in

This report was written only.

- B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – no report
- C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – no report
- D. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – [report](#) – Pages 8-9

**W. Pitney** highlighted the following information from this meeting:

- The committee approved the Nankai-NIU International College. This was a collaborative venture in Tianjin, China partnering with NIU. NIU will offer 2-plus-2 programs in political science with two emphasis: international politics and public administration; and economics as well.
- The committee approved the proposed Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management.
- The committee approved the B.S. in ed and middle level teaching and learning degree, the College of Education.

- The committee approved the sabbaticals for Supportive Professional Staff and faculty.
- The committee received a report on curriculum diversity at Northern Illinois University.

E. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee –  
Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – [report](#) – Pages 10-11

This report was written only.

F. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee –  
Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – [report](#) – Page 12

This report was written only.

G. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee –  
Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Page 13

This report was written only.

H. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – no report

I. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and William Pitney – no report

J. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Pages 14-16

W. Pitney highlighted the following from the written report:

- The Board approved the student health insurance fee and indeed it totals \$1,052 per semester. The explanation for the dramatic increase in that fee is the Affordable Care Act and the need to expand the coverage for students. Concerns about the fee increases at the graduate and undergraduate level have been raised.
- The board had a first reading of a proposed tuition remittance program for the Ph.D. in Health Sciences.

## **VIII. 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 – Gary Baker, Chair – no report

E. Resources, Space and Budget – Stephen Tonks, Liaison/Spokesperson

1. [RSB Budget Survey](#) – Pages 17-20

**W. Pitney** noted that the RSB wanted to make the FS aware that they are currently conducting a survey of chairs, deans and office managers who have been closely associated with the budget and vacancy hearing process.

2. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 2.8](#) – Pages 21-23  
Resources, Space and Budget Committee – **INFORMATION ONLY**

**W. Pitney** provided information about the proposed revisions to the RSB committee. The proposal is to add four faculty members, two duties, and allow for the RSB to function without a quorum outside of the academic year calendar providing there are at least five members, three of whom must be faculty. The proposal is designed to allow for input into time-sensitive budget issues that may occur once the spring semester has concluded.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair; Therese Arado, Alternate

1. Letter of acceptance of nomination for President of Faculty Senate/  
Executive Secretary of University Council;  
Faculty Senate will vote at the April 22, 2015 meeting.

[Greg Long](#) – Pages 24-25  
[Virginia Naples](#) – Page 26

**T. Arado** explained that two faculty members have accepted nominations to serve as the next president of Faculty Senate, executive secretary of University Council.

## **IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws [Article 3](#) – Pages 27-30  
Rules & Governance Committee and  
Elections & Legislative Oversight Committee  
**FIRST READING**

**W. Pitney** explained the proposal to consolidate the Rules and Governance Committee with the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. Moreover, the proposal is to make this new consolidated committee a joint committee of the University Council and of the Faculty Senate.

**P. Stoddard** noted that the consolidation has some merit but he expressed concern that by making a joint committee you then give other constituencies on campus the right to influence the way the FS conducts its business.

## **XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**W. Pitney** articulated that faculty leave guidelines are being examined. The issue was raised by some faculty who expressed having sick leave docked when they missed a committee meeting.

**P. Stoddard** noted this was raised to him as the Faculty SPS advisor. **G. Slotsve** mentioned that this issue was discussed at an HR meeting. **S. Klaper** noted that in her role as ombudsperson she has faced this issue three times in the past year, one at a college and twice at departmental levels. And the discussion also should expand past committee meetings and include when faculty miss a class. **W. Pitney** noted that he, Celeste Latham, and Murali Karishnamurthi have met and are drafting some guidelines. These would need to go through Legal and eventually be vetted.

**P. Stoddard** explained that another issue that maybe we want to take up is problem of online course evaluations that have low response rates and result in evaluations that are skewed very heavily toward the negative when, in fact, that might not represent the faculty member's instructing capabilities at all. **W. Pitney** said he would move this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

**T. Than** raised a concern from her department about how the prioritization task force members will be selected from those nominated. The concern she expressed was that having the selection by the President, Executive Vice President and Provost, and Vice President for Administration and Finance and University Council Executive Secretary results in a high proportion of administrators selecting from the nominees.

**W. Pitney** explained that this concern has also been expressed from other groups as well. He reported that, given the concerns, he met with Provost Lisa Freeman yesterday and raised the concerns. Other options were weighed and considered and a composition such as the UAC-BOT Committee was thought to be a reasonable approach.

**B. Jaffee** asked if members of that selection committee would not ultimately serve on the task force? **W. Pitney** articulated that it would be a conflict of interest. **T. Ryan** asked why shouldn't Faculty Senate get to approve the task forces once they're appointed? **W. Pitney** explained that he was a proponent of having more faculty at the table and identify an appropriate group from those nominated. Having those selected could certainly be brought to Faculty Senate for a vote; but that is not a process that has been used for past task forces, so it could be very divisive. **R. Feurer** advocated for the FS vote. She commented that the UAC-BOT (four faculty) is good but the issue is such that all faculty should be involved. She urged bypassing the UAC-BOT and asking the Faculty Senate to vote on the task force members.

**D. Haliczzer** added that committees that are making selections should be dominated by faculty. That being said, the committee is going to be looking at both academic programs as well as administrative and so involvement by a diverse set of personnel from the university makes sense as long as we continue with the principle of dominance by faculty.

**M. Lenczewski** suggested a straw poll just to see if we want this. **W. Pitney** called on the parliamentarian to comment on this. **F. Bryan** stated that there are several places in Roberts

where it is clear that they are not in favor of straw polls. We need to have a motion, a second, and a vote.

**W. Pitney** commented on the modes shared governance tends to take: 1) faculty have sole decision making authority on a piece of something – typically the curriculum, 2) that we have a level of representation and input in a process. If we move to having the UAC-BOT representing the constituency groups and the largest portion are faculty, to him to follow that up with a ratification means that the Faculty Senate does not trust, appreciate or value that group's decision. Pitney questioned whether having an administrator removed from that group would improve the proportionality. **T. Ryan** expressed his concern that the faculty have not been consulted at several key steps of the process.

**T. Ryan** motioned to give Faculty Senate the power to approve the task force that is being put together to assess the academic programs. **R. Feurer** seconded. **W. Pitney** called for discussion and noted that to say that faculty have not been consulted goes back to definitions of shared governance which are probably wide and varied. From the outset, the provost had put together a team to explore the prioritization process that was recommend by the Higher Learning Commission and bolstered after the Board of Trustees stated that NIU should align its budget with its strategic initiatives.

**M. Falkoff** commented that the baseline idea with prioritization is that it's a process that invites faculty participation rather than having determinations made from administration. It is an opportunity for us all, as a community, faculty and all members of the community, to have some voice about the potential reallocation of resources. The determination of the criteria to be used during the prioritization has been a campus-wide event. The final selection of those criteria is being made by a combined group of RSB and APC. Its clear there are going to be two task forces and the ultimate decisions on prioritization, are going to be made by faculty. **J. Novak** commented that the process thus far has been opaque.

**B. Jaffee** expressed that having the Faculty Senate ratify the selections is not really going to make that much of a difference. The issue is: If all the colleges are going to have at least one representative on these task forces, why can't the colleges elect their own representative? She expressed a concern over the trustee's mentality. We all care about the university. What is needed on the task force is zealous representation for every college so that every college can feel confident in this process. **W. Pitney** clarified that T. Ryan has put a motion from the floor to have the Faculty Senate approve the task force. Pitney asked for clarification if it included both task forces or one.

**T. Ryan** stated he did say just the one task force. He commented that the most recent point raised was more germane. And if it is possible for him to withdraw the motion, and for the body to explore this idea of zealous representation of colleges electing members. He was trying to address the issue because faculty have not been sufficiently involved in the process in a way that gives them authority. We've been invited into the process; we've been invited to meetings; we've been sent emails; we've been given presentations. But we're not in the driving seat and we need to be driving as well. **T. Ryan** withdrew his motion.

**R. Moremen** commented that having served on numerous task forces over the various years that she has been here, her concern was not so much the constituency of the task force itself, but what input that task force will have in the final budgetary decision making process. A task force can meet, consult, provide input, but her concern is whether this is going to be a situation where the decisions are going to be made by individuals who will listen to us, perhaps patiently, but then proceed to do as they wish when all is said and done.

**W. Pitney** commented that the task force would evaluate program reports that would be built by a data team and information added by programs. The task forces would examine those and draw up a set of recommendations in terms of all the programs. Those recommendations, as this plays out in other institutions, goes to the president and provost. With respect to academic programs, once recommendations are received and approved by the president, those are going to be passed down to the various departments and colleges where those programs reside. The prioritization process does not take the place of any of NIU's current curricular processes. So recommendations will then be sent to departments for action. At that point, there is likely to be a continuum of possible outcomes from accepting the recommendation as is, modifying it, or, perhaps rejecting it.

**R. Feurer** commented that what is missing from this discussion is the very premise of the endorsement of faculty. Moreover, people have examples from across the United States where this book has been used to implement program prioritization and the picture isn't pretty. Faculty attrition is a huge concern and we have to safeguard, as a faculty, the very notion of a university and what it is.

**B. Jaffee** articulated that one of the goals implicit in prioritization is to reduce the budget. And it might have the effect indicated by Feurer. At the very least, monies will be reallocated. Even if it's not about reducing the total, there will be winners and losers. It is a very serious business. She questioned why are there two separate task forces for administration and academics? **W. Pitney** commented that the advantage may be that the criteria may be different for administrative versus academic programs. **J. Stafstrom** asked whether it is known how the recommendations of the two task forces will be intertwined or meshed into a single decision making process? **W. Pitney** stated that he doesn't know. **M. Falkoff** commented that it was not clear, but he didn't believe there was any sense that the lists are going to merge in some way. **B. Jaffee** requested clarification on the composition of these task forces. **W. Pitney** stated that for the academic program task force there will be up to 20 faculty with representation from each college. **M. Konon** clarified from the web site that for the administrative task force staff, tenured faculty and instructors, at least one from each division, totaling no more than 20.

**B. Jaffee** motioned, after a friendly amendment from Feurer, to have a proportional faculty representation on each task force and for the selection of task force members from those nominated to occur at the respective college level. **R. Feurer** seconded. **W. Pitney** called for discussion.

**M. Falkoff** commented that he was going to recommend that the motion be broken up into two parts. The college representation might make clear sense for the academic task force and it might be a little more complicated for the administrative. **W. Pitney commented that** the coordinating

team has operated thus far having looked at how other universities have run their prioritization process. He noted having taken faculty concern about the selection process to Provost Freeman and she understood the concerns and there was a willingness to change the process. Thus there was a good faith effort that, given faculty concerns to look at alternatives.

**B. Jaffee** noted that the Faculty Senate **does not** have any binding authority so we can vote it up or we can vote it down, but it would give us a voice in this. She asked for clarification about the trustee's mentality component being sought for task force members. **M. Falkoff** explained that the theory is that the task forces should be populated by faculty that put the best interests of the entire university at the forefront and that we don't populate the task forces with people who are there to stake out their own territory, prepare to engage in turf wars, prepare to engage in log rolling. The vision is not to have the zealous advocacy going on during the task forces but to have a group comprised of people who are going to work together to figure out what's best for the university. The zealous advocacy is supposed to happen by the program faculty when they create their reports.

**W. Pitney** called for a role call vote. Arguments were made that this was inappropriate. **W. Pitney** withdrew the request. A request was made to clarify the motion. **W. Pitney** clarified the motion.

The motion passed with the following vote:

- 1 – Yes – 25
- 2 – No – 10
- 3 – Abstain – 4

**W. Pitney** stated that he would forward a letter of this motion to the provost and president. **F. Bryan** clarified that a call for a role call vote should be done by the individual making the motion.

## **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

### **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.