

FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, September 3, 2014, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Allori, Arado, Azad, Bateni, Briscoe, Brubaker, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Conderman, Falkoff, Feurer, Gorman, Hathaway, Henning, Hunt, Irwin, Johnson, Koren, Lenczewski, Macdonald, Mackie, Manning, Martin, McHone-Chase, Millis, Montana, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Pitney, Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Rush, Sagarin, Schneider, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Stoddard, Than, Tonks, Un, Wilson

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bujarski, Campbell, Chen, Chmaissem, Deng, Fredericks, Gaillard, Giese, Jaffee, Khoury, Lee, G. Long, Mogren, Mohabbat, Moraga, Munroe, Patro, Plonczynski, Riley, Schwartz-Bechet, Sirotkin, Stephen

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryan, Coronado, Haliczzer, Klaper, Kolb, D. Long, Monteiro, Shortridge

OTHERS ABSENT: Doederlein, Gebo, Streb, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

W. Pitney: [First comments are off-microphone.] ... For the University Council and the Faculty Senate ... is that better? Okay, Ferald Bryan is our parliamentarian and Sarah Klaper is our ombudsperson. Just a few announcements. First I'm going to turn it over to Sarah to present some information about the 45th anniversary of the ombudsperson.

Meeting called to order at 3:04 p.m.

S. Klaper: Hello, again. My name is Sarah Klaper. I'm the university ombudsperson and so, if you are not familiar with my office, I work with faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni and family members, everybody associated with the university. I'm a confidential resource, neutral, can't take anybody's side. But I can help you through a process or identify all of your options that are available to you to deal with the situation. Also, I'm independent. I report to the president, get evaluated to University Council, so I don't belong to a department or division to have a bias one way or the other toward or against anybody on campus.

And the last thing is I'm informal. So I'm not one of those places on campus that's authorized to seek notice. So if you're trying to tell the university something so the university will do something about it, my office really isn't the right place for that, but I can get you to the right office and help you through talking with that office if that's what's required.

The point of me talking today is that this year is the 45th anniversary of my office being in existence at NIU which is one of the oldest Office of the Ombudsperson in an academic setting in North America. I believe the oldest one is at Simon Fraser in Canada. NIU started 45 years

ago and so we are having a celebration and it's next week. Next week in the glass gallery downstairs in the student center across from the hotel desk, we will have a display featuring the history of the office, reminiscences, that's probably not a good word, but from previous ombuds-people and photographs and a video produced by media services about our office. Also on Tuesday, I cordially invite you to come get free food. Free food is good – hors d'oeuvres on Tuesday from like 11 to 2, down in the gallery, we're going to have a little reception. So, hors d'oeuvres and beverages. And the president is going to come and make a few remarks about the value of our office on this campus and his experience at Idaho with their office, which is very similar to our office.

I really welcome you. My office will be there – me, my office administrator, my graduate assistants, and the president, and anybody else. So we welcome you to come and please join us for that reception even if you only have a couple minutes. But again there will be free food and that's good. And invite anybody else that you see. You should be getting a notice about it also through your e-mail. Thank you.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Sarah.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

W. Pitney: So I was in this role for about 30 seconds here today and made my first couple of errors. I think we need to adopt the agenda, right? So could I have a motion to accept the agenda?

R. Siegesmund: So moved.

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

W. Pitney: All in favor.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Thank you, the agenda is adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 23, 2014 FS MEETING

W. Pitney: We also have to approve our minutes from the April 23 Faculty Senate meeting that was posted online and available to you. Can I have a motion to accept the minutes?

R. Siegesmund: So moved.

M. Lenczewski: Second.

W. Pitney: Having a motion and a second are there any edits, changes? Hearing none, all in favor, say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

W. Pitney: Now how about some announcements? Just to let you know, a heads-up on October 29, I've invited President Baker to come join us in a question and answer session. So he will be here then. I will send out an e-mail to all of the senators asking for a list of questions and I'll try to compile those and make those available so I can moderate that session. Next, I'm excited to have Dr. Michael Kolb, the Associate Vice Provost, and Dr. Ed. Klonoski a professor from the School of Music to present to us some information about the undergraduate general education program and some proposed changes. So let's go ahead.

- A. [NIU PLUS](#) – Progressive Learning in Undergraduate Studies – Pages 5-6
[PowerPoint Presentation](#)

Michael Kolb, Associate Vice Provost

Ed Klonoski, Associate Professor, School of Music

M. Kolb: Hi, everybody. Can you hear me okay? Is this working all right? Okay. Thanks for having us here. We appreciate the opportunity to come and to debrief you a little bit about some of the curricular changes that we will be recommending to the provost probably within a week or within the next two weeks. We've got a couple key things and we would like to share them with you. We would like the opportunity for you to take what we present back. Also the report will be put out for public comment. After we get the provost's and the president's comments, we'll probably do the final revisions.

This is a program, actually a task force, that was assembled in the spring of 2013 to begin undergraduate curricular revision and has been expanded to incorporate a couple important changes in the baccalaureate program. It's the moniker, it's called the Progressive Learning and Undergraduate Studies or NIU PLUS. And we have been working diligently for three semesters as well as a good summer to try to prepare this report. The task force is made up of mostly faculty. We have some administrators, we have some staff members, we have some students in the group as well. And we've been charged basically to come up with a couple key curricular reforms. And these reforms, if I may speak for the entire task force, I think is something that we have a responsibility as a faculty body to undertake. And we've all been hearing the messaging that's been coming down regarding retention, regarding our dropping numbers, and we can all do things individually and perhaps amongst our departments.

But one of the things that we can do as a faculty body is really try to address the curriculum as a whole and how it integrates effectively. And we've done our best as a group to bench mark other institutions to look at what we have as strengths, to what we have as challenges here, and try to come up with our idea of what the best recommendations can be to the institutions. What we would eventually like, like I say, is for you to maybe debate these, to talk about it. We would love once the report is finalized, an endorsement from the Faculty Senate – or a non-endorsement – either way. But we would like to certainly hear your comments either now as well as we go through the process over the next couple of months.

We have three specific objectives and some of you are maybe familiar with some of the challenges that we have been facing in terms of dropping enrollments, the disconnection students have with general education, they don't understand why it's important and much of the data has supported the idea that students don't really understand it and that we have not really effectively communicated it. What we've come up with is trying to look at the entirety of the baccalaureate program and integrating it as best as possible. We all, of course, are focused on major studies, right? This is what students walk away with is their degree. But there's two other components that probably have not been as privileged over the last decade or more. That would be the aspect of general education which would be considered to be the academic breadth as well as one of the important strengths that we have at our institution which is practice and the engaged learning.

One of the things that we can offer, the task force believes, compared to many of our competitors as well as community colleges is that engagement, where we have students involved in research and internships and other practices. And what we're proposing are three things: We would like to see an increase in high-impact practices at our institution. We want to see better integration and flexibility of the general education program so it integrates and segues into the major better. And we want to see the baccalaureate goals at our student learning outcomes (abbreviated SLO's). We have eight of those. We won't go into details about those but those will be in the report as well. To be at the forefront of what we want students to walk away from this institution with in terms of knowledge.

Now one of the things that we're concerned about, of course, is flexibility. With all the various changes that we've recommended, we envision a potential reduction of up to 11 credit hours for students in their baccalaureate which, of course, can increase the flexibility that they might have in their degree program whether it be a licensure or other things and some programs are now beyond that 120 hour credits. If, as long as they do this, there are basically four things, as long as they do their general education here either as a native student or maybe as a transferee, transferring in after one year. As long as they take major area courses that satisfy general education requirements, we're going to allow some, what we call double-dipping, of course, in the major and in gen ed and that's all on your executive summary. We were looking at two courses. We're also encouraging new, enhanced writing requirements and, as long as students take those from existing courses either in their major study area or in their general education program. And we're also proposing some sort of capstone program we're tentatively titling it UNIV301. So those are the four steps that we envision students having more flexibility here.

I'll begin, and again if you could look at that graph or you can look at those ten key points that we recommend and I'll just summarize them here. We're looking at four specific high-impact practices that we want all students to undertake. It boils down to these and actually high-impact practices for those of you who don't know, have been actually there's a national movement called the Liberal Education on America's Promise initiative which is the American Association of Colleges and Universities have collected extensive data on high-impact practices that affect things such as student persistence and retention and satisfaction with their degree programs and they are listed here. There's a bunch of them.

We envision four that we want to emphasize in our baccalaureate. The first important one is more writing. Everyone indicated this on our surveys – faculty, students and staff – that students basically are not properly trained in writing. What we envision is adding two upper-division what we call writing infused courses. These can be existing courses in the baccalaureate in the major studies or general education that meets certain qualifications for writing infused, a certain limitation or a certain number of words that they're writing, the chance to get feedback and to rewrite and other things. We've got that all lined out. We also believe very strongly in the First-Year Experience, which is the UNIV101-201 class which is currently offered. We would like to see this mandatory for all students. We would also like to have it tweaked a little bit so they understand more in regards to their baccalaureate experience, ideas of critical thinking, and so on. So try to infuse a little bit more academic content. We would like to see them get involved in engaged learning. We would like to have them undertake at least one engaged learning practice either in a course that could be identified. Like a study abroad course, for example, would be engaged learning where they are taken abroad. That could be again put on their transcript as well as co-curricular activities. Things like Research Rookies or other internships. We would like to see them undertake one of these, either or. And finally, we're envisioning some sort of career success course. There's a lot of courses already in the curriculum that might be entitled capstone courses. We would like to see that, as well, be in place. At least a one credit sort of course that would tie to again their baccalaureate outcomes as they progress and ideas of career success.

Moving on to the general education program, on the left you'll see an image of the existing general education program. It consists of 13 courses. A minimum of 39 credit hours and it's broken down into five different categories. We have our core competencies which are practices in math or communication as well as writing or English. We also have four distributive study areas. We have the humanities and arts, science and math, social sciences and interdisciplinary studies. And students have to basically take 39 credit hours minimum if they come in as a native student.

We also have a set of specific general education goals. There's four main goals. We envision a transformation in regards to the credit hours: a drop of about two courses that 33 credit hours distributed into four what we call areas of study which mimic, to some degree, our existing categories or distributive areas. We renamed it foundational studies where they have to take four courses once again in what we consider to be quantitative literacy, oral communication and writing composition, so again it doesn't change a whole lot. And we have to abide by that regarding the Illinois Articulation Initiative compact with other institutions around the state.

And then we envision three knowledge domains: one called creativity and critical analysis, another nature and technology, the third society and culture. They have to take two out of each of those domains as well as one elective from any of those three domains. So we're envisioning 11 courses distributed in four areas and instead of utilizing our four general education goals, we want to adopt all eight student learning outcomes for the baccalaureate.

Now the foundational competencies this explains our goals for the foundational competencies. Again, it's to focus on critical thinking, quantitative/qualitative reasoning, communicating effectively both written and oral, as well as working collaboratively. All four of these represent four of our baccalaureate outcomes. So it hasn't changed a whole lot other than perhaps the

collaborative learning. Our knowledge domain studies is meant to assure content breadth between various categories and various departments as well as various colleges. So the idea of different disciplines and content exposure is very, very important. This way students can explore different categories. This is the heart of what general education means.

Now what we envision as well is all the existing general education courses, of which we have 144, to articulate, or to roll over, or to be distributed into, our four areas of study quite easily. So we don't want to envision any major transformation. These courses can roll over relatively easy. We want to give the option for the department to declare what knowledge domain that they would like to see their courses occupy and roll them over. Moreover, there's other courses that come in from our other state institutions that have the IAIA code which means we have to accept them as gen ed and these gen ed codes likewise can be distributed. Most of our gen ed courses already have IAIA codes. So there's a way to really easily populate the new model.

Now the category that we removed was interdisciplinary studies. Not that we have anything against those particular departments or those particular courses, but what we'd like to see is broader integration. And we propose a series, actually a component of the knowledge domains what we call pathways, and these are pathways that lead to student transcript documentation of a minor essentially in liberal studies in general education, or in a pathway, or however you want to call it. These minors or these opportunities for pathways hopefully will segue into major studies programs as students again get exposed right to various departments and various disciplines then they might be able to pursue a general education focus or a pathway focus, or a minor, that again might complement their major studies program.

So a pathway is a body of knowledge domain, courses that address a specific theme from different disciplinary perspectives. These pathways will be organized around a set of broad thematic questions. We have identified what we think are eight potential pathways. These are possible ones. We have been working with faculty to try to outline what courses might roll over into these pathways and to develop what these general questions are. And we've begun this process already just as a grass roots effort and we hope – of course, we want complete faculty participation and we're not set in stone on these ideas – but we'd like to begin the process, begin the thinking and demonstrate how this can be affective for students.

Finally, what we envision are two things on their transcript. If they take three courses, one from each of the knowledge domains, they get a transcript indication that says a focus in it might be global affairs or a focus in sustainability. If they take three lower-divisions, one in each domain and then three upper-divisions in two knowledge domains, they will earn a minor. This is a component that vetted extremely well with the students. They suddenly were able to grasp how general education can have meaning, how it might complement their degree programs and the ideas of pathways have been effective at other institutions primarily Cal State which is instituting this. This is one of the institutions we benchmarked. This is the way again we would envision how courses would basically move from our existing gen ed courses and IA coded courses. We would, of course, allow the departments and the instructors in those courses to choose the area of study they want to go in. So we would anticipate this would be a relatively rapid change. Okay that would be the first step.

The second step is: let them identify what pathways they think they could participate in as we form these workgroups of faculty to organize a pathway. They would then create the definition, the questions, and maybe the course listings. And then they would put that application in front of the GEC who would then review that pathway and accept that body of courses. So that's how we would envision existing courses rolling into the pathway. So they will automatically roll into gen ed and then they have the option to roll into pathways. And the pathways, by the way, are optional for students. Students can choose to take all their courses or most of them on a pathway or just some.

And, finally, for new courses they would have to put in an application for a pathway and then be placed in an area of study and a pathway. So, in sum, we envision these three components, and emphasis of the baccalaureate level of high-impact practices: revisioning of the general education curriculum to increase integration and flexibility, and then a focus on the baccalaureate goals and SLO's which will be the goals of gen ed. And we are in the process of putting the final details of our plan regarding assessment and how the assessment of the baccalaureate outcomes would work. We've presented a couple things regarding our timeline. We've talked to the president and the provost multiple times. We technically have another year to prepare this report and the president and the provost would like this by mid-September. So we've been under the gun to try to prepare all this. So this gives you the idea of the proposed timeline. Again, we envision giving it to the provost and sending it out for public comment, making whatever changes we have to do by then and then sending it out, putting it out to the curricular committees in November.

The president and the provost have indicated they want some sort of transformation and it may be again in steps at some point but the fall of 2015. That's the tentative focus, that's the tentative timeline. Okay. I think I've probably run over in terms of time but we would be happy to take any questions. Again we would like you to think this over. Look forward to the report. We would love, like you say, some sort of discussion in the Faculty Senate and perhaps an endorsement or perhaps some hard criticism if that's what it takes. But we've been working very hard. Like I say, this is all just an individual committee. There hasn't been any compensation for people to do this other than just the passion of trying to re-envision our curriculum that we feel is all of our responsibility in hopes of improving NIU in the future. Any questions or comments?

R. Schneider: Is the articulation list on the website now?

E. Klonoski: No, it's not but that's public information. It's through the Illinois Articulation Initiative so we can easily provide that for you.

M. Kolb: If you go to itransfer.org, which is the IAI website, you can search by IA code by any institution in the state. Or you can search by institution and find all the courses that have IA endorse.

J. Novak: Could you explain where in the new nomenclature foreign language fits?

E. Klonoski: Foreign language has been, it depends on how you look at what level of foreign language you would like to see included. For example, there's a conversation right now about

foreign language fourth semester, foreign language being included in the knowledge domains as other institutions do that. In terms of the introductory foreign language courses, because they are much more mechanical and less cultural content, the folks in the foreign language here have not placed them in a gen ed domain at this time. We're not opposed to it and the discussion is ongoing right now.

J. Novak: Thank you.

R. Schneider: I applaud the work you've done but it's constantly being updated. The domain which is now creativity and clinical analysis didn't it used to be aesthetics?

E. Klonoski: Unless you have a copy of an early secret document, no. I actually think, yes, at some point that was the case and we asked a couple of colleagues – one in philosophy, David Buller, and one in history, Jim Schmidt – to take a whack at giving us some different labels for these categories. The idea behind the knowledge domains is to make them broad enough to be beyond any particular discipline as to encourage participation from the other colleges. So, Rob, that's entirely possible but I'm trying to forget that.

M.B. Henning: About the high-impact engaged experience category, would we be considering already required internships or student teaching to be the [inaudible, off-mic] of an engaged experience?

E. Klonoski: Yes.

M.B. Henning: Okay, so it can be advanced junior or senior level?

E. Klonoski: Yes and ideally dispersed throughout the four-year experience for the students but, yes, at any level. And part of our thinking there is that the students do a lot of active, hands-on learning that doesn't get credit any place on their transcript and so we would like to document that and encourage greater participation in those kinds of activities.

W. Pitney: Michael, could you talk about the, very briefly, the process that you went through to vet this with faculty, with students, etc. because I think that's one of the things here. A lot of this isn't new. You've consistently rolled it out over time. Could you just comment on that for us?

M. Kolb: Yes sir. One of the things that we felt very strongly about was to try to again get feedback periodically, actually at regular intervals throughout the process. We began, as I mentioned, in the spring of 2013 where we spent the majority of the semester benchmarking other institutions as well as trying to collect some institutional data on what's not working and what is working at our own institution. Based upon that then, we began in the fall by reaching out to all the curriculum committees from all the colleges, a variety of departments and other C committees, college curriculum committees, to work on – basically to get feedback. We also had a public survey if you remember in the fall.

So we tried our best to incorporate all those comments, produce some feedback, produce some recommendations in terms of the overall goals, work diligently and came back out in January of

this coming year with our General Education Symposium if you remember. Some of you I know were there and some of you maybe weren't aware. But we went ahead and again vetted some of the main key components that we thought were important and received feedback. And, once again, we turned that around in about six weeks or eight weeks and in March we put forward three potential models each. And we tried to be as diverse as possible understanding that not necessarily one of these models would be accepted, but maybe we would want to merge the three which is what we ended up doing. We fused components that people liked at all three models of general education.

So there were three main steps at least we went out for public comment in addition to reaching out to again the college curriculum committees and other departments throughout the spring term. And we've also begun that, both Ed and I in particular, have been going out to departments and talking to them specifically this year. Us, either Ed or I, other members of the committee, David Gorman, by the way, should be acknowledged. He's here and he's a member of our task force. We'd be happy to come out and brief anybody if it's a group of faculty who are thinking about a pathway, if it's a department that's interested in getting a gen ed course put into the curriculum, we'd be happy to come and talk about these changes.

Also, like I say, these changes again it's not official. This is what we came up with. This is going to be our report. So it's still flexible. There's still options to make some changes. We feel, at least in terms of pedagogy, we feel fairly confident about what we're trying to accomplish and that's all we can do as a body of faculty is make that representation. We will want to hear what the upper administration says regarding support because that's really key. If they say, you know what, we love the writing component but we can't afford doing this, well we'd like to know that now as opposed to having to go through all the rigamarole of getting this approved and everyone talking about it and it can't be funded. So we're trying very hard to, not only to address the faculty, but also to address the upper administration to what they feel that can be affordable for us to do. And we've been mindful of trying to do this on a – not on a shoestring – but again taking advantage of practices that were already employed here.

R. Moremen: Given your plan to implement this in a year or slightly less than a year and given that advisors in the colleges and the departments are the ones who are going to have to actually be the boots on the ground so to speak in terms of implementing this, what have you planned in terms of bringing those advisors on board?

M. Kolb: We have, we're working through some of the details of the implementation in concert with provost's staff. And the task force has acknowledged, of course, education is going to be critical to reach out to students, not only to our own advisors here but potentially advisors at community colleges. That's already begun. I've presented at 11 different community colleges this summer some of the potential changes so they are aware. We have a specific request for education of advisors at all levels both on-campus and off-campus and that we see as one of the important stages in the spring. I don't know if we can manage it any sooner. It depends upon how we want to stage this. It may be that the pathways don't come on line until 2016, we'll see. Again it depends on what the president and the provost would like to see and what they're willing to put forward. But we would like to involve the advisors in a series of workshops, educational workshops, and training in the spring.

R. Moremen: As a follow-up, well I'll just let it go at that. I guess I'm concerned that there's not going to be enough time and so will existing students be grandfathered in? I'm concerned that the confusion that this may bring about, at least from the advising standpoint, could have a negative impact on student career success through frustration. What thought has been given to that?

M. Kolb: Well, as far as the implementation, we've talked about various ways that it can be implemented and we would prefer as a task force to see it staged. So, in other words, it could be that we just do the preliminaries for the 2015, we had asked for maybe 2016, and again it really depends upon the upper administration and what they're wanting to do because, as a task force, we're not empowered to do this. This has to be implementation from above and so we've thought a lot about it and, of course, we've laid out all the pitfalls. We've got a series of what we think are problems that have to be addressed at various stages. It's all a matter of time though, as you said, and it could, in fact, have a negative impact if it's not executed in proper fashion. Let's just say ideally we could even execute it properly and we've seen benchmark institutions still have problems for that first or second year issue. So I view it as not necessarily addressing immediate concerns of retention of which like we say we've all been hearing about. I see it more as a goal for long-term persistence of students and attraction of new students. One of the data sets that we worked with are the institutions that are doing very well in their general education program attracting new students and these are the institutions that I think are our competitors. And we have an opportunity now I think to present something that's much more forward thinking and in the long term, maybe after five years, hopefully that will see full effect. And, again, other institutions when they see a new general education program come into being, it usually takes that four or five years before you can actually measure the impact.

E. Klonoski: Can I try and address your question slightly more directly in terms of the current students? I think we're going to have to live with students under their current catalog and then the students under the new catalog. And so I don't think that it's going to be that tricky because you're going to be under the old catalog you just have to see where those courses are not going to be placed within the knowledge domain. So as long as you know a kid needs X course, you look at where that course lies in the knowledge domain and that will satisfy that requirement. So we're not going to hold them to the new catalog immediately because we couldn't do that.

D. Macdonald: I'm wondering if you have spent some time specifically consulting with departments that offer course in foundational studies. And I speak to this largely because I'm from the Department of English and I don't know whether we have a 200-level writing and composition course, but I also know that the courses that articulate are all 100-level. Will we be asked to revise curriculum too?

E. Klonoski: We've spoken with Michael Day from English and we've spoken with the chair of math and we've spoken with Ferald and Gary Burns from communications. And, so, yeah, we've had extensive conversations among the foundations areas, and they know what we're asking and we've actually asked them what they could do, particularly in the foundations since we're looking to implement collaborative learning among students. We've gotten agreement from across the three English and math and comms that that's a good possibility.

D. Macdonald: Okay can I ask a follow-up to that and it follows on Robin's question as well. A student who is transferring in will not necessarily be on the old catalog, would be on the new catalog but would not have, let's say, necessarily a 200-level composition course. Would that put that student at a disadvantage? Would we grandfather in 100-level coursework, for example?

E. Klonoski: I think it's gonna depend on how many credits they're actually going to transfer in with. Many institutions, we have a broad range of credits that transferees come in with and many institutions set thresholds: If you're at X number of credits coming in, you're under the new catalog. If you're above that, you're under the old catalog and so I think that has to be worked out, but I also think there are ways to do that and we've seen it.

D. Macdonald: And these are things you have talked about.

E. Klonoski: Yes, absolutely.

D. Macdonald: Great. Thank you.

W. Pitney: Thank you so much for your presentation today. I think one of the cool things I've seen is that, for example, with respect to the writing, it's infused at the upper levels across the disciplines and I think will probably move us away from students feeling like they're just ticking off a box and they're done with writing. So I think that's a real plus. I also applaud the task force for all of the feedback they've gotten from everybody over the course of the year, year-and-a-half. So, nicely done. Any last comments, questions? Okay on October 1, I would like us to bring this up again at Faculty Senate. I would like to get a sense of the level of support our faculty have for this proposed model. And so, if possible, if we could make this PowerPoint available to our senators and then, as we start to see the rest of it unfolding and out for more comments in the next month, I think that will give us a sense of where we're at with things. I hope that sounds reasonable.

M. Kolb: Yes, that's very reasonable. We'll be sure to keep in contact and, as our document progresses and it's finalized, we'll be sure that the senate gets ahold of it.

W. Pitney: Very good, thank you so much. I appreciate your time.

My last announcement related to Faculty Club lunches that we've got scheduled. The first one is Monday, September 22. It's in the Chandelier Room. It's \$12 inclusive and you can contact Pat if you're interested in coming by. It's a chance to build some community and have some collegial conversations across the university.

And lastly, just a comment in terms of our roles as faculty senators; we've got a couple of responsibilities. One is to take back any critical noteworthy information back to your department and present that to your colleagues; but secondly to get information from your colleagues, perceptions and perspectives and bring that to Faculty Senate. And to that end, I have drafted an e-mail that I'll send out to each of the department chairs. We're hoping to get that out maybe next week and what I'm requesting of the department chairs is that, in the spirit of shared

governance, time be allotted at each department meeting for faculty senators to present current information from the senate but also get feedback related to some issues. As a perfect example, as it relates to this general education proposal, I think it would be important to get information from your colleagues about the level of support. The general education curriculum, as I see it, affects every one of our students and we all have a vested interest in seeing it be meaningful for our students. And the curriculum should be in the hands of the faculty. So if conceptionally it makes sense, certainly it seems like there are some logistical challenges that have to be worked out, but I don't think that's unusual at all with any curricular change you're trying to roll out. So I'd like us to get a sense for the extent to which we would support that. I'll offer that as a task and follow-up with you electronically to get information from your colleagues on the general education program that's proposed.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

W. Pitney: So that moves us into our Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. We've got three items. The first item, A, is the selection of a vice president and secretary of the Faculty Senate. George Slotsve has agreed to be our vice president. I'd like to nominate him, however, I'd like to take any other nominations from the floor if anybody else is interested, willing, and has a passion to be the vice president. Ferald, perhaps you can help me with this. Do we need to use the clickers for this? We have one nominee. I would accept the nomination by acclamation. May I hear that from the floor please?

J. Novak: So moved.

S. McHone Chase: Second.

W. Pitney: All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed?

W. Pitney: Our next item in that regard is to identify a secretary to the Faculty Senate. I'd like nominate Sarah McHone-Chase from the library. Are there any other nominations from the floor? Hearing none could we have a motion acclamation?

M. Rosenbaum: So moved.

W. Pitney: Second, do I need a second?

J. Novak: I'll second it.

W. Pitney: Thank you Joe. All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed?

- B. Selection of Faculty Senate liaison to the Libraries Advisory Committee. The LAC typically meets from 2 to 3 p.m. on the third Friday of the month, though they meet only two to three times per semester. This person also will be asked to represent the Faculty Senate on the Provost's Open Access to Research Articles Act (OARAA) Task Force.

W. Pitney: Our next item is selection of Faculty Senate liaison to the Libraries Advisory Committee. Gleb Sirotkin from Math has represented Faculty Senate in the past. I've reached out to him. He's willing to do that again. Is there anybody else from the floor that would be interested and willing to do that? Hearing none can we have a motion to have Gleb Sirotkin from Math be our Faculty Senate liaison to the Libraries Advisory Committee by acclamation?

Unidentified: So moved.

P. Stoddard: Second

W. Pitney: Thank you, Paul. All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you.

- C. Selection of two faculty members to serve on the Ombudsperson Review Committee per NIU Bylaws [Article 20.5.1](#) – Pages 7-8

W. Pitney: Our last item, we need two faculty members from this body to be on our Ombudsperson Review Committee. Those of you who might have been on University Council might be saying to yourself, "well jeez didn't we just do a very thorough review last spring?" And, if you're thinking that to yourself, you would be absolutely right, we did. Sarah is in her third year of her first term and has expressed an interest and willingness to continue in that role for another term. According to our constitution Article 20.5.1 we need to assemble a review panel. So we need two individuals from this body to be on that panel. Sarah McHone-Chase has volunteered to be one of our members. Are there any other volunteers? Mark Rosenbaum from business has also volunteered. So that give us two. Is there anybody else? And I wanted to use the clickers. I'm just kidding. If we could have a motion to accept these two by acclamation to serve on the Ombudsperson Review Committee.

R. Sigesmund: So moved.

R. Schneider: Second.

W. Pitney: All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay so that concludes our items for Faculty Senate consideration. Thank you folks for stepping up. I appreciate that. That's very good.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. [Faculty Senate Standing Committees](#) – Per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3, approve the 2014-15 membership rosters – Pages 9-13
- B. [University Council Steering Committee](#) – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 2.1.1, approve the faculty members of the 2014-15 UC-Steering Committee – Page 14
- C. [Parliamentarian](#) – Per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.2, approve Professor Ferald Bryan, Department of Communication to serve as the Faculty Senate parliamentarian for the 2014-15 academic year – Page 15

W. Pitney: We also have our Consent Agenda in your packet. On pages 9 to 15 are three different items related to our standing committees, University Council Steering Committee, and our parliamentarian, Ferald Bryan. We need to vote on this Consent Agenda, approval of the Consent Agenda. Here we're going to use the clickers. Do we need to do these separate Ferald, A, B and C?

F. Bryan: No.

W. Pitney: One item, very good. We're going to set up, if you don't have a clicker, please run and get one. And as we vote to approve the Consent Agenda, 1 will be yes to approve, 2 will be no and 3 is abstain. So 1 will be yes you approve the Consent Agenda, 2 will be no you do not, and 3 will be abstain. Our Consent Agenda is approved.

Yes – 32

No – 0

Abstain – 0

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report
[May 16, 2014](#) – Page 16
[June 20, 2014](#) – Pages 17-18

W. Pitney: That will move us to Reports from our Advisory Committees. Our first report will be from Sonya Armstrong. That can be found on pages 16 through 18 and Sonya is with us today.

S. Armstrong: Hi. So I think I can make this quick because this happened a long time ago frankly, but I thought it might be useful for folks who are new to Faculty Senate to know what this committee does. The Illinois Board of Higher Education, the IBHE, is the governing board

for higher education in the state of Illinois. And the committee I serve on is the FAC, the Faculty Advisory Council. All higher ed institutions in the state are represented on this council and we meet monthly to work with the IBHE staff and board members. In May, not a whole lot happened. All IBHE's staff vacancies are filled and that's been something that's kind of been an ongoing issue so that's important to note.

In June, we actually met at NIU, here on campus, and that went very well. And I want to publically acknowledge the work of Pat. She said she would turn red. Thank you very much. Thank you. (Applause) The other thing is that, if you look on the second page of this June document, you will note that – and I try to always include caucus updates, we're part of obviously the public universities caucus – and one of the ongoing conversations that we've been having in the caucus is communication and how to best communicate with the public on the value of higher education and, in particular, public universities. If you have recommendations for topics we should discuss, if you have recommendations for how we can best communicate with other bodies, especially the public, please do let me know and I'll be happy to take that information back to the FAC. Any questions?

W. Pitney: Thank you, Sonya.

B. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczzer – [report](#) – Pages 19-20

W. Pitney: University Benefits Committee, Deborah.

D. Haliczzer: Hello, I'm Deborah Haliczzer representing the University Benefits Committee. You'll be getting our annual report after the Benefit's Committee takes a vote tomorrow on its annual report and then we'll post it for the committees. You have the written reports in your packets, but I wanted to draw your attention to an e-mail you all should have gotten yesterday from Human Resources advertising additional retirement counseling sessions November 3 and 4. This was the theme last year: retirement counseling sessions, never enough. It's been a more than exciting time. You all know that the law was delayed by a court decision and so we're going to have to be having another year of the rollercoaster on: Are we going to reform or ruin or alter employee pensions? I know that's a political statement so slap my hand. But it's going to be an interesting year. Pay attention especially after the elections to correspondence you'll be seeing and to articles that we will be posting on the NIU website on that budget and pension update because I anticipate some changes coming this year, and when that happens we will, of course, mobilize all of the councils to have some of the excellent statements made by the Faculty Senate, the excellent efforts made by our colleagues, so we will be working on this this year. Thank you.

W. Pitney: Very good, thank you. Any questions for Deb?

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee –
Dan Gebo and William Pitney – report
[May 29, 2014](#) – Pages 21-24
[August 28, 2014](#) – Pages 25-27

W. Pitney: Our next report you can find on pages 21 through 24 presented by Dan Gebo. Dan can't be with us today. I'd just like to highlight a couple things from the May 29 Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee for the Board of Trustees. One is that many of our colleagues got promoted, tenured and also there's a list of awards. So if you see your colleagues on there, give them a good level of congratulations with respect to that. There was also a Higher Learning Commission accreditation update in the report, and I believe some of the information has since been updated on the website. So you can go to the website [HLC](#) link to our homepage for more information on that. In terms of the August 28 meeting that just occurred, you can find the report on page 28. The approval of the honorary doctorate was noteworthy. It was an interesting report that Ray Alden gave in terms of the international activities with our faculty across the university and I think it's fair to say the Board of Trustees was very impressed with the volume and the quality of those activities so that was pretty interesting. So that is that report. Are there any questions related to that?

- D. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee –
Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – report
[May 29, 2014](#) – Pages 28-29
[August 28, 2014](#) – walk-in

W. Pitney: BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operation Committee. Jay.

J. Monteiro: The first report that's there actually was done by Alan Rosenbaum and you can read through that. The second report is for the August 28 meeting and I'll pretty much let you read through that. Mostly what was passed were internal budget items for fiscal 2016. I'll let you read through that though. Thank you.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Jay.

- E. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee –
Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – report
[August 28, 2014](#) – walk-in

W. Pitney: I believe for our next report, the Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee, we also have a walk-in report. Correct? For those of you who are new, we've got those – those are loose on your table at your place so you'll be able to find those. It's on page 3 of the loose leaf papers. Deborah, anything to add to that report?

D. Haliczzer: Yeah, I'm gonna add the editorial comment that we made. This report, ah committee came right after the Academic Affairs Committee where we looked at faculty emeritus, and Professor Gebo raised our attention to the fact of how many of those individual emeriti faculty were, in fact, Board of Trustees, Distinguished Research and Distinguished Teaching faculty. I then made the next editorial comment which was that, as we're looking at legislative and fiscal issues, are we asked for the support of our Board of Trustees on pension issues and salary issues because we stand to lose still more excellent faculty from the university and the board needed to be aware of the risks and pay close attention to legislative issues. You can read the rest.

W. Pitney: Thank you.

- F. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee –
Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – report
[May 29, 2014](#) – Page 30
[August 28, 2014](#) – walk-in
- G. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – report
[May 29, 2014](#) – Page 31
[June 19, 2014](#) – Page 32
[August 28, 2014](#) – Page 33

W. Pitney: Our last reports are from the Board of Trustees meeting. On page 31 is a report from Alan Rosenbaum. He was covering that at that time. So that's available to you as well as the June 19 report is in written form there. I covered the August 28 special meeting of the Board of Trustees and there was only one action item before they went to closed session and that was the approval of \$215,000 for legal services. There was no discussion in terms of what specific services those were for other than forensic. So that's our Board of Trustees report. Any questions on any of those?

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 – Robert Schneider, Chair – no report
- E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – [report](#) – Pages 34-35

W. Pitney: Hearing none, we'll progress to our Reports from Standing Committees. I think our first report is from Resource, Space and Budget, Jim.

J. Wilson: Yes, Jim Wilson, Geography. You find enclosed a document that Paul Carpenter who has now left to California as our co-chair, that he wrote up just after our meeting concerned with vacancy hearings, that process. And that's pretty much what this document is about. We were asked to give – we met with the APC [Academic Planning Council] our committee along with the APC and gave feedback on the level of degree or alignment with budget principals and our budget priorities that we had set forth last year which we had come up with as a committee every spring. Several criteria were examined and some other details, how well follow the strategic plan, management needs and budget, and so forth and how well they align with the president's pillars and so on.

It was kind of a very interesting exercise because what we were presented with at this meeting in early May was a whole list of all faculty positions that were open and during this faculty hearing what kinds of criteria, how they were prioritized and they were color coded and so forth. This was like a massive document on very odd-sized paper so it was kind of hard to kind of grasp mentally all what was going on. The idea was the deans to get together and prioritize which positions, provosts would of course make the ultimate decisions, cabinet and so on, make the ultimate decision about that, but they would put forth the openings and what would meet the criteria set by the budget and so forth. I know in the College of Arts and Sciences, there were like 98 or 96 put forward at the dean level and came up with a priority of 48, about half and then from that what was accepted, about 18. What was left were a lot of let's say unhappy departments versus fairly happy departments. So that's what this document is about. We have not met yet to get things together, but we'll have more for you the next time.

W. Pitney: Appreciate that. Any questions for Jim? I have one or maybe a comment and that would be just a request for the committee of Resource, Space and Budget to be vigilant in terms of how many positions were vacated and how did we really get back.

J. Wilson: One of the charges that we have for each semester is a meeting with the president and the provost twice a semester to get that kind of information.

W. Pitney: That would be fantastic. We have a lot of excellent folks who were hired as adjuncts and instructors to cover our classes and certainly they're valued members, but I think what we're seeing across the country is an erosion of tenure track positions and we've got to be conscientious about our mission to create knowledge and engage in scholarly creative activity. I think that's a piece we've got to be very watchful of. Thank you, I appreciate it. Are there other questions?

R. Feurer: I just want to reinforce that and ask: Can't we get that information now? Is that what this meeting is going to be about very soon? I guess I'm flabbergasted that the information isn't out there and it just seems to me that there's an inclination for hiring to be done without the process that is in the constitution and I'm really concerned about that. Some of you may be aware that the faculty at the University of Illinois Chicago just wrote a no confidence vote for a hire that was made outside the constitution, but I think we had one this year that was not done with formal faculty vetting. So I just want to put that on record. I think hypervigilance is called for here and I would like us to call for a listing of this and this to be open because the administration to its credit is saying they're for transparency. I'd like to see that transparency like tomorrow.

J. Wilson: Well, we will be meeting Friday.

R. Feurer: Oh, Friday? And you're going to get this information?

J. Wilson: We will set forth an agenda of questions that we would like to speak with the president and provost about.

M.B. Henning: I'm Mary Beth Henning from the Department of Literacy and Elementary Education. I guess I would follow-up on Rosemary's comment because I think that there is a perception that, not only do we need hypervigilance about the faculty openings, but it seems very questionable about the administrative hiring process right now and the perception it doesn't look too good in terms of how quickly administrators at the top level and provosts are being hired and how it doesn't seem to be following the process that is seeming to be so slow for faculty. So I think if we could get a little bit more of a report back on both faculty and administrative, that would be very good.

W. Pitney: Very good, I agree. Any other questions, comments? Thank you.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair

W. Pitney: All right so now that brings us to Elections and Legislative Oversight, Stephen this is your moment in the sun.

S. Tonks: My moment to shine. We have four elections today. They should go pretty quickly. Before we begin, I'll remind you only voting members of the Faculty Senate please vote in the elections and most of them and there's one different one and I'll announce that in a minute.

1. Hearing Panel election – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting

S. Tonks: First of all, we have an election for the Hearing Panel. The Hearing Panel is used for appeals based on bylaws Article 7.3 regarding due process for faculty dismissal issues. The ballot is printed on the white piece of paper that was at your seat. It has 34 names of tenured faculty that were selected randomly. So, if you see your name on there, it was selected randomly from all tenured faculty members. Please vote for 20 by placing a checkmark in the appropriate place. Twenty on this one. I guess you can just keep doing that as we go. I'll go ahead and announce the next one. It's not so hard to listen and do that. One more thing, it is possible that there are people on this list that are no longer around. If you see someone on there, don't vote for them and tell the rest of us not to vote for that person. Does anybody notice someone on there? Okay, we'll assume everybody is here.

2. By-lot election of Faculty Grievance Panel members

S. Tonks: Second, we have, per NIU Bylaws Article 11.5.3.1(b), the Faculty Senate is asked to forward the names of 15 members of its faculty constituency to serve as a panel from which a grievance committee can be chosen should one be needed to review a Step III grievance during the academic year. These 15 panel members will be selected by-lot from all University Council and Faculty Senate members who are tenured and not currently serving in an administrative role. So we will draw those 15 names at this time. John, you mind announcing them?

J. Novak: Jana Brubaker, Reinaldo Moraga, Hamid Bateni, Diane Rogers, Stephen Martin, Elisa Fredericks, Donna Monroe, Donna Plonczynski, Keith Millis, Melissa Lenczewski, Jimmie Manning, Eui-Kyung Shin, Eric Mogren.

Unidentified: Could you repeat what this is for?

S. Tonks: This is the Faculty Grievance Panel. In case there is a grievance during the academic year, these people will be called upon.

J. Novak: Brian Mackie, Joseph Stephen.

S. Tonks: Thank you to those people who have been chosen by lot at random.

3. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting

S. Tonks: Okay, next we will elect University Council alternates from among the faculty senators. As an alternate, you might be called upon during the year to serve on the UC should a UC member from your college be unable to attend a meeting. So these ballots are color-coded and by college and I have them here. Thank you, Sarah. We have one volunteer. When I call your college name, raise your hand and I'll give you a ballot.

Unidentified: Can you tell us when those meetings are so we know what?

S. Tonks: Okay so let me go on with this. So College of Business first and then I'll... Aren't the UC meetings on the third? It's two weeks apart from this meeting on Wednesdays. One week after this on Wednesdays.

Unidentified: Do UC members vote on this? If you are a current UC member, do you vote?

S. Tonks: Yes, good question. This is faculty senators and members of University Council who are present today vote on this.

Unidentified: Okay so we vote as a UC rep or a senate...

S. Tonks: Senators who would be alternates, yes. Is that clear? College of Education. College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. Health and Human Sciences. Liberal Arts and Sciences. And Visual and Performing Arts. So we'll obviously vote for the number that it says at the top of your ballot and you can leave these at your place when you're finished voting and we'll collect them after.

4. Selection of one Faculty Senate member to serve on the 2015 BOT Professorship Award Selection Committee. Committee members review approximately 20 applications online and the committee meets 2-3 times (November/December and January/February).

S. Tonks: And finally, we have at the beginning of each fall semester we ask for a faculty volunteer to serve on the Board of Trustees Professorship Awards Selection Committee. The assignment includes reviewing approximately 20 applications online and the committee meets

two or three times around November, December and January, February. John Novak did you serve on this last year?

J. Novak: [inaudible, off mic]

S. Tonks: More like ten probably applications. Could we have a volunteer to serve on this selection committee?

W. Pitney: I've served on some similar review committees for these awards and it's typically a very well-oiled machine. It's very organized.

S. Tonks: We have one volunteer, great and your name?

J. Manning: Jimmie Manning.

S. Tonks: Thank you very much. Do we need to do anything with that? Alright thank you very much. That's it.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW 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](#) – **FIRST READING** – Page 36

W. Pitney: We don't have any unfinished business, but we do have one piece of new business. This came from the end of the spring semester when we did the evaluation of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor, as well as the evaluation of Executive Secretary of the University Council/President of the Faculty Senate. A suggestion was made at that point in time to consider folding in all of the constituents to be part of that review committee. As an example, for the Faculty Senate President and Executive Secretary University Council position, we only had faculty involved in that process and that person actually also represents SPS staff, as well as operating staff. So it was suggested that we expand the inclusion on that committee a little bit. And for the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor, it was suggested that, rather than just faculty only one there, we also include at least one SPS representative. So that's where this suggestion came from. Robin?

R. Moremen: I was on that committee for reviewing the Faculty Senate chair. There was a student who was also on that committee; I just wanted to add that. It was faculty; it was made of faculty senators, University Council reps and a student.

W. Pitney: That's a good clarification. Thank you. We didn't have representation for SPS or operating staff.

R. Moremen: No, which it makes no sense to my mind that we had a mixed group doing the evaluation that did not include SPS or operating staff.

W. Pitney: Exactly so. Also in the spring, in terms of the evaluation process and members of that evaluation committee for the Faculty Senate President and Executive Secretary, it was also suggested that an administrator be on that evaluation committee, as well. So last week I had presented to both our Steering Committee of University Council as well as our Faculty Senate Executive Committee some proposed language. Most of it is on page 36. At that point in time, I had the administrator on that review committee, but in the spirit of full transparency because of what I learned at the Steering Committee for University Council, we took the administrator off. The argument was made at that point that an administrator really isn't a constituent of the Faculty Senate President or the Executive Secretary of the University Council. And it really resonated with that body so, just for those of you who are on the Executive Committee, pull that off. Knowing that this is our first reading, if there is a strong desire to put the administrator back on there as one of the committee members, we can certainly have that dialog, but I just wanted to make that clear. So on page 36, you see some proposed language. I think what we need to do in terms of process, we need to have a motion and a second and we'll discuss this further but this will be a first reading. We don't need to do that? Okay very good. So this is our first reading. Is there any suggested feedback, questions or concerns related to this? All right hearing none, we'll vote on that at the next meeting which will be the second reading then and go from there. Yes, Sarah?

S. McHone-Chase: How are we choosing [inaudible mic is not on.]

W. Pitney: My thought would be to leave the language as is and let the SPS Council sort that out in terms of how they would like to select their representative and the same for the Operating Staff Council.

M.B. Henning: If there is really a student on the committee why doesn't it say that?

Unidentified: It does, and one student.

W. Pitney: It's not in bold it's after the second, look at the second bold line in that paragraph and you'll see it...

R. Moremen: There were two separate review committees. The question was, was I on the committee for the Ombudsperson? No I was not. I was on the review committee for the Faculty Senate President and, yes, there was a student on that committee. There was a student member on that committee.

W. Pitney: And that student is from the University Council. So we'll revisit this and vote on this at the next meeting. We have to have a first reading.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

W. Pitney: Our last item, the calendar, is available on page 37 and information items are contained in the packet.

And I guess we do have one last section and that's Comments and Questions From the Floor. In years past, we've often used the Faculty Senate meetings to hear reports, receive reports, give reports and only on certain circumstances were there dialog and debate on particular issues. At our Executive Committee last week, we talked about the need perhaps to have more of that, to make our meetings a little bit more meaningful. And I guess, perhaps as a first start to that, this section of our agenda might be a good place for that – Comments and Questions From the Floor – I suppose to extend from among the floor.

So let me offer up one piece here. It does relate a little bit to the vacancy hearing process, I think. Because that process attempted to prioritize vacancies across departments and colleges, etc. This October there is an academic service prioritization conference in Chicago and Provost Freeman has put together a delegation from NIU to attend that. I've been invited to represent the faculty. We also have Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb from Resource, Space and Budget is going as well. Marc, I believe you're going also. And Provost Freeman and a few other individuals from the Provost's office, and believe one dean although I don't know who that is who is going. The idea here is to attend this conference that's based on the works of Dickenson. It's a second edition text that's been around. The idea is that participants at this conference will go through some break-out groups and some educational sessions in order to get an understanding of some strategies that institutions of higher education can utilize to prioritize with academic programs as well as other service-oriented programs on the campus. I want to at least raise that awareness here. I think we're in an interesting time where there's a drive for financial sustainability, and I think we've seen it play out with the vacancies here that some positions aren't being renewed necessarily and rolled over. And I think the same might start occurring with our academic and non-academic programs on campus. I wanted to report on that. I will certainly let this body know how that conference goes and then any organizational aspects of prioritizing things on this campus as that unfolds keep you aware of that. Marc would you like to add anything to that?

M. Falkoff: I think it's really important for us to be aware of what's going on. I think what was presented last year at our Resource, Space and Budget and to the APC it was we had kind of at the last minute we had a huge document and the whole process had an ad hoc feel to it and it's going to be different moving forward. And the president and the provost are really thinking about what prioritization is going to mean, both for faculty and for administrative positions. And the baseline of their thinking is this treatise by this guy Dickeson, it's an orange and blue book. It's something that you really might want to think about getting your hands on and reading. It's a relatively quick read but it will give you a sense of probably where the president and provost are starting their thoughts right now. It's called, the author I believe is John Dickeson. I can find out in just a moment, Prioritizing Academic Institutions, something like that. I can find that title in a moment. I think it's Robert Dickeson. I'll get the title.

W. Pitney: I can share that with you. I've also got some web links that kind of distill that information down. George.

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to encourage the senators to use this time to also bring up things from the department or put things potentially on the agenda for the next meeting. Over the years I don't think enough has bubbled up. I think a lot of it has come top down. One of the things we did talk about at the Executive Committee meeting was can we get ideas generated and get input into what we should be talking about and what is of concern from members of the Faculty Senate. So I strongly encourage everyone to beforehand come and have ideas that you want to talk about and at least alert us to and we can try to discuss them and get them on the agenda and talk at a later point in time.

M. Falkoff: And the author's name is Robert Dickeson and his book is called Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Based on George's comment, are there any issues anybody would like to raise at this point in time.

R. Feurer: I'm concerned about the new, well I don't know how new it is, it's kind of sneaked up, the policy when you sign on to the Internet. It floored me because it had issues about political advocacy in there that I hadn't seen previously; maybe it's just that I have ignored it. I think I've written to you about this and you have, I don't know if any of you or all of you are aware of this.

W. Pitney: Yeah, that's a good question. You are probably the third person that reached out to me and that's the fair use or access, acceptable access policy. There's been some reports on the Internet and, George, I see you, I'll be right there.

G. Slotsve: Well, I just wanted to mention I'm also I guess UC/Faculty Senate rep on CFAC. This is something that on the October 3 meeting we're going to start discussing. I think it's over the over next, and partially because of what happened this fall, is we're going to be reviewing the policy. Now while I've been representing, Marc has also been invited to join us. He's from the Law School and help represent the faculty and faculty viewpoint as opposed to university lawyers. So I've been able to have Marc invited along. Brett, the CIO, is willing to send one member of the CFAC committee to Cornell. There's an annual conference at Cornell. About 50 people attend from all over the U.S. And it specifically deals with what internet policy in higher education should be. What are some of the best practices? Now who exactly is being sent over and is willing to go out in the middle of September. Some of this is coming up, though, and we're on it. We got to see what the old policy is and get everything clarified. I think some of this was done without a lot of clearance prior. So there's an old policy thT he was working from so we're working on it.

R. Feurer: I was told that it was like boiler plate language and that's actually frightening. Is that what they're saying?

Unidentified: That was the impression [inaudible off-mic]

G. Slotsve: This was 2007 I think or something? Wasn't it around there that this was put together?

Unidentified: And it went out and basically it [inaudible, off-mic]

W. Pitney: If I could comment on this, I shared with Brett Coryell, who by the way was very open-minded with respect to making sure we refined the language to accept freedom of speech and academic freedom and also in the spirit of shared governance and he was very, very in tune with that. What I shared with him were concerns related to freedom of speech, this idea that Internet usage could be monitored in some way and what that meant in terms of confidentiality and working with [inaudible] and then also the idea that it bans political activities from a faculty standpoint, that makes sense. Our ethics act prohibits us from engaging in political activity, but if it prevents our students from engaging in a level of activism and ethically inspired action, I'm not sure that's the type of language we want. He was very, very open to that and willing to work with CFAC and get input. And to that end he's presenting at University Council next week and I asked him to address that acceptable use policy issue. He does a good discussion and I think some good points were raised. Yes, Robin.

R. Moremen: On a separate issue having to do with faculty hires, in our department the only positions we've been allowed to hire for in the last couple of years have been joint appointments that have involved memoranda of understanding. And it seems to me, as we move through the personnel process after these individuals are hired, there doesn't seem to be any kind of standardization regarding memoranda of understanding. I'm not interested per se in a boiler plate format for that, but is that even being discussed as our hiring decisions are being more and more restricted to these kinds of hires?

W. Pitney: Good question. The only thing I can say to that, I'm not sure it's been currently discussed, but I believe two years ago or three years ago in Faculty Senate we started examining some of the language related to joint appointments and the process is related to those. We've approved some changes to that and the issue was trying to protect faculty in joint appointments if one department or school or institute decided not to renew, what would happen to that person then. So that issue has been discussed but I'm not sure, in terms of memoranda of understanding, we chiseled that out.

G. Slotsve: I was just gonna say that I think it got brought forth by Dean McCord. But at time, I think Rosemary was the one who chaired the committee so some of that Rosemary you many want to talk about. I know it did and I don't recall memoranda of understanding being covered in that, but this has been before us.

R. Feurer: I think. The main thing is I mean the unwritten text here is the fear of merging colleges. There's all this acknowledgement that that's been done at other places and is this like a prelude to the loss of faculty input as more and more joint appointments are made.

W. Pitney: I think that's an example of an issue that just bubbled up and maybe we can draw some attention to that. So I would encourage those of us on the Executive Committee to maybe earmark that and start to discuss that to see where we can channel that to perhaps create some language, carve that out, and then have it vetted by Faculty Senate.

J. Novak: There was a letter to the Daily Chronicle about a month ago asking: Can NIU faculty get raises? It caused the president to write explaining what he was doing by giving very large raises to people that he felt were very important and it raised a lot of questions from faculty members and one of the questions is: What does Faculty Senate have to say about this? I don't know if this has boiled over and it's just normal now, but it did seem really odd to me the amount of money these people were making and maybe we are comfortable. I don't know what else we can say about this, but I think that it would be nice if somebody could say, yes Faculty Senate is interested in what's happening. That's all I have to say.

W. Pitney: I have a meeting with the president tomorrow at 3 p.m. My last meeting I had with him was just before that hit the papers. I think I met with him the day after and I hadn't yet seen that and those issues bubbled up. There's multiple ways of looking at that issue and I thought a lot about that. And when I meet with the president what I have done is categorize things in four ways: One is just updates in terms of what we're doing in the office to change things and what our initiatives are and the changes that are coming along University Council, etc., discussion points; concerns that are brought forth by the faculty, and any requests. So to give you an example of concerns he and I have talked about before, I raised the issue of the perception that there's more administrators being hired but not so much faculty. I've also raised the concern certainly related to raises, or lack thereof, and the other one was related to the hiring process for in particular the provost position and the VP of research and information partnerships. I made it clear that from my discussions with faculty on [inaudible] it's not about the people that were hired, it's about the process by which they were hired. And so he's aware of those concerns and so the faculty raise issue is certainly on my radar. I'll raise that tomorrow. There's a couple ways to think about that. Are there faculty that received raises this year? Because there are, there absolutely are. It may not be as evident and not looked on as high profile. For a long time at NIU, if we applied for a job elsewhere and got a job offer and we went through the process to counter that, for some faculty that could result in a raise. It's certainly not the same thing, but it happens. But I think that the issues raised in that editorial, it's a lot to unpack and there's a lot to that issue and I don't think that one's gonna go away.

J. Novak: Thank you.

W. Pitney: All right, so let's conclude our comments and questions from the floor. I hope, at the very least, we've started to understand that there's a chance for some dialog and to raise some issues at this meeting that might be important to us as faculty and that might precipitate some further discussions at our next meeting. There's a list of information items in the last piece of your agenda, please read through those. Are there any questions on those or concerns related to those before we have a motion to adjourn?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Meeting schedule](#), 2014-2015 – Page 37
- B. [Annual Report](#), Academic Planning Council
- C. [Annual Report](#), Affirmative Action & Diversity resources Advisory Committee
- D. [Annual Report](#), Campus Security & Environmental Quality Committee
- E. [Annual Report](#), Graduate Council

- F. [Annual Report](#), University Assessment Panel
- G. [Annual Report](#), University Council Personnel Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- K. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
- M. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- N. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
- O. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- P. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- Q. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- R. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- S. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- T. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- U. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- V. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- W. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

W. Pitney: Hearing none, I'd accept a motion to adjourn.

G. Slotsve: So moved.

J. Novak: Second.

W. Pitney: Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.