FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, October 1, 2014, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Allori, Arado, Azad, Baker, Bateni, Brown, Brubaker, Burton (for Briscoe), Campbell, Cefaratti, Chakraborti, Chen, Chmaissem, Conderman, Falkoff, Feurer, Fredericks, Gilson, Gorman, Haji-Sheikh, Hathaway, Henning, Hunt, Irwin, Jaffee, Koren, Long, Macdonald, Mackie, Manning, McHone-Chase, Millis, Montana, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Pitney, Rodgers, Rush, Ryu, Sagarin, Shin, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Stoddard, Tonks, Un, Wilson, Xie

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

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

OTHERS ABSENT: Doederlein, Gebo, Shortridge, Waas

I.   CALL TO ORDER

W. Pitney: Let's call the meeting to order please.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II.   ADOPTION OF AGENDA

W. Pitney: Our first item is to adopt our agenda. So if I could have a motion to adopt our agenda please.

G. Slotsve: So moved.

R. Siegesmund: Second.

W. Pitney: Any discussion? Actually, I do have a discussion point related to that. I would suggest that for our agenda we move up our unfinished business to be item V so that we can have a large portion of folks here since we need to vote on that as a constitutional change. So we'll move that forward. Any other discussion items for adopting our agenda? Again, we'll move the unfinished business up to item 5. Any objections to that friendly amendment? With that in mind, all in favor of adopting the agenda with that change say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay so we've approved out agenda.

III.   APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES](#) OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2014 FS MEETING

W. Pitney: Our next item is the approval of the minutes of our September 3 meeting. Those were in your packet. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes?

R. Siegesmund: So moved.

W. Pitney: Richard, thank you.

T. Arado: Second.

W. Pitney: Thank you. We have a second on the floor. Any edits or modifications to the minutes? I will say, after creating those minutes, this might be the longest set of minutes of the year, because I think next time they're going to be a lot more concise. So we have a motion and a second to approve the minutes, no changes, so all in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Our minutes are approved.

IV.   PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A.   Career Satisfaction and Gender Among NIU STEM Faculty – [presentation](#) – Pages 4-15
Chris McCord, Principal Investigator/Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Brian Coller, Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Amy Levin, Chair, Department of English
Jeffrey Reynolds, Director, Academic Analysis and Reporting, Office of the Provost
Lesley Rigg, Vice President for Research and Innovation Partnerships

W. Pitney: That moves us to our President's Announcements. Just a reminder our next Faculty Club lunch will be October 21. That will be in Ellington's downstairs. Our first one was a rousing success. We just had a ton of folks there. I think we had all of the folks there who had reserved and then some. It was good time. It's a great chance to meet some colleagues. I'm pleased to announce that we're going to have a presentation today by Lesley Rigg and Jeffrey Reynolds and Amy Levin of a report that also included Chris McCord and Brian Coller. The report is in your packet along with the PowerPoint presentation and they're going to present for us today on Career Satisfaction and Gender Among NIU STEM Faculty. So that presentation can be found on pages 4-15 in your packet. So I'll invite them to come on up to the table.

L. Rigg: Good afternoon. Thank you for the invitation to come and present. What we're going to present about today was a National Science Foundation ADVANCE grant that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology received in 2010. The point to the proposal and the resulting research data was to examine or to do a

climate survey on campus. And so we sent out a survey in 2010 and had it out for a few months. And the survey went to both colleges, to the entire college. So we surveyed both the Arts and Sciences within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences and then all of Engineering and Engineering Technology.

The point to this survey was to sort of determine how we would go about achieving career satisfaction at NIU and what the temperature of these two colleges was in regard to their own, the individual faculty's satisfaction with their career and their career progression and what aspects of their career were satisfactory and which ones needed improvement. It's a very large survey and I invite you to go online to the NIU website and, if you search Navigate, Balance and Retain, you will get to a page that has the image of the report. The report is very long and very detailed. We had a lot of questions in the survey. And so what I'm going to do today, because we only have about 10 or 15 minutes, is introduce you to how to read the graphs that we have produced so that you can go through the data on your own. And then I'm going to hand the microphone over to Amy Levin who's going to go through the recommendations because I think that's really to the heart of what this body would like to get to.

With all the questions that we asked, what we did was a factor analysis on that data. And we grouped questions or responses actually to question that were similar. So if somebody responded in a similar way to five different questions, those got grouped through factor analysis to immerge out of this massive data set with several themes.

The themes are what you see in front of you in a flow diagram where, out of all the questions we asked, as you'll see some of them as you go through the presentation, there were two sort of lines to satisfaction: one along gender and one along discipline. But everything, regardless of gender and regardless of discipline, funneled through what we call agency and respect. Having a sense of agency and respect both from your peers, your colleagues, your students, your researchers outside of campus, leads to job satisfaction. And so issues associated with agency and respect are crucial at retaining a productive and satisfied faculty.

Along gender lines, there is obviously more gender marginalization and you can look at the data and see what questions sort of identified the notion of gender marginalization and equity, that notion of being treated fairly. Along discipline lines, disciplinary lines, the data is in the package and we can breeze past it very quickly. Work/family balance became an issue so that was more science versus non-science. Groups, science groups tended, regardless of gender, to report less family/work balance and the little picture I have up here is actually of my kids standing on the continental divide. And it's always to remind me to tell the audiences that work should not be the continental divide. It shouldn't be one or the other. There has to be a balance.

Hiring outcomes hangs off the bottom here as a message to all of us, we don't really think about the hiring process as something that leads to job satisfaction. One of the interesting things that we found out during this survey was that the way you're treated in the first three days or two days you are on campus, sticks with you whether you've been here for 40 years or six months. That initial few days and the way people talked to you, treated you, greeted you, asked you questions, forms in your mind your perception of how your time at NIU will be. So hiring is extremely important in terms of job satisfaction.

So this is just to show you the respondents. It wasn't a huge survey pool, but it was a fairly representative survey pool. And, while we don't see very many female STEM, the lower yellow, that's reflective of the proportion of actual female STEM – science, technology, engineering and math – faculty that we have on campus. So this only went to faculty, okay tenure track faculty. So in general people are happy. People are satisfied here at NIU.

What we do see if you look at this slide here, so the first one is just your position at NIU. Most people are happy. If we look at your career [microphone goes out] at NIU we see that it's flatter for the women. So the darker bars are the women reporting and we see that they are not quite as satisfied as their male colleagues regardless of discipline in terms of their progression, career progression. And one of the key things that we were getting at in many of our questions was how we perceive the tenure process, how we perceive teaching load, how we perceive support of research, how we perceived support for facilities. And so a lot of these questions, or all the questions, attacked many aspects [microphone goes out] I'll just talk loudly maybe. So if I could have the next.

So this is where I want to get us to and, while there are a lot of slides in your package and a lot of data that's on the website, if you go to the full report. We don't have time to go through all of it today and you don't want to hear it, you want the recommendations. But I do just want to walk you through how we read and how we group some of these ideas. So this question or this theme that we called satisfaction was actually based on responses from two questions in the data set. And the two questions were: How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your position at NIU? And how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your career progression? So that was the data that I showed you in figures before. What we did with these factors, once we grouped them in terms of their responses, was we did a Z-Score analysis. So essentially what we're looking at is how people are reporting below or above the mean. So the average response across male, female, STEM, non-STEM is the black line going across the middle of the diagram. So that's just sort of the mean response. Regardless, the mean response could be everybody hated it here or everybody loved it here. So it's just the mean response, it's the average response. So anything above that black line is a positive trend. Anything below that black line is a more negative response. Okay. So in this case what we see very broadly is that our STEM faculty are much less satisfied than our non-STEM faculty and I'm guessing the people laughing are STEM faculty. But we also see that, along gender lines, women are less satisfied here at NIU within these two colleges. Yes?

G. Slotsve: [off microphone] is it tenure and tenure track?

L. Rigg: It's tenure and tenure track, but it's not instructors. So we did and we were going to divide it, it's a good question though because we were going to divide the analysis by time and rank, but unfortunately sometimes there would be one individual that would be: Oh, that's Joanne in that department. So we had to take that analysis out. So we've only done it by STEM, non-STEM and then gender.

So the other thing, just so that you know, we did the survey and then we also did focus groups and so we had four focus groups where we had a group of faculty come in and talk through a

number of questions and then, from the focus groups, we selected some individuals for one-on-one interviews. So we had four sets of data. We had the Likert and the survey data that I just showed you. We had open-ended questions where we did a work analysis. We had focus group analysis and then we had individual one-on-one interview analysis. So those are all in the final report. I welcome you to read it. There's a lot of data and, if you have any questions whatsoever when you're going through the report, or even the brief of the report that you have in front of you in your package, please contact any one of us and we can answer those questions.

What I'd like to do right now is skip many, many slides and go to the beginning analysis. Can we go back one? This is the word count analysis on the open-ended surveys or the open-ended questions within the survey. And just to show you, these are the themes along the bottom that were the top ten. So there were a lot more, but these were the top ten positive statements and the top ten negative. To read this graph, anything going up is a positive use of the word, anything going down was a negative use of the word. So words associated, for example, with flexibility there in the middle, so people become academics because it's a flexible career and so most of the terms associated with flexibility were positive. I chose to become an academic because it's flexible. I like my department because the teaching, it's flexible the timing of my teaching, so those types of positive statements. Some things had negative statements associated with them such as salary, merit, promotion and tenure, and campus infrastructure. So there were a few things which tended to have negative reporting associated with them.

So if we could then go two slides, there. And so what we did was based on all these various analyses, we came up with a number of action steps that went through several committees internal to the grant and also we presented to several places on campus including the Presidential Committee on the Status of Women. We've presented to the Council of Deans and the college senates and a number of other locations. So we're very happy to be able talk to you today and I'm going to hand the microphone over now to Amy or to Chris or to somebody to talk about recommendations.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [off microphone] What was the response rate?

L. Rigg: It was about what 20 percent. Yeah, somewhere between 18 to 20 percent.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [off microphone] So who didn't respond?

L. Rigg: The bad people, the bad, bad people. No we don't know who because we don't have any identifiers on them. So we did not collect identifiers so we don't know who didn't respond. That would be wrong.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [off microphone] …the point that needs to be clear is the gender issues. Because we are so low in female engineering professors, that that's very heavily weighed in telling this because we don't have that many females.

L. Rigg: I know, that's an issue, which is partly why we had to take out some of the other analyses which would have identified: Oh, that's her.

J. Reynolds: So, just to follow up on that, we as a group we've worked on this research. But we had an internal data team that actually, you'll notice there's a dean up here of a certain college and so we needed to go ahead and have a blind filter for Chris McCord's benefit. And so to speak to what you just mentioned in terms of the female engineering faculty, it gets to low end very quickly. But you can actually see this pop up in much of the data and so we put some serious controls on that internally.

Unidentified: The point is that [no microphone] satisfaction or no satisfaction it really has no, we have almost no input in the because of the size of the sample compared to the overall.

L. Rigg: Right, but it's STEM more generally and we do also have some other data sets that we used in terms of to work towards the recommendations. And those came from provost-supported workshops that we did for STEM and those actually had much greater representation. Not that you can ever get a big end with engineering but, over the years, we've had several different female faculty and so we used the responses from surveys and then also to inform some of the recommendations. Yes.

H. Bateni: [off microphone] I was just wondering, did you notice any differences between the colleges [inaudible]

L. Rigg: Well, what we had to do, because it was a National Science Foundation, we were limited to those colleges and departments that were considered within the advanced program. So we were extremely limited. Do we think that it's representative? Yes, but not completely obviously. But we did have a very good representation from the humanities and the social sciences and the sciences within the college. Does that necessarily represent the College of Education of VPNA? No and it would be really nice to do a very broad climate survey across the campus. Unfortunately, we just were not, within the constraints of the National Science Foundation, able to get to the entire campus. But sure, I would love to do that. Yes.

G. Slotsve: Just to ask one more time and see if any sense, but with the 20 percent response rate, is there any sense, can you see anything in the data that it was polarization that people had strong feelings one way or the other with the 20 percent that tended to respond?

L. Rigg: No, I mean we would have loved to have had a much better response rate and we actually even extended the date. And we did have a better response rate, but then at the end of 169 questions was the question: Can we use this data? And people checked "no" after answering all the questions. So we would have had a better response rate – lesson learned: Take that question out. But, yeah, ask it first. What we really paid attention to, because of our low sample size, was during the focus groups to get a sense of that to see if there was polarization, if we were catching the extremes. And we were very, very satisfied afterwards using a number of analyses that were put together with Barbara Verell and a number of other people to try to catch that and we were happy. Yes.

J. Novak: [off microphone] I noticed that the date on the shelf is April 2013 and a lot of water has gone under the bridge [since then], do you feel like the survey [inaudible] be done today, that it would be pretty much the same or could there be a vast difference?

L. Rigg: I think, at this point, right now, today, it would be the same. And my hope is that some of the recommendations now will be moving towards through an organization that might be just as receptive as the previous organization may have been. But we might be in a better position to be more active and proactive. So I'm hopeful that the recommendations will be falling on ears that will be ready to take action.

C. McCord: So on that note, this was a climate survey. It was not fundamentally driven by a goal of identifying policy recommendations or identifying actions steps. Its purpose was to understand the current situation and then to use that as a basis for forward movement. Nonetheless, there were certain issues that came up with enough frequency and enough force for us to take note of them. So we've summarized some of them here. I say that because you may feel that the recommendations seem a bit of a non-sequitur compared to the analysis that went before it. And there would be a measure of truth to that. The recommendations are, to a certain extent, a non-sequitur in that we are not trying to say we have done a survey and, therefore, this is everything the university must do. These are, if you will, a byproduct of things that were surfaced, things that were brought up as particular issues. So that said, some of the specific issues: I want to mention a couple and then I'll hand off to Amy Levin to speak some more.

I want to mention a couple of policy issues. The university adopted a procedure for addressing faculty going on leave under the Family Medical Leave Act, FMLA. And in particular adopted a policy for how to address untenured faculty who might encounter an FMLA leave situation while their tenure clock was running, so a stop-the-clock policy. This policy was certainly much better than no policy, but it very clearly surfaced that there are still issues. The policy that was adopted just about a decade ago by University Council certainly needs revisiting. There's a lack of clarity on some of the issues. There are concerns that the, in particular, back-to-work policies, the policies that govern what happens if somebody's on intermittent leave, are not clear. There are concerns that the way the policy can be applied or withheld might be uneven. So I think there's definitely a sense that immerged from the people participating in the survey that it's time for us to revisit that decade-old policy and see whether we can improve our FMLA policy. Could we advance please?

Something that came up with some frequency, of course, is promotion and tenure. For untenured faculty, well there's a pretty rigorous clock. Promotion to full professor, on the other hand, you might never be brought up for promotion to full professor. And, depending on how your department operates, you may never know why you were never considered for promotion to full professor. There was a very strong concern expressed about the perception of a lack of clarity, a lack of clearly articulated standards that people could look at to know whether they were considered ready for full professor or not within their department, and a lack of clarity about the process by which an individual faculty member can seek consideration for promotion to full professor. This is something that is, I can tell you within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, we're looking at our promotion and tenure policies right now. This is an issue we're trying to take on. Certainly university bylaws speak to this issue and we commend to University Council's attention the possibility of looking at those aspects of promotion and tenure guidelines within the bylaws. I think the next point is actually much the same. Just sort of a different facet of the same and then I think I'll hand off to Amy for the rest.

A. Levin: We also had, and these are on page 15 in your packet by the way, now you know. We also had recommendations regarding the campus climate based on the surveys, the interviews, and the focus groups. One of them, if you go back to that slide about satisfaction, and we had similar ones on a sense of isolation. We found that many women in STEM face difficulties accessing the informal networks within their departments. The way they're getting to that point of satisfaction is they're finding networks outside their departments. And it might be through Women's Studies or PCSW or a committee, whatever. And so one of our action steps is that we need to continue to make available alternative paths for networking and mentorship. And certainly one example, I don't know if you all know about it, there's been a monthly lunch group for women in STEM areas that's been going on for about 20 years now. The current coordinator is Beth Gaillard in Chemistry. It's changed over the years, but that would be an example. Our college has appointed as part of Janice Hamlet's responsibilities, a faculty member to help coordinate these alternatives. I don't know that we have the half-time teaching assistant.

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

This probably comes as a surprise to nobody: Faculty members in all areas, STEM and non-STEM, experience difficulties in achieving a satisfactory work life balance. And they reported this in both directions. I don't get to family things or I don't get to work commitments. It wasn't just one direction. They felt that there were significant difficulties in a climate of sort of doing more with less. We hope that Employee Wellness can take up the issue, but we also feel that the role of department chairs in this is very important because department chairs were perceived in these surveys as playing an essential role in whether a faculty member felt satisfied and included. So it can't just come from one source, and advice on how to establish a positive climate is recommended. Any questions? Yes?

H. Bateni: [off microphone] I have a comment about your previous slide where you said that female faculty members felt being left out of informal male networks. I was wondering if probably it wasn't very easy to identify whether the ratio of male or female faculty members have an impact on that result. The reason that I'm saying is that in college like CHHS, this may be quite opposite like male feel that they are not getting into the informal female networks because of a very low number of male faculty member versus female faculty members.

A. Levin: Well, we didn't survey that college.

H. Bateni: I know but what I'm saying that it would be very interesting to see like that conclusion would be – there would be a difference between like engineering as this gentleman just mentions, there are just a very small number of female faculty members compared to the other colleges that they are a larger number of female faculty members. Just a comment.

L. Rigg: I think there would be a number of factors so I think that's a really good point. And so we are skewed in the direction of male dominance and females having lesser numbers of women. So in a college like that, yes, I could see it going exactly the other way around. What's really interesting, and what I just want to show you very briefly, is what we found. This is the question: Do you feel isolated in your department? And, while most people disagree, if you look on the far side, we see that the dark bars, which are the women, it's a flatter curve. So women feel more isolated within their departments. But if we go to the next slide, this was the shocking part. Do you feel isolated at NIU? And women in STEM disagree with this vehemently. And this was a surprising finding and that speaks to the informal networks that Amy was talking about. That, while within departments where the ratios are skewed women feel isolated across the campus, because there are so many informal networks in place and places for them to get together, they don't feel isolated on campus. And so we may find the exact response in CHHS in reverse where the men might feel isolated within the department, but this might be the experience across campus depending on who they collaborate with and what partnerships they have.

G. Chen: [no microphone] for example female feel strongly isolated because within their department that they probably only had one or two females in a department. So, in terms of their classification there, they are just one out of many. But comparing to NIU at large that female versus male from their perception?

L. Rigg: Well, no, their perception would have to be based on an experience. And so what we found from the open-ended responses, the focus groups and the interviews, is that the response, I don't know if you can go to one of them that has a lot of words, there, okay. This one in particular: "Most of the faculty in my department are completely unaware of the biases built into our departments, written and unwritten rules, and totally deny any bias even when it's pointed out to them. So it's a relief to meet other women through Women's Studies and with STEM who have had the same experiences." So again, and again, and again, when we spoke to women and when we spoke to men, they shared with us that it's the external to their department, but particularly for the women, it's those experiences that they had where they met other women from around the campus who may have similar but different experiences or research interests, but it was just refreshing to sit around with somebody who they could feel very comfortable talking about what was going on in terms of their tenure package or their research proposal or their grad students, and they were with a group that they could converse with.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Isolation questions are really interesting because one of the things I think we should take a look at departments that are heavily compared to departments that are lightly staffed, I think you're going to find the same result between the men too because there's not much interaction when you're chasing 120 students a semester. Whereas, if you have a more research-oriented department where there's less teaching, you're going to see more collaboration.

L. Rigg: Right, I mean I think the point to the survey was to really get perceptions of the group that we surveyed so hypothesizing about other groups, I'm treading on light water.

M. Haji-Sheikh: You're surveying us too so I'm just telling you, you would find that probably if you look in that…[off microphone].

9

L. Rigg: Yeah.

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to tie this in on the networking. One of the reasons we started the faculty luncheons that the Faculty Senate has been sponsoring that started a year ago, was to try to help members of the academic community network and meet people from other departments.

L. Rigg: Create a community.

G. Slotsve: Yeah and that's something that, in a broad sense, I think has probably been lacking at NIU and what I wish we would have this a little more. If you want to create that type of network, it would be nice to have a space to do some of this stuff in. And there are other universities that I've been at, either as a grad student or taught at, where you've got more of a Faculty Club. And it's not to try and exclude, you can think of it as a broader to maybe just faculty, but it would allow for networking and it gives you a central location to go and meet. Maybe it's have lunch, it's whatever, and I was hoping something a little broader would also have been in here. Because I think this is a bigger problem.

L. Rigg: That's up to you guys.

G. Slotsve: Well no, but this is a recommendation that I think could have come from your committee that's something that was a little broader across the university.

L. Rigg: So, as Chris said, so we: a) weren't a committee; b) it was a research proposal; and the point of the research proposal wasn't to actually create policy change or affect…

G. Slotsve: I'm not saying it was. What I am saying is you're making recommendations. I wish the recommendations had been thought about a little more broadly given you weren't…

L. Rigg: If I can springboard off

G. Slotsve: …a broader interpretation would have been nice.

L. Rigg: If I can springboard off of what you said, there was a STEM symposium last week put on by the Women's Studies Department, which is now not called Women's Studies. And it looked at participation in STEM from kindergarten all the way through faculty. So we presented there, but what was amazing to me was, at every single level, one of the key things that made a difference in terms of retention, that sense of belonging, a lack of isolation, was a club. And so whether it's you're in grade 3 or you're in pre-tenure or you're a full professor, you need a club. And so whether it's a Faculty Club, whether it's an informal network, whether it's basketball or music, whatever it is, something needs to bring you together. You need that outside ability to network. So, yes, while we didn't I apologize, but yes I do understand and I know that that's a very important avenue of networking.

P. Stoddard: You have a very small end for female respondents, how confident are you in drawing any significant…[off microphone]

L. Rigg: It's proportionally the same and so we've done the power analysis on it through with the stats and we're absolutely certain that what we were able to say is valid within the statistics that we used. We have a paper that's being submitted, so once that comes out, I'll send it to everybody and that has a very detailed methodology in it. We can share that once it's published. But it's also much more detailed in the report. So please, we don't want to take any more time, I'm sure Bill's – see he's standing, he's got the hook ready. So if you go on and you search Navigate, Balance, Retain, if you search that at NIU, the whole report is there and we're in the process of getting some nice, glossy ones printed up and so we'll be able to send those out. Thank you so much.

W. Pitney: Thank you very much for that informative presentation. Appreciate it. Our last item under President's Announcements, I'd like to call on Therese Arado. Is she here? Oh there you are. Thank you, Therese.

T. Arado: Hello. I'm here just to make an announcement on behalf of a couple of colleagues of mine who are the co-chairs of the Open Access Week that's coming up. And, at your seats, you should all have an orange card about open access and on the back it has the dates, October 20 through the 23. And there's a website you can get to for further information on it. I'll give you a little bit. And there's also when you sign out of your NIU e-mail, the NIUToday page has a little article on open access that you can get some information. But they would like you to attend any and all of the open access symposium activities the week of October 20th to the 23rd. These activities will include information for people who know a lot and a little bit about open access. If you don't know a lot about it, they have Open Access 101 presentations that are covering the basics of it. But then they are also going to have scholarly communication services, having sessions discussing the topics of how can I use this, and copyright considerations for individuals who want to publish in open access. There will also be sessions on dealing with the cost of education and how open access can actually help with that and it can help with teaching resources as well as resources for the students. All of these events will be held right here in this room the week of October 20th to the 23rd so you are welcome to attend any and all of them. For a complete schedule of information, if you go to the website that's on the card, you'll get that. Thank you, Bill, for letting me talk.

W. Pitney: Thank you very much. Will they have food there?

T. Arado: I have no idea.

W. Pitney: It's always a draw so I thought maybe that would be a good thing. Thank you, Therese.

V.   UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

W. Pitney: Just a reminder, we moved up Unfinished Business to this point in our agenda and it was originally item IX on your docket. This is a second reading and it's an action item and it relates to some bylaw changes in our Faculty Senate Bylaws. So, to get us started, I would accept a motion to approve the personnel review responsibilities changes as noted on page 59. May I have a motion please?

G. Slotsve: So moved.

W. Pitney: George, thank you. And Greg seconds. Thank you. In terms of discussion, just to remind you what we're changing in Bylaw 7.1 is we're adding one member from the SPS Council to be on the review committee for the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor Evaluation Committee. And then we're also adding one SPS Council member and one Operating Staff member to the evaluation committee for the Faculty Senate President and Executive Secretary of the University Council. In the spirit of shared governance, because both of those positions affect those employment classifications, we thought it fair to add those individuals on there. Any other discussion points, comments, concerns, etc.

All right so I've learned that we need at least 46 folks in attendance in order to take a vote. So, in order to take a vote, just a reminder, we need you to get your clicker. And then so, therefore, from there we need two-thirds of those in attendance after we get the 46 in order to pass the bylaw change. This is an interesting one by the way, just a discussion point: This is an example of language that appears not only in our Faculty Senate Bylaws, but also the University Council Bylaws so it's an item that we're having to run through both bodies simultaneously. I think it's an example of redundancies, maybe that's a good thing, maybe it's bad, I don't know. But I think that might be something worth discussing in the future.

But if we could have everybody take your clicker and press A, please press 1 or A on your clicker. Can they press now? That's going to give us our voting member attendance. Did everybody press A? Everybody press A? All right, thank you. So now we can clear that. We already have a motion and a second for this bylaw change. So now to vote on this, press 1 or A if you vote yes to accept the bylaw change; press 2 or B if you vote no; press 3 or C if you abstain. So I think voting can start now correct? Go ahead and vote. Come on, 30. All right, we're good. So everybody voted? Does everybody have a signal that they voted? It's a little black box in the bottom with a smiley face. We may not need everybody to vote. Hopefully the majority here pressed A to begin with. If we could go ahead and look at the outcome. 82 percent. All set. Yay, the motion passes. Thank you. That was painful.

Yes – 36
No – 3
Abstain - 5

VI.   ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A.   Selection of alternate to FAC to IBHE representative
       The Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE meets monthly on Fridays at various
       university locations across the state. Travel reimbursement is provided. The alternate

would attend meetings only if NIU's representative, Sonya Armstrong, is unable to attend.

W. Pitney: Okay, let's move to item VI on our agenda, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. Sonya Armstrong is currently on the Faculty Advisory Council for the IBHE and we need an alternate. There are a few dates that she may not be able to attend and so would anybody like to nominate himself or herself to be the alternate for Sonya? I'll nominate myself seeing none. Anybody else? Paul, excellent. Is it okay to withdraw myself? I withdraw myself then since Paul has stepped up. Any other nominations from the floor? I would accept a motion by acclimation to take Paul as our alternate as our Faculty Advisory Council representative. John Novak and Michael. So we've got a motion and second. All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Alright thank you. Motion passes. Paul, thank you for doing that. I appreciate that. Awesome. I'm sure Sonya will connect with you about the dates that she can't make it and those sorts of things.

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

W. Pitney: All right, our next item is the NIU PLUS. We're going to discuss the general education report. That can be found on page 16 through 51 on your agenda. To get us started with this, we'll have a motion and a second and then start the discussion and we'll see how far we get. But I would accept a motion to endorse the report in terms of concept and framework. Can I have a motion for that?

G. Slotsve: So moved.

W. Pitney: George Slotsve. A second.

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Sarah McHone-Chase, second. Now it's open for discussion. Let's turn to the report and I think what might be helpful is to remember to use the microphones that we can all hear any thoughts related to the general education report for the PLUS program. And I think what might be helpful is if we go through this kind of in sections a lot like we might go through chapters of a thesis just so that we don't have comments related to something in the front end of the report and the back end. And it might help us focus our discussions just a little bit.

Michael Kolb sent me some information. He attended very recently the Association for General and Liberal Studies, they actually presented the PLUS program. Some comments emerged from the presentation there saying that the presentation and the program constructed was impressive. Such things as, and this is from Tom Steen, Director of Essential Studies at the University of North Dakota, just to give you an example of where some of these comments were from. "Forward thinking and innovative were some general thoughts related to the PLUS program as it was presented there."

Also, Alex Martin is here from our Student Association. I think he's over here to my left. He's our Student Association member in attendance today. The program was recently endorsed by the Student Association. They passed a resolution in support of the program and I would also just make mention before we start our larger discussion here that the General Education Committee voted to endorse the program, the program's concept and frame, if I'm not mistaken. Is that right, David? Yes. So just to give you a sense of kind of where this is at in terms of some other perceptions both within and outside of NIU.

I would open up the discussion of the Progressive Learning and Undergraduate Studies program. Perhaps if we could maybe take the first section in terms of the baccalaureate program revised which is on page 24. This kind of outlines the snapshot of the program and what it would look like. And maybe we could first take its purpose, mission, goal definition, the three C's and maybe the student learning outcomes. Any discussion on those areas of the report? Yes, Paul.

P. Stoddard: I'm not sure this is right, but since it's up on the slide under Knowledge Domain Studies, I know our department, I believe others as well, are very concerned with this six hours in nature and technology. Right now it's 7 to 11 or something like that which really encourages students to take a laboratory in the sciences classes. We feel very strongly that's an essential component of science. This allows them to avoid that entirely. Actually, if I read this correctly, I think it allows them to avoid any science class whatsoever while they're here which means they would not get any introduction to the scientific method which is one of the cornerstones, I always thought, of what we're trying to teach here at Northern. So I mean from a general programmatic stand, I'm very concerned about that particular box and what they've done with it.

There are certain self-serving interests that the science departments have. We stand to lose probably five or six teaching assistantships if we don't have to man for those laboratories which means there is probably five or six fewer graduate students in Geology we're going to see at a time when we're falling behind in the sciences globally, I think anything that discourages students from continuing with their education in that field in the sciences is problematic at best. I'm very concerned about that particular spot on this.

W. Pitney: And can everybody hear Paul okay? Very good, thank you. I thought that would be the case. That's a concern that's bubbled up fairly consistently over the past several months. The change is from requiring seven to 11 hours of science down to six hours which is a minimum, of course.

P. Stoddard: This is in nature and technology it's not science so [not using microphone]

Unidentified: [off microphone]

Long: I'd also say that there is going to be a letter that's going to be shared with the PLUS Task Force from a variety of us who were discussing the Power and Social Justice pathway because your fourth box there under Knowledge Domain just has an elective and that seems to be really quite vague. And we're going to suggest that there be some three-hour course and put that within the issue of diversity so that they have diversity as a Knowledge Domain. And a variety of

courses around campus could satisfy that but it would make an explicit statement that we do value diversity. And, at this point, there's nothing in the document that really does hit that as clearly as we might like. So there will be a letter forthcoming and hoping to get some additional supports from the various commissions and cultural centers and so forth to say diversity could be a knowledge area. And, again, three hours is fine, but we think that every student should have some exposure to different ways of thinking about the world.

W. Pitney: Very good. Any other comments related to either the lab or the diversity issue? I did receive some information from Michael Kolb. I regret I don't have it for the slides. I only got it later this afternoon right before coming here. They ran some numbers with respect to the labs. I'm going to read this. I think that might be the best way to approach it as I don't know how we can get it presented. But they looked at the semesters from 2009 to 2014, so over a six year period, and what they found is that the number of distinct students who take non-lab science courses is 57 percent. Greater than the 50 percent that they would expect of students minimized their efforts and took one three- and one four-hour course to fill the minimum of seven hours required to satisfy their general ed science area requirement. He reports that this suggests non-science students are preferring to take three different, three-hour science courses than take a four-hour science course. And this is not taking into account the weighting done by science, electrical engineering, health and human services and education majors who are taking two four-hour courses because they must do so as a major requirement. He also presented some data. I'm certainly willing to send this out to the group. He sent me some data, he said you see the number of students taking four-hour science courses in the general education program has dropped 20 percent over six years compared to 11 percent drop for three-credit science courses. This, in effect, suggests we have to think about new ways to teach in the sciences. That's what he sent me. I wanted to share that with folks. I haven't had time to digest the numbers, but that was his take. I know their weighing in considering the lab issue.

P. Stoddard: I'd respond to that by suggesting that they just require seven hours and not give them the option of not taking of taking three non-science classes if they feel that bad.

Unidentified: And I'm suggesting that the waive is going to be higher than you think because in Electrical Engineer of course you have to take many more science classes that they're taking three physics classes and then a chemistry.

W. Pitney: Very good. Joel.

J. Stafstrom: I don't know if any of you know me. My name is Joel Stafstrom and I'm here today at the Chair of UCC but I'm also a member of the PLUS Task Force, as is David [Gorman] and I don't know if there are other members here or not. But, just a couple of general comments. I'm in the Biology Department and I certainly understand the need for science or the desire to have it as part of our curriculum for every educated student. And I respectfully acknowledge the desire to reflect a broad education including diversity studies. This is weighed against other conflicts and needs for our students. And I think one of the statements that's made in this report, and I'm only going to make a very general statement here, is that we're striving to help students get through the program efficiently and quickly and to lower barriers. And every constituency can probably identify some that are, they believe would be helpful to students and I don't

disagree with any of them. Personally, I'd like to see the 48-hour general education requirement but it would impede progress of many of our students. So I don't want to provide any kind of special pleading for any area. But I'll certainly, I'm curious and eager to learn what you have to say. I think that Michael [Kolb] and other members of the task force have made the presentation to you already and they probably said these same things. Anyway we do have a couple of open forums coming up: tomorrow, Friday and Monday. And I encourage people to attend those and provide your comments to the task force by next Friday. All this information is on the PLUS web page. So I provide that just as information.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Joel. Any other discussion points pertaining to that? Yes ma'am?

Unidentified: I have a question in general about the PLUS program and the [inaudible]. The feedback that you've been getting, is there any summary of common criticisms and then the responses? So acknowledging that, yes, there are tradeoffs like you said, is there any record of some of the comments of criticisms?

J. Stafstrom: I think that what we are getting right now is open comments period where we're soliciting comments through the PLUS web page there's a site where you can make them through October 10, which is next Friday. So because it's still open, we haven't analyzed comments yet.

W. Pitney: Okay, very good. Yes?

D. Macdonald: Since, Joel, you're here and you can help, I understood from the last Faculty Senate meeting and from this document, that implementation is moving along fairly quickly. I do have some questions about implementation in terms of courses, curricular changes that might need to happen that have not yet occurred and maybe are behind a deadline. And also I'm speaking, not as a college representative, which is what I am, but as a member of my department which is English where we foresee some issues with the second-year rhetoric and composition. We love the idea of a second-year writing course, but it has a huge impact on staffing, on room assignments, on lab assignments, and I don't know whether any of these implementation questions have been sort of discussed by the group or whether they're being left up to the Gen Ed Committee to discuss. That's one comment that I had.

And another one is, I know that it is not the job of the PLUS committee to talk about specific courses and specific pathways, but in terms of just general understanding and public relations, it would be very helpful to have hypothetical student so-and-so chooses, for example, this course, this course, and this course. And this is their focus or this is their minor just in terms of making it more concrete for those of us who are seeing this is going to be happening pretty soon. Is there any – and I've made these comments to Michael [Kolb] as well, so I don't know whether it's the purview of this…

J. Stafstrom: First, with regard to implementation, I think that is something that we have discussed a lot although in the abstract. We don't have concrete ideas and an implementation team, I believe, is in the process of being assembled which would include some of the task force but would also include other individuals. Getting this into the catalog and operating by next fall

was a very ambitious deadline. It's what we're striving for and will follow the university's curricular process through all of its proper steps but also look for expedition of those steps. So that's a lot of hand waving without any really...

Then you ask about sort of models and we're certainly doing that as well. And I think that, in some of Michael's most recent presentations, he would say that, if you were gonna go through a pathway, this is what it might look like. One thing I'll say about pathways and this is toward the end of the program rather than the beginning which is what Bill wanted to focus on now, is that they are all suggested at this point. I believe we have seven ideas. Groups were recruited informally to develop ideas that we initially thought would be models of how it could be done, do a couple in the first year, roll out more in the second year. There's also talk of finding some six, seven, eight of these that we would roll out all at once. This is certainly under discussion and implementation is beyond what we can do. But I think the idea of coming up with models of how a student could possibly create the three-course focus, the six-course minor, courses that would fill those, it's being worked on. I wish I could give you more specifics.

D. Macdonald: No. Thank you.

W. Pitney: Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: One question I'm a little concerned about. I've been in the assessment that's been looking through this, is that I don't know how far you've gone to in bringing it up to our feeder junior colleges, because this could be a big conflict if it's not massaged properly between what they're doing and what we're doing.

J. Stafstrom: There are many interactions we have with our community college partners and your question is simple but…

M. Haji-Sheikh: I know but my open-ended of the question is the fact that is that, in the case of engineering, many of our students come as transfers.

J. Stafstrom: [Off Microphone] In the spring time I wasn't part of it myself, but members of our task force visited about five community colleges and we're trying to let them know that we're doing this. Yes we have articulation, we have [inaudible] we have reverse articulation [inaudible].

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah, we just got reverse articulation with Kishwaukee that's why I was asking.

J. Stafstrom: We are certainly aware that they are our partners and we will work with them to make this clear.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I was just wondering how far that, if that has been broached to some extent because, in the assessment, we never bothered asking them questions.

J. Stafstrom: Yes.

R. Moremen: I'm concerned about, I'm Robin Moremen, I'm in Sociology but I'm a college rep in much the same way in LA&S. I'm concerned about the implementation as well, but I'm concerned at the grassroots sort of where the rubber-meets-the-road-level of departmental advisors. What is the plan to bring them on board because they're the ones with whom the students will meet. They're the ones who are gonna shepherd them through this combination of gen ed and departmental requirements. How is that gonna happen all before next fall is my first question.

The second one is: I, too, have questions about the pathways and I was somewhat concerned as I was reading through this report that sort of from a reader-based prospective, the specificity or how the pathways were gonna work didn't occur until later in the report. You keep referring to pathways early on in the report and it was not at all clear to me how the pathways were gonna be constituted, what was gonna be considered as part of a pathway in terms of course work and the like. I'm concerned that, as this is rolled out, if pathways are this innovation that you want to introduce as part of linking gen ed with departmental requirements, there needs to be more attention paid to it up front as opposed to a later on discussion. I understand it's gonna be rolled out in phases, but it was not at all clear to me until I, I think I got to the appendix, as to what constituted a pathway.

J. Stafstrom: There's a lot of things in response there. For one thing, what originally began as general education re-envisioning became the Baccalaureate Plus Task Force so not just general education but the entire baccalaureate. The pathways are an optional way of a student achieving general education. It's not required for one thing so that the student could take existing gen ed classes. What's another thing that you mentioned?

R. Moremen: Well, I presume you want the pathways to succeed. I understand they're optional, but you didn't just create them to have them be out there and not be pursued. If we want them to succeed, how are we going to, how are the people on the ground going to get students interested in them when they're so vague at this point?

J. Stafstrom: And, also as far as the advising goes, as is always the case, students who enter at different times can choose to be under different catalogs. So all of next year's first-year students won't necessarily, or I guess next year students if it's enacted would be under the PLUS program. But current students don't have to shift. So they can decided which catalog they work under. The pathways are not fully formed. In fact, I think we do need to have clear ways for producing them, implementing, carrying them out, a lot of this is gonna be done by the General Education Committee and I look to David for comments as well, both for the Gen Ed Committee as well as the task force. Where was I going?

R. Moremen: The advising issue?

J. Stafstrom: The advising issue, yeah. And the pathways. We really wanted to set a template for the kinds of things that would happen. We had direct contact with a few individuals, a few ideas over the summer as word got out there's been this I think development of people working on making these pathways, having a pathway leader, some number of classes. The key idea is to

have a central theme and some kind of group of questions around which they would rally. Also that the courses that would be part of these would not just be courses that exist exactly like they are now. Your classes in sociology could certainly be included, but we would want to make sure that they include aspects of integration across disciplines with your partners and also ways of achieving what we call collaboration-across-disciplines. If anybody is familiar with the so called T-shaped learning, the depth in a major, the collaboration-across-disciplines, this is different than collaboration within a discipline. So the way your senior students might work together on a joint project. If it's in general education, we have students from biology and sociology and nursing working together who don't normally see each other. This is, hopefully, going to replicate the kind of situation they see in their future careers and workplace and train them to have empathy and be able to w ork with others. So this collaboration is another key component of the pathways classes.

R. Moremen: I came to understand that eventually in reading the report. My bigger question on advising is: Is there some plan to train departmental advisors on how to speak to this program prior to fall?

J. Stafstrom: I don't know. This is actually implementation and implementation has not been established yet, but yeah it's a very important and fair question.

W. Pitney: I could speak directly to advising component, but I think from what I've heard in my conversations with the group is that there's an understanding that they're going to have to have set funds. For example, for the writing center, since it's proposed that there be some upper-division writing-infused courses that would be required. Well that's going to tax, for example, the Writing Center and they're gonna need more resources for that. And I think it would be fair to say that I bet that's the lens that's being put on the advising issue. We're going to have to have training for the advisors with respect to the pathways and those sorts of things. That's my hunch and that's all that I'm offering that as.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Will there be a form of assessment to see whether or not, I'm going to throw assessment back at the administration, will there be assessment of the administration's attempt to fill this so that we can decide whether or not we're being successful or not at this path and decided maybe we have to change paths? And we need to have that because if we make a big change and we go along and all the sudden we say: Oh my God this is not working, are we going to keep pouring money into it at full steam, or will there be back-out points where we can change what we are doing.

J. Stafstrom: It is a fair question.

M. Haji-Sheikh: You can't answer that. I know that.

J. Stafstrom: It sounds more like a comment than a question.

M. Haji-Sheikh: It's a comment to the chair.

D. Gorman: Michael, are you asking: Will there back-up points for the pathways or for the whole pathway thing?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Right. If we're gonna do this as a major change to whole thing, okay is what we're asking, there needs to be some point as we bring in a new class or something, you have to determine whether or not it's working or not okay. And if it isn't working, if the system's smart enough to figure out how to fix it on the fly, because we're essentially going to have to make a change to the whole concept and the idea of having a committee, going through the whole thing, everybody signs up, go full steam and all the sudden, uh, what are we going to do, something goes wrong.

D. Gorman: Right. Right. So, we have the buses on the other side of the building and then we realize:: Oh, that was a bad idea, can we move them back to the right side of the building?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah, but this is a much bigger bus.

D. Gorman: Right.

M. Haji-Sheikh: It's a fair question to ask back at the people in charge, I would say.

J. Stafstrom: We have been struggling with one of Robin's questions is how do these pathways get formed and we have a reasonable framework for that. But an important part of that also which you addressed is how to get rid of one. A mechanism for appraisal, assessment, measures of efficacy for the university and the students; it's not well established yet.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah, and that's the one fear about going full blast into something if you don't have that mechanism set you may not be able to – it's like a bus without brakes and brake fluid.

D. Gorman: That's gonna be the primary task for the General Education Committee in this fall semester, working out some mechanisms for individual pathways. But the larger questions that you're raising – What if this whole thing turns out to be not such a great idea? – I don't have an answer for that.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah, that's the real question you hit on.

D. Gorman: I know.

M. Haji-Sheikh: If it turns out that we took a right instead of taking a left and the bus only fits in an alley, I'm using your bus analogy, how do you get the bus back?

W. Pitney: We originally tried to start off by looking at different sections, we've kind of moved all over so I'm going to abandon that. I can change very quickly. So, any other thoughts, discussion points, concerns and perhaps optimism?

J. Stafstrom: I have optimism. I think it's a really good program. We set out and we wanted to find something that was novel, bold, but also doable and would be a good thing for NIU and for

the students that we serve. And I personally feel that this is a good compromise of those goals. It's a doable thing which is also bold enough to make an impact on the educational community.

W. Pitney: Well said. Yes sir.

D. Brown: Are there any examples?

J. Stafstrom: Yeah, there's actually many and one of the things that the task force did from early on was examined programs at other universities. There's a book published about general education reform that we read and looked at. One of the key things that came out of that book was, don't look at somebody else's program and try to do it. Find out what's gonna work for you. Draw inspiration and ideas from others, but do what's going to work for your institution. And we have looked a lot at other universities including people that have clusters or pathways or whatever they want to call them. A couple of the keys are, as I said, integrating ideas across discipline, enhanced writing, these high impact practices which we haven't talked about today, and engaged learning, the collaboration-across-disciplines that I mentioned before. These are some of the key things that we came in wanting to do and I think that the program does them in a general way. No doubt that there's details to be worked out.

D. Brown: Are we doing any of this now?

J. Stafstrom: Well, I think that OSEAL [Office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning] is a large expanding and very successful program for engaged learning and high impact practices. We have a Writing Center and we want to enhance that. We have very successful collaborations in many areas and we're trying to enhance those especially through the pathways. I think others can speak to that what we're doing here better than I can.

G. Chen: My name is Gary Chen I'm representing College of Engineering. My questions is: It seems the mechanism of implementation is unclear based on what I have heard right here today. Is there a possibility that we can have a try-out period planned? That, for example, for the students following year, next year that would be year '15, year '15 catalog, are they going to be offered flexible options to choose either the new PLUS gen ed program or the traditional program? If we are offering them flexibility to have the options at the same time we can continue to assess and receive meaningful feedback about how to fine tune or maybe students, they just don't like it. It may not be this program. This PLUS program is not innovative, but maybe our student body they are not ready yet to be that innovative.

J. Stafstrom: At this point, this is a report to the provost. This is some recommendations. It's being discussed by the university community including here today. Nothing is finalized. The provost together with the money people and others will make the decisions about when it gets implemented and what gets used. This is a suggestion. Nothing is finalized as far as I understand it. As I said before, will it roll out next fall? Well, I think if you don't have an ambitious goal, you just kind of get mired and keep putting things off. So it is the goal, as far I understand it, to begin it next fall. Will there be need for modification, change and amendment? Undoubtedly. Will it apply to every student that comes in? I'm not sure. Maybe some parts will be phased in. I think that the required UNIV101 is likely to become part of the program quickly. The upper-

level career success courses may be phased in. The pathways are going to be developing over time and, hopefully, will go forward with a handful at least of good well developed ones and have the option for creating more as the university community feels, in an organic way, the need for a particular pathway to be developed. That's my view. We're moving forward, but there's still time to amend this program and, hopefully, to amend it in the future as well as needed.

W. Pitney: It's still billed as a draft report, correct?

J. Stafstrom: Yes.

W. Pitney: I sense that there's still a great number of questions out there. I'm going to postpone the vote until next time. We'll put this under Unfinished Business. Can we get a motion to postpone this?

P. Stoddard: So moved.

J. Novak: Second.

W. Pitney: All in favor of postponing this until our next meeting say aye.

Senators: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Two abstentions. Thank you. So motion passes. We will put this as Unfinished Business next time and revisit this. I would encourage you to attend some of the open forums. I think those are starting today and go through Friday at least.

J. Stafstrom: The forums are Thursday, Friday and Monday.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Thursday, Friday and Monday.

J. Stafstrom: Do you want to know the exact times?

W. Pitney: Not necessarily. We'll let folks look that up on their own. Thank you so much, Joel. I appreciate you fielding some questions for us.

VII.   CONSENT AGENDA

VIII.   REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A.   FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 52-53

W. Pitney: Let's move on down. We don't have a consent agenda. Let's move on down to our reports from advisory committees. We're gonna start with Sonya Armstrong.

S. Armstrong: So, the Faculty Advisory Council of the Illinois Board of Higher Education met last Friday at Illinois State University. I do have a couple of information items that I think the

senate will be interested in. First of all, the link that you can see up there and on the report to the Faculty Fellow Program, this is a program that was jointly created by the FAC and the IBHE, and the IBHE staff I should mention, two years ago. This is a program for faculty members to have the opportunity to do research with the IBHE or for the IBHE. If anyone has a sabbatical opportunity coming up, I'm happy to give more information on this. So far, the only Faculty Fellows, I believe, have been from UIC, so NIU needs to get in there. It is rolling deadlines for applications and they do, by the way, offer Faculty Fellows for the summer. The IBHE is offering a very small stipend to help out with this, it's not much, so we would obviously need the institutional support. But if anyone is interested in this, please let me know, because I'd really like to get some applications from our institution.

The next is we had a conversation about the Midwest Student Exchange Program. Apparently NIU is not involved in this currently. I do have flyers. I could pass these around if you're interested. But basically this is a reduced tuition program and we're all being encouraged at our institutions to get administration to consider this. So in case anyone is interested, I can pass this around.

The other items that we discussed really were more panel discussions just really having conversations. One was on shared governance. I'll let you read what I'm reporting there. It was a very interesting conversation with former Illinois State University President Al Bowman. He was very frank about his criticism of much administration in higher education in our state. So I'll let you look over that. I do have more detailed notes in case you have interest in what specifically was said.

And then finally, we had a guest presentation on academic freedom specifically associated with the Salaita case. Also very interesting, I have a handout for that in case you're interested which basically details the timeline involved. Both of these conversations, very relevant I think for all of us. So if you'd like information on either of these, let me know. I think everything else I'm just going to let you read. So if you have questions I'm happy to answer.

W. Pitney: Any questions for Sonya? Seeing none, thank you Sonya.

B.   University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – report – Page 54

W. Pitney: Our next report, is Brian Mackie here from our benefits committee?

B. Mackie: Again, I've given you the bullet points, very minimum, but if you have questions I can maybe answer. Terry Borg was the chair. The topics, Human Resources working through the legislation regarding retirees returning to work which has become a headache I think is trying to figure out how to make it work. The SURS employers as of November has a standardized year of September to August, which is the problem because some would use the calendar year versus and so they put that back. Retirees can volunteer at the university immediately after retiring. For some reason some departments were given the understanding that they could not, they had to have that 60-day waiting period. Retirees can continue using Groupwise and they are testing out using the, there's a trial group for the beta test of Office 365 e-mail, they're going to do some

retirees trying that out to see that it's working correctly. Human Resources is coming up with a plan on how to deal with employees working 30 hours or less that are ineligible for state benefits. This is with other universities. Again this was brought up by Human Resources. No data is set yet for beginning of dependent audit. Again, they are trying to find a way not to have to go through everybody to check it. The topics that will be covered this year will include morale, pension issues, how to communicate to various groups. Our meetings, the next two is the 16th of October and November the 10th. Questions?

W. Pitney: Any questions for Brian? Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

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

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

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

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

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

H.   BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – report – Page 55

W. Pitney: Our next report is my report from the Board of Trustees meeting from September 18. Just a couple of bullet points: The Board of Trustees created two ad hoc committees, one on enrollment, a second one on governance. And so they're going to be looking at those issues as it relates to the board and NIU. President Baker did cordially thank faculty and staff for their work and involvement with the Welcome Days for with our students. He was very thankful for us. And lastly, the board, just a comment that the board approved the authorization for President Baker to take the necessary steps to implement the Smoke-Free Campus Act here at NIU. So I think that takes effect July 1 if I'm not mistaken. So, no smoking on campus except in your car perhaps with the windows up. I don't know, we'll have to see. He did mention that there's going to be an effort on education and highlighting some smoking cessation programs for faculty and staff and of course a discussion on how to enforce that. So that's my report. Any questions?

IX.   REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

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

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

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

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

E.   Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – [report](#) – Pages 56-58

W. Pitney: For our standing committees, I think the only report we have is from Resource, Space and Budget, Jim I saw.

J. Wilson: [No microphone] We have a new chair Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb and he started out our first meeting on September 5 by providing us with a flow chart on how we might proceed, visualize, conceptualize and operationalize our role in the budgetary process.

Another thing he provided us with was a book titled Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services to give us an insight as to what the administration is [inaudible] in prioritizing programs and the budget hearings for example that we had several months ago. I'm not going to go into a great amount of detail.

One of the things that came out was that we would be given kind of a mini course by Nancy Suttenfield about the budgetary process to get everybody on the same page with that. We have two items, parts of the flow chart that address both budget and space. We spent some time talking about space, perhaps looking at that as more as a resource, how we could make that produce some revenues for us. For example, looking at dorm space as conference, rooming for conferences and so forth and what would be needed to make them suitable for that purpose. We did discuss that.

Mike Mann came and discussed with us a couple of tables he did provide. One table, Illinois Higher Education budget final action for the fiscal year '15, it was a comparison between the prior year and this year. The whole system, the whole university system, was down .22 percent in general funds appropriations and our change, of course, was a little bit lower than that at -.24 percent. The next table showed that it was a comparison of state general funds appropriations from 2002 to 2015 and for all universities it was 18.2 percent decline with a 21.1 percent decline for NIU which was the highest among all universities.

Finally, we did briefly talk about a list that I compiled based on Faculty Senate's questions from our last Faculty Senate meeting. I compiled them as best I could, reading my notes and remembering. I also took some ideas that I heard elsewhere, created this list, then I submitted to Pat and it became circulated and the president received them in a few days. So he has seen these comments. Our next meeting is on October 17 and we meet with the president. as per our charge. on December 1. That's it.

W. Pitney: Okay, any questions for Jim? Yes?

Unidentified: Yes, there is still a concern about how the hires are done.

J. Wilson: That's in the list whether it's answered or not, I can't speak to that.

W. Pitney: Thank you for putting that list together, by the way. I think that was very responsive and reflective of our last meeting here at Faculty Senate. Rosemary?

R. Feurer: I think the questions are great and I appreciate your inability to answer whether we're going to actually get answers to them, but I want to have you scan down to the first chart there which, the chart that was presented. Has anybody looked at that chart in respect to the governing document of the university? I'd just like to raise that question: Does this chart conform to the shared governance, stated shared governance mandate? Pardon?

[inaudible]

R. Feurer: True enough but since we have a chart here I just want to raise that question. I do think that a chart should represent what the bylaws of the university suggest the faculty's role should be so I'd like to raise that question. I know that it's knowledge, that's our problem, if we don't have the knowledge. So I really do appreciate if their trying to give us the knowledge so that we can have the input that was constitutionally mandated to have. So I just want to raise that question. If they're going to start making charts, those charts should conform to the university bylaws.

W. Pitney: Rosemary, can you comment on how this doesn't? By the way just to clarify, this chart was created by the chair of the RSB.

R. Feurer: I'm sorry what?

W. Pitney: This chart was created by the chair of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee and put forward on the table as a way to get systematic input into the process and out of the process to continue its transparency. This is not something that was given to the committee from the administration.

R. Feurer: Oh, I see. So you're saying that this is what they're suggesting as a …

J. Wilson: The chair brought this up. He's an engineer …

R. Feurer: Maybe that's my problem. I'm not a – I look at this and it just is so confusing. I don't see how the data reflects [inaudible].

M. Haji-Sheikh: I resent that comment as how we look at the world. I've been a working engineer for 13 years in the field, trust me.

R. Feurer: It looks good. So I guess I looked at this as I'm very confused about how it's going to allow us to have information.

J. Wilson: Well, I will bring this up and we'll talk about this more. This is the first install and we try to discuss it. The thing that was most useful, it gave us kind of a handle, a starting point, to discuss some of these issues and sort of set the tone for the coming year.

R. Feurer: And so I thought this was a meeting [inaudible].

J. Wilson: No, not yet we haven't discussed [inaudible].

W. Pitney: My understanding is that this was put forward as a way in which to obtain information, for example, from program directors, department chairs, and even perhaps some deans in terms of some budget issues they were facing so that they would have a voice related to some of their concerns and then the budget process would be juxtaposed to that and the committee would examine those issues and the process, recommend modifications to the budget process as necessary, get it implemented, but have a feedback loop in terms of once it's implemented what kind of feedback do we have, what type of assessment data might we have in order to then re-inform the process. That's the best I can do. I wish he were here to explain it. As he presented it at the Steering Committee, it seemed to make some sense in terms of just kind of making the process a little more systematic.

J. Wilson: And you look at it [inaudible].

W. Pitney: The way he explained it too is that that process is often being used for softer issues such as personnel management and things like that. Just to clarify, that wasn't something that was a directive from the administration. That was born from the committee.

R. Feurer: Okay, well, I guess that is definitely reassuring because [inaudible].

W. Pitney: Any questions for Jim? Hearing none we'll move on. We've already completed the Unfinished Business. We have no New Bbusiness.

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

X.   NEW BUSINESS

XI.   COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A.   Faculty morale

W. Pitney: Our last item here before we adjourn, I sent out an e-mail to the senators asking them to raise the issue of faculty morale and faculty members' perceptions of that on our campus. I didn't pull it from the air. That issue came up from a planning session I did with both Executive Committee of Faculty Senate and well as the Steering Committee of University Council. That issue bubbled up as a concern. I know that the SPS Council has taken on that topic as well. That's a topic that's of concern to our staff also. That issue also came out of a small faculty survey I conducted in August. The link was available through the Faculty Matters link. So that was one of the emergent themes. So in the spirit of having some meetings that aren't just reading reports and listening to reports, we wanted to have some dialog. And I appreciated the dialog on the PLUS proposal today as well as the dialog from the research presentation. I told Stephen over there, I said maybe all of our reports should be researched based and data driven and then we could have a lot of good dialog here. I digress.

So the issue of faculty morale, I put it out there. Would anybody like to comment or raise questions from the floor related to that topic? What did you learn from your faculty colleagues in the departments? Is it an issue? Is it not an issue? If it is an issue, what should we do about it? What can we do about it as faculty?

M. Haji-Sheikh: It's been an issue in engineering for quite a while.

W. Pitney: It's been an issue in engineering for quite a while now? Can I ask a follow up question and ask how so? Can you describe that?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well, partially because, whether or not you know, our administration is pushing the model of a limited faculty count. Most of the departments right now are – you know we're generally growing, generally growing back to where we were just before we sunk after the recession. We're sitting and I mean I think part of the driving problem is just faculty count. Tenure faculty counts are way down. We're running about 10, probably about 47 students per faculty on average. Budgets have been slashed so there's no – so what's driving a lot of it and I it's very hard for departments to get cash for projects for just simple things on campus now. We're losing administrative assistants left and right for departments paying a little bit more, so we're down to zero right now in the EE office. Those type of things do tend to weigh heavily on the faculty because high work load, low amount of help, low assistantship dollars. And it looks to me like the type of model the rest of the campus is going to start working towards. And I'm not sure that's what you guys really want. I think last year I taught eight classes and still had a research load. So, just to give you an idea.

W. Pitney: Absolutely, thank you. Anybody else?

C. Campbell: My name is Cynthia Campbell and I'm with the College of Education. And our department had a discussion about that today and, if I could of summarize some of the things that came out, a couple things: One is related to the university and then there's one related to the college. And it's the faculty's perspective that there seems to be less and less transparency that's available. There seems to be decisions being made without a lot of faculty input or notification. So that's very concerning. I'm not quite sure, it seems like there's been this downward trend with regard to transparency for the last several years.

M. Haji-Sheikh: It's with hiring at the high end.

C. Campbell: Well, it's with the hiring and it's also with we can't get faculty but we're adding consultants and administrators all over the place. I think that's a good part of the morale issue. Just feeling undervalued and not getting a chance to really buy into it.

Unidentified: Shouldn't there be accounting how much consulting is costing us too?

W. Pitney: Very good. Thank you, Cynthia. And I saw a hand in the back.

B. Jaffee: I participated in that strategic planning workshop that you led, thank you for that. And one of the things that came out of the working group that I participated in that I think also reflects concerns [inaudible] in performing arts, is the way that morale is linked to issues of shared governance and concern that shared governance as we all know, places tremendous burdens on us in terms of expectations of time and our commitment to working collaborative on issues, but that as decisions go higher up in the food chain, there is less of us faculty involvement so that we're all actively engaged in committees and other kind of work, but then decisions are made that don't necessarily seem to connect to that work that we're all doing. So I know that concern about shared governance and faculty morale are linked in my area.

W. Pitney: I don't know if you can all hear her but she shared that faculty morale and shared governance, or a lack thereof, correct, are linked. Good, thank you for sharing. Yes ma'am.

D. Rodgers: I got a very wide range in a way of responses. One, was not going to be a surprise: salary raises. That was listed. Also some discontent, this might piggyback on what others have been saying, but on the vision that some of our faculty members do not share about, and their fear that the vision is becoming more about being sort of a vocational emphasis or more of a business agenda for our students rather than liberal arts education which we would be. Sort of our area seeming to be pushed out of the agenda for students' learning. Okay.

Then the other thing was that the actual classrooms that we teach in have been a consistent sort of demoralizing aspect. We have classes in DuSable, I don't know for those of you that – yeah you understand. What is it, 110 on any day that you're teaching in there. There absolutely seems to be no temperature control except for hot or hotter in the rooms and this is just a constant issue for the students and for us teaching in these buildings. And then just in general the maintenance of them; it's kind of glum in the rooms a lot of the times, stained carpeting and so forth.

The last but not least, actually had someone saying that they were a little bit disturbed that we were even talking about faculty morale and that we should kind of keep quiet and not make President Baker feel like we're not supporting him. I'm just sharing that that was a concern that by kind of griping we're not then throwing our support behind all these changes and that we should be. So it's kind of a wide range.

W. Pitney: It is, thank you for sharing. I've been called disturbed before. A little levity there. David.

D. Gorman: I just have a very brief comment about I think rather than asking my colleagues what makes them happy or what grinds their gears, I think a better way of addressing the morale question is I would ask my colleagues: What do you think a university would be like if everybody had high morale? What would that show and what would it be? Because everybody is happy? Because, listen baby, the band could be playing while the Titanic is sinking. Correlatively I'd ask: What would be the symptom of low morale faculty? And, once you sort of made a list of symptoms of high morale and low morale, then you could look at NIU or anyplace and say: Well where are we, briefly.

W. Pitney: Good, thank you. I'm not sure this is any resolution or we've gotten to any conclusions here, but any other comments, concerns related to faculty morale?

Unidentified: Everybody says shared governance, but shared governance starts at the department budget, okay. You have the ability to make a decision at some point that affects your class and your colleagues have and it affects the department. That starts at your budget. When you don't have a budget that is workable, you have no shared governance. When you are told there is nothing there, there is nothing and what can you govern? You go to class, you teach your class and you go home. Shared governance is more than just us sitting around and talking. It's having some share of the finances and control the finances of the university to some extent within our small little sphere.

W. Pitney: I'm not sure, I don't know: Do you think we could all agree on a definition of shared governance? If we just did a think, pair and share, would we have the same definition? My sense is probably not. I think it might mean different things to different folks. I thought a lot about it and I don't know that I could define it, but I think it might come down to maybe two components, one being that maybe somebody has given authority over a piece of something. For example, on our campus I'd like to think that the curriculum is in the hands of our faculty at the department, college and university level. We can decide, for example, to be behind something or not to approve a course or so forth. I think for a lot of campuses that's often how they operate.

The other piece is at least having a voice in part of a process. I don't know that we could ever get authority for everything and have that decision making. And I'm just kind of reflecting here thinking out loud more than anything. I think it can be defined in different ways, but I think what I've heard is that common theme is: Things may not be as transparent as they need to be so that kind of speaks to a bit of shared governance issue. Shared governance, it was an issue that came up also.

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

W. Pitney: Sure. Thank you. Gary?

G. Chen: I have been here for seven years. Right now I can honestly say that morale is much increased than the first couple years that I was here. That was year 2007 to 2008 or a little bit of year 2009. At that time, as a young faculty coming into this university I was so excited and trying to work as best as I could, but I was appalled by, I would call it disrespect for statements by the administrators, under my college. It's my personal story but I don't want this to be a

statement that I'm representing my college. It's just my personal story. Gary, are you tenured? Gary, this is what I'm hiring you for, are you tenured? That's what I heard as a young faculty coming in to my college. So my morale was so down for the first couple years until I found my way working and more like a head up as a professor. So from my personal experience, I would like professors to be respected and we are here, we are all professors, no matter you are a faculty member or you are so called promoted to administrators. We are all professors. That's why we are here. We love teaching, ee love doing research, and we love being with our students educating the talented young minds. I wished that I never heard about that kind of in person statement from an administrator. Gary, are you tenured? So is that really something that the administration is using this kind of power or control? So you are not tenured yet so you have to be a good boy or good girl until you are tenured. I'm lucky and I'm humbly thankful right now I'm a proud professor of industrials and systems engineering. Thank you.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Gary. Well we've come to the five o'clock hour and reached no conclusions at all on faculty morale and I thought I was going to, the constant optimist.

P. Stoddard: My morale goes up at five.

W. Pitney: Goes up five, morale is high here at five o'clock. First of all, thank you all for your dialog on the PLUS program. Thank you all also for taking time to discuss faculty morale and listen to the reports, as well as the career satisfaction earlier on. If I can ever answer any questions for you at any time, feel free to contact me.

XII.   INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

W. Pitney: I would accept a motion to adjourn.

J. Novak: So moved.

J. Wilson: Second.

W. Pitney: All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye

W. Pitney: Opposed? Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.