

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Wednesday, October 29, 2014, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Azad, G. Baker, Bateni, Briscoe, Brown, Brubaker, Bujarski, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Conderman, Falkoff, Gilson, Gorman, Haji-Sheikh, Hathaway, Henning, Hunt, Irwin, Jacobsen (for Montana), Jaffee, Koren, Macdonald, Manning, McHone-Chase, Millis, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Pitney, Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Rush, Ryu, Sagarin, Schneider, Schwartz-Bechet, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Stoddard, Than, Tonks, Un, Wilson, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Campbell, Chen, Chmaissem, Deng, Feurer, Fredericks, Giese, Hedin, Khoury, Lee, Lenczewski, Long, Mackie, Martin, Mogren, Mohabbat, Montana, Moraga, Munroe, Onyuksel, Plonczynski, Riley, Sirotkin

OTHERS PRESENT: D. Baker, Bryan, Haliczzer, Klaper, Monteiro, Stafstrom, Streb

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Doederlein, Gebo, Shortridge, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

W. Pitney called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

R. Siegesmund moved to adopt the agenda. **J. Novak** Seconded. **W. Pitney** added a report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2014 FS MEETING

R. Siegesmund moved to approve the minutes. **T. Gilson** seconded. Motion passed.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

M. Streb reported that NIU athletics has the highest graduation rate among student athletes in the Mid-American Conference. The NCAA has their own graduation rate—the GSR. NIU's GSR for this past year was the highest ever at 89 percent. Football had a graduation rate of 91 percent which put it at eighth among all football bowl subdivision schools and was 14 percent higher than any other Mid-American Conference football program. NIU student athletes graduated at a 23 percent rate higher than our student body as a whole, and our football team actually has a graduation rate that's 32 percent higher than the student body as a whole.

President Douglas Baker addressed questions submitted by senate members. He began by discussing the [current organizational chart](#) of the administration and various roles and proceeded to address questions in order. See transcript of the session for specifics.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong; Paul Stoddard, alternate – [report](#) – Page 3

P. Stoddard identified the main issues discussed at the meeting: 1) updates from the provost and the president of Governor's State; 2) academic freedom and shared governance issues resulting from the Salaita case at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; and 3) Chicago State University's issues with the administration and their governing board that has now dismissed the Faculty Senate.

The FAC to IBHE will create a statement reaffirming academic freedom and shared governance.

- B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – [report](#) – Page 4

G. Slotsve provided a UBC update: 1) faculty and staff are able to use the Disability Resource Center; 2) the Metra pre-tax proposal is being considered.

- C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve, Marc Falkoff – report

M. Falkoff provided an updated on the university's new Acceptable Use Policy for technology. The committee is right now looking for models for other schools that have adopted the AUP principles so that we might have a template that we can adapt and adopt here.

- 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 Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – no report

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

- H. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – [report](#) – walk-in

R. Siegesmund reported that the committee has initiated work to draft a policy for tenure clock stoppage related to FMLA and other extenuating circumstances.

- 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](#) – Page 5

J. Wilson provided an update from RSB: 1) the committee is examining principles from the Dickeson Prioritization text; 2) a workshop is planned for November to learn about the NIU budget process.

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

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. NIU PLUS – General Education – [addendum and report](#) – Pages 6-47
PLUS Advantages Executive [Summary](#) – walk-in

The NIU PLUS general education program was discussed. **W. Pitney** provided a status report of the forums and the recent approvals of the five principles of PLUS from the general education committee. The PLUS task force issued an addendum that addresses many concerns that were articulated over the past month. **P. Stoddard** articulated that the concern related to the science courses expressed at the last senate meeting was also shared by the chairs of the various science departments. The chairs questioned the wisdom of that decision by the task force and the task force's response to that issue (adding "science" to the nature and technology title for the knowledge domain and not making any substantive change to address the issue) was shortsighted. This is perhaps a missed opportunity to develop science literacy for our students.

J. Stafstrom articulated that the task force had to make a lot of hard decisions and compromises. A bigger question with regard to PLUS is likely whether a laboratory experience is necessary to learn the scientific method.

R. Schneider shared his concern that the general education course will simply become flavorings to a multitude of classes which teach the SOLs over and over and over again.

D. Macdonald expressed concerns related to implementation. **D. Gorman** shared similar concerns as well.

M. Haji-Sheikh commented on whether there is structurally something to be done related to adding in a lab component. **M. Cefaratti** asked to clarify the curricular process. **W. Pitney** replied that the way our curricular process is structured, the UCC would have to approve the changes coming from the GEC. **P. Stoddard** clarified this. The UCC would discuss it and have the ability to say yes or no on it, or suggest modifications or send it back.

G. Baker offered that PLUS is an opportunity to maybe reflect on some of our practices. There is a lot to be learned from the much published course-based research experience that other universities have set up to model in a classroom experience to actually address the issue of inquiry and that is the most fundamental aspect of doing science. Perhaps with the PLUS framework, this is an opportunity to try to band together in the sciences to maybe attempt a better curricular design that will appeal more to our students and he thinks that is in the spirit of what PLUS is intending.

R. Schneider shared that the School of Theatre and Dance has worked out a series of 12 measures that can be taken in order to be part of the curricular reform movement, but the deadline for getting those approved through the curricular process is already upon us and we're not yet certain if the task force report will be accepted by the provost.

W. Pitney stated that there are still lots of concerns related to implementation. To that end maybe a statement of concern from the Faculty Senate is in order.

W. Pitney acknowledged the hard work and effort put forth by the 24 members of this task force.

R. Moremen questioned whether it is possible to approve the idea behind the PLUS program but not approve the rush to implementation for fall of '15. **W. Pitney** clarified that the original motion was to endorse the concept and framework of the proposal.

Discussion ensued as to what was meant by framework and concept. Concern was raised that "concept" and "framework" may not be clearly understood. **W. Pitney** offered that it is the general idea of something. **D. Gorman** stated that we as a senate can perfectly well endorse or reject the general spirit of something, the overall package, which has very specific points and very vague points, without necessarily entailing that we are endorsing or rejecting every single point.

W. Pitney called the question. The motion on the floor is to endorse the concept and framework of the report. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes – 22

No – 8

Abstain – 2

R. Moremen moved to create a statement of concern about the implementation of PLUS. **D. Macdonald** seconded. Discussion related to the need for coherence of implementation and not to sacrifice quality for expediency. **P. Stoddard** offered a friendly amendment that was

accepted: add the words after we say express concern about the implementation, and specifically with regard to the pace or timing of the implementation. So that we are concerned about the whole thing but the concerns over the implementation of which includes the modalities and the pace, thereof, perhaps. The statement of concern is as follows: The Faculty senate expresses a statement of concern about the implementation of PLUS, including both the pace and the modalities of implementation. At the core of this motion is the Faculty Senate's concern that quality not be sacrificed for expediency. Should the program move forward, we simply urge that what would best serve the institution is that implementation—including timing, coordination, and budgeting—be carried out in a deliberate manner. The motion passed:

Yes – 25

No – 6

Abstain – 2

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

W. Pitney: Information items are in your packet.

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

W. Pitney: Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.