

**FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT**  
**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:** Let's go ahead.

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

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**W. Pitney:** We're gonna get started by

**R. Siegesmund:** So moved.

**J. Novak:** Second.

**W. Pitney:** I've got one small amendment to that and that is to add a report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. So with that small amendment, are there any other changes or modifications? Hearing none, all in favor of adopting the agenda with that small edit say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? The agenda's been adopted.

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

**W. Pitney:** Our next item is to approve the minutes of the October 1 Faculty Senate meeting. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? Richard, and a second, please? Todd Gilson, thank you. Any edits, modifications, changes, deletions? Everybody liked the minutes. All right, all in favor of the minutes say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions?

#### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**W. Pitney:** Well, President Baker will be joining us shortly. I think I told him we usually get things going around 3:05 so this will work great. In the meantime, I've got Matt Streb to give us one exciting announcement.

**M. Streb:** Thanks, Bill. For those of you who don't know, I'm the faculty athletics rep and one of my responsibilities as the FAR is to give periodic reports to the Faculty Senate about the state of our athletic program. And I have some pretty exciting news that we're very excited about here on campus to report. We have five teams right now that are, our five fall teams are competing for a MAC championship, but we were informed earlier this week that we won the most important MAC championship and that is we have the highest graduation rate among our student athletes in the Mid-American Conference. Just to give you a little background on that, the NCAA has their own graduation rate they do; it's called the GSR and it's a better rate in many ways than the federal rate because schools get credit for – it includes transfer students, mid-year enrollees, that type of thing.

Our GSR for this past year was the highest we've ever had, it was 80 percent. Thirteen of our 15 sports were either equal to or above the percentage, the mean percentages for their respective sports. And, obviously, our most visible sport is football, and football had a graduation rate of 91 percent which put it at eighth among all football bowl subdivision schools. And, maybe more impressively, it was 14 percent higher than any other Mid-American Conference football program. That's a lot to be excited about. The only apples-to-apples comparison you can make to the student body as a whole is if you use the federal rate, and when we do that, our 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. So I don't know how many of you have paid attention to some of the negative stories, there's been a lot of negative stories written about athletics and academics in the past couple of weeks because of the situation at North Carolina, but I think this is something that we can all be proud of. So, thanks very much for your time.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you very much, Matt, for some exciting news. Any questions for Matt? Okay seeing none, let's move on to the man who needs no introduction. Thank you, President Baker, for joining us today. Appreciate your time and willingness to come in and share some information for us. I was hoping perhaps, would you like to give an update about the interim position for administration and for facilities? Or do you want to wait?

**D. Baker:** Well I'm going to wait on that but I've got an [org chart](#) that you asked to see so we'll go over that.

**W. Pitney:** Absolutely.

**D. Baker:** And lay all that out.

**W. Pitney:** That sounds good.

**D. Baker:** Ok great thanks.

A. President Doug Baker – Faculty Senate [Questions](#) – walk-in

**D. Baker:** So, Bill asked me to address a number of questions I guess you guys put together. Oh there's the org chart. Why don't we do that since it's up. No that's fine. That's one of the questions. So one of the questions was about where is it – it was part way through here – about the organization, number 10: Please present a [current organizational chart](#) of the administration and various roles. And I can talk about the changes that have gone on while I've been here.

So since I started last summer, a year ago summer, I've eliminated two vice presidencies and will eliminate a third one with Bill Nicklas' retirement. I will say I have added two so we'll be down that one, but the positions that I added already existed, I just changed their titles, so it wasn't a new position, it was a re-titling. So let me go through those and explain that. And you're probably most interested in the ones down below the vice presidents, but on the left you see Bill and then Danielle on the left. And on the right I've got the special events director and my assistant, Dori Hooker. So Ellen and Dori and then legal service we have Jerry and his office and then Jim is the ethics officer.

But you're probably most interested in the vice presidential area down below. So let's go across. Division of Academic Affairs, we have Lisa Freeman, executive vice president and provost. When I came in, there were two executive vice presidents. There was the vice president for finance and facilities and the executive vice president. So that was Eddie Williams and then there was the provost and executive vice president. So it seemed unusual to me to have two executive vice presidents. It seemed like we needed one executive vice president and that needed to be in Academic Affairs. So I ultimately eliminated Eddie's position and transferred many of those duties, the finance duties to Nancy Suttentfield, our interim chief financial officer. And then the facilities piece and HR went to Steve Cunningham. And then, when he left, I eliminated that vice presidency and added those to Bill Nicklas' position. And now with Bill retiring, I'm going to eliminate that vice presidency and allocate those out and I'll tell you how I'm going to do those here as we go through.

This coming spring I guess we will have a similar number, maybe one less vice president and the salaries for the whole group will be about \$300,000 less than when I started. So I think we've taken a good step at reducing the administration and rationalizing it. Let me go through these other positions. Division of Finance, Nancy Suttentfield is the interim. We searched – well when I came on last year I felt like we really needed to get our arms around the budget. We didn't have

a good budget and budget model and budget system, and it wasn't very clear internally and externally where we were. So we created the budget principles with the help of the senate and University Council last year. Went through our position hearings, etc. and have really tried to lay out where we are with the budget. Nancy and her team have done an amazing job there. Our budget director position that reports in there is open, has been for a number of months. And, as we go through this reorganization, I'm going to pull the planning and budget piece out and have that report to me and work with Lisa Freeman. I feel like you kind of need to have a separation here where you've got the budget planning people in one place and you've got the spending people in another place. So procurement, payment, controller, that kind of stuff I think is a good thing to have in one place, and the planning in another so you don't intermingle those. And I'd like to take a university-wide perspective on the budget and allocate those in strategic ways. And I think that's best coming to the president and the provost. That's the way I've worked at the last two institutions and it's worked fairly well.

Okay so you've got Lisa and Nancy and let's go down, I guess Bill's box went off here, didn't it, this has been updated. There was a box on here for Bill Nicklas for Operations and Community Relations and there were four areas that reported to Bill. One was Facilities and, as we eliminate his position, that will go into the finance division. We have a search underway for that vice presidency to fill Nancy's position. It will be administration and finance together but with a budget pulled out, the budget director pulled out of there and reporting to me. So we'll have facilities and public safety, the police will go under there, under that vice presidency. There's a community relations piece that Bill had that's going to be largely with Jennifer Groce who's been doing our communiversity work. And human resources is the fourth area that Bill had and we're going to move that into the provost and executive vice president, under her executive vice president role. The executive vice president already has faculty personnel. So we've had kind of two pieces there: We've had a personnel staff side and a personnel faculty side. And it seems to make sense to bring those pieces together for better coordination and integration. So I think that kind of gets us in the ballpark of a more traditional higher ed organizational chart with the facilities/finance piece in one place and community relations having a direct link. Stop me if you've got questions as I go through these because it may be hard to come back. Any so far on that? So far so good?

Okay let's keep marching on. We've got a search underway for the finance position. Lisa is chairing that committee. We had not a particularly strong pool last spring so we failed the search. We wanted to hire a top notch person and felt like we didn't have the pool we needed for it. We've got the search underway. It looks like it's a much stronger pool. We'll have airport interviews, so to speak, you know the rough cut interviews the first week in December and then we'll have the on-campus interviews before the end of the semester. So we're progressing well there.

Division of Information Technology, this position existed before I got here but it was called a vice presidency. It was Wally Czerniak and Wally reported in to Anne Kaplan in outreach. And, before I got here, there was a consultant report looking at IT at the university and where we were and what our strengths and weaknesses were and what we needed to do. And a lot of things we need to do. I think some of you have heard Brett speak about the many things he has underway from security to the services at your desktop and I really felt that we needed to elevate this

position. That was the recommendation coming out of the consultant's report, to hire a top flight person in higher education today. This position needs to sit at the table and be part of the discussion so we can serve the faculty, staff and student needs of the university. So we've hired Brett, if you don't know him he's a great guy. He came to us from Emory University where he was the number two person at Emory in their IT group and is really doing a great job. So not a new position but a new title coming over from outreach and now reports to me rather than outreach.

Division of Intercollegiate Athletics Associate Vice President Director Sean Frazier. Sean came to us last summer from Wisconsin in the same position we've had before and is doing a great job there.

International Affairs, Ray had been the provost and I really felt like we needed an emphasis on global affairs for a variety of reasons. We're in a global economy and our students need to have that opportunity to have global experiences abroad and we also need to recruit from overseas to enrich our campus and felt like we needed a real emphasis there. I've been to a number of conferences where again people say that position needs to be at a top level if you're going to get this kind of work done and Ray is in China today. I think he's still there. He's been there the last ten days or so working on some partnership agreements with some pipeline universities. And as you may have seen, we were up 240 international students this last fall. So we've made some progress in a relatively short period of time. More to do there.

Shall we just drop straight down to Division of University Advancement, Mike Malone's position? Not a new position, been there for some time. Mike is retiring. He announced his retirement two years ago, three years ago, and has been doing victory laps, I guess, for the last couple years. And, as part of that retirement announcement or agreement, he will be done this summer and we have a search underway now and a good committee working for that. And in advancement you've got the fund raising piece and you have alumni that report up into there. I'm not anticipating any changes in that structure.

Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management is Eric Weldy. He, too, came in a year ago summer and again not a new position but has all the broad range of student affairs and enrollment management pieces. He's been short staffed in enrollment management and admissions and he has an interim in admissions and we're looking at one in enrollment management right now. Critical positions for us as we get our enrollment right and our budget right.

Division or Research and Innovation Partnerships, we added the "Innovation Partnerships" on last year as we did some reorganization and Lesley Rigg fills that position. She'd previously been the interim and was chosen through a search process, internal search process, for the interim position. And, when Lisa – and I should come back to that because it's another question about the hiring I think in your questions here – as Lisa was hired to be the provost, that left the gap back with Lesley. And having been through the internal search process and having a lot of pieces in play with cluster hires and safety issues and a variety of policy issues, I asked her to stay on for a three-year position there.

Division of Outreach Engagement and Regional Development is Anne Kaplan's position. She's been in that for some time and we're trying to expand our engagement and regional development pieces. We have great assets at our branch campuses. We have collaborative work with a number of communities and organizations like the EIGERlab in Rockford and now the Rev3 lab; Revolution 3 Incubator in our Naperville campus. And so Anne has been helping us lead the way on that as well as forming stronger partnerships with community colleges in the state, so areas that we're trying to strengthen and build.

Division of Marketing and Communications, Harlan Teller is the interim vice president. He's signed on for a two-year position, graduate of NIU, he's been one of the top marketing communications people in Chicago for 40 years and has a great love for the institution and is doing a lot of things to help us turn around our marketing, branding, communications, internally and externally, so very appreciative of his work.

I mentioned Lisa's hire, that was another question about, or Lesley's hire. Lisa's hire there was a question about that. We did do a national search for provost and executive vice president last year. We got down to three candidates, two were recommended by the committee. I ended up offering to one of the candidates and thought we were in the final stages of an agreement and she took a job elsewhere. And the same day, I got a call from the search firm who said that the other candidate had withdrawn. His institution had wooed him back to stay and he's withdrawn his candidacy. So there we were. I went back to the search committee. Did anybody serve on that search committee for provost that's here today? So we had a conversation about what to do. Marc – and the committee had actually even brought up Lisa's name prior to that and were very high on her. So we talked about her appointment and concluded that that was the right thing to do and went ahead and made that appointment given where we were and I think she's done a great job. So that's the process that we went through. Anything you want to add to that, Marc? So the search committee was very supportive of that and off we went with it. So that's the org chart. What questions do you have?

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I think the question really is about Lisa's hiring. It's not that she isn't capable or wasn't a good candidate, but we don't usually hire people in casual conversations after the search committee's over. If we did that in our department we would have been really scolded by the administration by just picking somebody casually for a position. I understand and I don't disagree that was a conversation. I talked to some people on the committee. But, traditionally, if you have a failed search committee, you go straight to a decision of having a secondary committee the next year and have an interim. That's the only question I think is on the minds of a lot of people.

**D. Baker:** So I wouldn't characterize it as a casual conversation. I would say it was very deliberative. I worked with Alan Rosenbaum at the time and he went back to the governance committee and they discussed it. And it was also discussed with the search committee so there was faculty deliberation on those. And I'd done a 360 evaluation on all the vice presidents and she had gotten very high remarks on those. And so I think it was a deliberative process and based on some feedback and data on her performance to date and I think she's serving us well. Others? Any of the other boxes? Who's the guy at the top? Yeah who is that guy? Okay let's do the other ones.

All right the first one was: What is the issue faculty could most help you with that they're not doing now? Well I think the faculty are doing a lot now. How many of you have been to one of the town hall meetings where we've looked at the budget and the enrollments and those kind of things. Many of you have seen it so I don't need to redo those. The thumbnail is that we've had about a 5,000 student decline over the last decade and we've had a 20 percent reduction in our state funding and we've had a drop in our room and board. If you add all those numbers up, it's about a \$100 million of lost revenue over that time period. And the way we've tried to solve that is raise tuition. And I think we're at the end of the road on raising tuition. We've priced out of, or are pricing ourselves out of, the market. We charge about \$12,000 a year for tuition and fees and about \$9,000 almost \$10,000 for room and board. That's a lot of money you know if a student's paying \$22,000-\$23,000 a year. That's really getting in the way. So I don't think we can just add it onto the backs of students. So now we need to look at how do we increase our revenues and what are our sources? Well traditionally we've had the state support and you've seen the state budget and the history in this state. I don't think there's going to be a miracle in Springfield. I don't think they're going to come to save the day. So we've lost about \$25 million in state support over the last decade and I don't think they're gonna come back and give it to us given the challenges of pensions and all the other demands in the state budget, all the entitlements in the budget. So that means we've got to control our own destiny. And if we can't get our revenues up by raising tuition, then that means we need to increase our enrollment. So that's going to be one of the critical factors. And in enrollment there's two pieces. There's recruitment and there's retention. As you remember from those charts, our retention rates have gone down dramatically over the last decade. A year ago they were 66 percent for freshmen returning as sophomores. We lost a third of our students. That's something we can affect and we did this last year with your help. We turned that around and went from 66 percent to 71 percent, a five percent jump in one year. That's outstanding. So thank you. A huge deal and I don't want to frame this as just an economic issues, it's really at the core of our mission. What are we here for? We're here to help our students succeed on campus and their lives after they leave us. And if they don't go through the educational process, they're not going to have the transformational experience and go on and live the great lives that we know we can help them with. So I would say help with that. Make contact with students. Help them with the advising, maybe the most intimate form of teaching that we do. Care about them. I know you do and I've seen a lot of places where we've reached out and done transformational work in University 101 and first year comp and in the majors. I've seen a number of colleges have dramatic increases in retention. I was looking at the engineering numbers the other day where we traditionally had high attrition rates and that's turned around in an fairly short period of time because of focused effort in that regard. So I know we can do those things. On the recruitment side, my personal opinion is it's a little bit hard to ask faculty to go out and hit high schools and community colleges and that kind of stuff; you've got plenty to do. But there are times when maybe we've got community college faculty on campus and you want to form a relationship for two-plus-two kinds of relationships. Or, from time to time, we may think it's a good idea to sit down and do some articulation work to make sure the classes that are coming over from those schools articulate with ours and students don't lose time and the progression from one school to another. So there's those kinds of recruitment activities. When students are on campus, that's a huge piece if they can sit down and talk with some people on campus. Who am I going to study under and what are they like? We all know that's so important in graduate education, but it's also true in undergraduate education. We have to do this in

measured forms because I know you're doing your teaching and your research and your outreach activities. So those are a few of the things I guess on that. Comments or questions? And participate in faculty governance.

Based on your projections when do expect faculty and staff to see a cost of living increase? Would the time table be any different for a merit increase? First, it's a very high priority for us and this last year when we did our budget analysis I asked Nancy Suttentfield and Lisa Freeman to really go over the budget and tell us where were. For those of you who saw the tables at the workshops, we were about \$15 million in the red last spring and we had to balance the budget. And so we did that through reducing expenses and through the hiring freeze and then going through the process of grading which ones we could hire and which ones we didn't hire. So the good news is we closed a \$15 million gap which left us with a razor thin reserve and no money for raises. So the good news is we didn't have layoffs or furloughs and the bad news is we didn't have the revenues at that point to work on a compensation increase that's a couple years overdue, so high priority. When do we have the revenues? I guess we have the revenues when we can turn the enrollment around and get the revenues up or we can reduce our expenses. We can look at both sides. We're going to continue to look at the expense side. We've got just the beginning of a program prioritization effort that's going on to look at those expenses. Bill, you took part in a workshop with a number of other people. Do you want to say anything about that?

**W. Pitney:** I think there's been a lot of interest, and a contingent from NIU that went to the "Prioritizing Academic and Administrative Programs" here recently. And I think for a lot of people that have heard that and perhaps have done a search on Robert Dickeson's work, it's easy to jump to conclusions that that means cutting programs and that's not necessarily the case at all. This was an initial step by representatives on campus to gather information and understand various strategies that we might use to use existing resources intentionally and purposely to really operationalize the strategic plan and fulfill our mission and do it very systematically and thoughtfully. I think we're very much aware of the current economic and fiscal climate and, when we start asking questions about salaries and maybe what we can do in terms of purchasing equipment and doing things for our students, it's hard to do that in such a tight fiscal environment. So we've researched a framework for prioritizing. We're only in the very initial steps of that. In fact, a portion of the steering committee met yesterday. It looks like we're going to fold in a couple of other individuals to that. And there's decisions to be made as a beginning part of the prioritizing process. I think we generally feel like the model we learned a lot about would work well for us, but we recognize too that we're going to have to modify that to meet our needs here at NIU and so that's a little bit of background on that.

**D. Baker:** A work in progress. Any questions on that? So, the faculty will be involved in that whole process, both in setting up the process, the criteria and then how we go through it and it's just important that we do that. Are we spending our money on the most important things, the highest priorities that we all have for this institution? And we need some process on that. And we've had kind of across-the-board increases and decreases as I understand it in the past, and we need to have some criteria to look at those things as we go forward. Salaries will be one of those in play that's a priority item for us.



Would the time table be any different for cost of living versus merit increases? I don't know. I guess I don't know, you could make an argument if you've got a razor thin when you do kind of an across-the-board one and, if you've got a little more, you could have merit. We'll just have to see where we get with our revenues. You know this spring is going to be really very interesting in the legislature. We've got an election coming up so I encourage you all to vote and I guess you can pre-vote now downstairs can't you? So Matt's like yes and Matt's probably watching the web right now to see how things are going. So vote and make your voice known. We really don't know what the legislature's gonna do or the governor's going to do with the temporary income tax surcharge that's running out in December. If that really goes away, there's going to be state budget cuts across the whole state. My sense is both candidates for governor don't want to do that and my sense is the leaders of both houses don't want to do that. And Matt can probably give us a much greater in depth analysis of what's likely to happen but something in the veto session or the session, that lame duck session after that, is going to happen before the regular session I think to get the budget into more balance. So, depending on what happens there, our budget will be affected or not affected and I'm hopeful that there will be rational discussions about that. Then we've got to look at what happens to our enrollment and that's going to be a driver in our budget. In the town hall meetings I talked about the demographic shifts inside our student body. So we've been having declining enrollments for about a decade and that means every senior class is bigger than the junior class is bigger than the sophomore class is bigger than the freshman class. So, when our senior class leaves, that's a bigger group of people than the freshman class. So that difference from the senior class to the freshman class is about 400 students. So when our seniors go away, if the same freshman class comes in, freshman and transfer class comes in, we'll be down 400 students. So that means we've got to have an increase in 400 students to maintain flat enrollments for the university. I think we can do that. You know with a five percent jump in retention this last year, a lot of activity going on right now around retention, we're going to see an increase. That's good. That's excellent. It's good for fiscal reasons but again its core to our mission what we're about, so excellent. And then we have a lot of pieces in plan on the recruitment side from departments to colleges to central admissions and enrollment management to marketing. There's a lot of people leaning forward trying to help, even alumni. Now that's gonna take a little time for our communication channels out to our potential customers to work. Whether it be new freshmen or transfer students or adult learners or international students. But I think we're going to see an increase there. So our goal is to be flat next year. To get that 400 student increase so we can be flat year to year. And if we can exceed that and then our budget is going up and then we can address the salary issues. So that's kind of the game plan on those. Any questions on number 2? Keep going.

3. In regards to faculty and staff work environment, are there plans to address and improve the following: a. shares governance and faculty morale. Well shared governance, I think we've made some pretty big strides in trying to make everything as open and accessible as we can. We've tried to put all the budget numbers out through the various budget committees and included faculty governance last year and the budget principles. So if there's more that we need to do there, let me know. We're trying to be as open and transparent about all those as we can.

b. Hiring tenure track faculty as opposed the adjuncts. Those decisions are largely made at the department levels. My guess is that with the hiring restrictions and the grading last year, that there was a prioritization for the tenure track and there may have been fewer adjuncts hired if

there were budget reductions that you weren't laying off tenure track faculty, you were reducing the adjuncts and those kind of folks. I think those are important strategic decisions for departments to make. You know it depends on where you are in the department. Are you better served by more adjuncts or more tenure track faculty? Does that help you accomplish your teaching, research and outreach or artistry goals that you may have? And so you need to develop those strategic plans within that triangle framework that we've been talking about with students, faculty, the outside world, and support services. And what's the right composition of the faculty or the staff or the graduate students to help you succeed in those? So I guess I would encourage you faculty to take that on as you work with your chairs and figure out where are we going and how do we best structure ourselves? How can we be most effective in attaining our goals within our resource constraints? What's the best way to get there? And that may affect faculty morale as you are engaged in that process.

d. Alleviating pressure on faculty in fundamental areas (scholarship, teaching, service) as well as additional responsibilities (recruiting students and other roles). I guess I'd go back to my former comment that we need to figure out what's the department trying to do, how do I fit into that, and how do we allocate our time. Bill and I have been talking a little bit about some of the service activities that we do and how we seem to have a lot of committees and maybe there's more efficient ways to do that. If we could reduce, that's kind of ourselves, making ourselves do stuff. Could we get rid of some of the stuff and still get the work done that we want to do in a fair and equitable way. So if we can streamline those processes, great. We're going to try and do that on the administrative side of the house and look at the processes. I see Deb Haliczzer back here. I know she took on a mapping exercise to look at HR processes with her colleagues last summer and identified areas where we could streamline activities and be more efficient and effective and we're going to try and take that on in other areas. Nancy Suttentfield's working on it or at the beginning stages of looking from procurement to payment in the financial side of the house. Can we streamline that so there's fewer steps along the way and it's easier for all of us. Maybe there's ways in faculty governance and university governance we can be more streamlined. I don't know if I got all the nuances in there. Are there questions on number 3?

4. Can you comment on steps being taken to either decrease or consolidate the number of administrative appointments as a way to reduce cost? Well I guess I did when I went through the structure. We're down three senior administrators or eliminated those three. I guess, as I said, I added Brett Coryell but that position had already existed under Anne Kaplan and I did add the vice presidential title for Ray Alden over in international affairs.

**W. Pitney:** Are you aware of any emphasis on like the middle administrative roles such as the dean's level or associate vice provost level to streamline?

**D. Baker:** Don't have any plans to reduce colleges or deans. I know in the administrative areas, for example in finance area, we're down about ten percent in our staff there and the provost's office has eliminated I think three vice provosts. We don't talk much about that next layer down but there were reductions happening in those areas. There have been other eliminations. When Steve Cunningham was here, he eliminated a couple positions below him in the facilities and finance areas. So there is another layer down that we are eliminating. At the associate dean levels I haven't seen a big proliferation of positions there. You guys may have a better feel for that than

I do but some universities you'll see, you know, scores of associate deans and I guess I haven't really seen that here. So at that level I haven't seen it.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Didn't Coryell's office add two more high-end people? Coryell's office added two more high-end people, I think.

**D. Baker:** Not to my knowledge he didn't.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** A security individual, a new security assistant vice president and I believe somebody in charge of procurement.

**D. Baker:** His budget hasn't gone up so any hires have been reallocations inside of that budget. In fact, his budget is down significantly. And security is really an important issue obviously in IT and we needed to address some issues there that have been serious issues we've identified. So the good news is, you know, sometimes you see a position come up but then the overall budget in an areas like IT is down significantly. So I think we need to look at the whole context of what he's doing there as a manager to reallocate his budget and do the right thing.

**W. Pitney:** I had lunch with Brett probably about a month ago and we talked about his organization and the current positions that he had posted. And, indeed, he kind of walked me through his budget and the hundreds of thousands of dollars that he's down and how he's reshifted things to create what he believed to be some critical positions to help kind of stabilize NIU's IT infrastructure.

**D. Baker:** Yeah, I think he's been a good steward of that money. You may want to invite him back sometime. Yeah, was there another question? Do you want to grab the mic?

**M. Cefaratti:** I think it was a few months back we saw a donation to the fire department for a ladder truck and so it's making me think of safety and security, and meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> floor, that's great. But my question is, so it was \$275,000 for the ladder truck. Were we stepping in where the state would have usually provided funding for that type of safety equipment?

**D. Baker:** My understanding of that one was that's a local issue and really the only buildings that they serve with that big, tall ladder truck are on this campus. The truck was 30 years old or something and not operating as well and the city was, since it's serving us, they were looking to us to help pay for us. And it seemed like an appropriate partnership between the community and the city, so we could afford to get it here and protect the public safety.

**M. Cefaratti:** Agreed. Do we foresee any more pulls on our budget from the city or in support of things that NIU as campus uses that's unique to NIU like that?

**D. Baker:** Not in that regard. Where are we here? 6. Do you envision making NIU a leading university in the Midwest? I'd say just a leading university period, yes. And if so, please discuss the tangible steps to help this come to fruition. My focus there is on that triangle plan that we've had linking faculty, staff, students with the outside world so we can really become a relevant institution and have that transformational experience for our students and the research and

artistry that distinguishes us. And we've had two leadership retreats now. One this summer and one last month and we're going to be coming back in December and all the groups are going to be presenting their plans on how to move us forward and really distinguish us. I think another thing that we can do is really partner with some of our other institutions in the state the way others haven't. Sixty percent of the students in the state are in community colleges and those that come to us do quite well. So are there ways for us to really build those tight couplings with the community colleges to enhance our enrollments but allow them to have the transformational education they need? They may not be able to afford to come here those first couple of years, but could they come here the second couple of years and have that great experience on this amazing residential campus. I think so and there are ways for us to make that easier and, if we can do that, it allows them to have a more affordable education because of the tax subsidies at the community colleges. We're reaching out forming regional partnerships. We have a regional K-20 partnership that the Center for Governmental Studies has been working on. We've got superintendents and principals and us, the community colleges, state board of higher education, all partnering on a regional partnership to try and really align those pieces. And there may be some close alliances that come out of that. We've got to see what happens. Higher education in this state is not at an equilibrium state. There isn't enough funding to do what we want to do and we need to look at new models in how to do that and so I'm excited about that in many ways. With that disequilibrium, we can think about new ways to restructure those partnerships and really make us a national model. So we're going to look at those. We've also worked on some focal community colleges where we've got together, for example, five community colleges north of us and said: Let's form an alliance around particular degree programs to streamline everything from advising to financial aid to articulation to reverse transfers so they can take their credits from here and transfer them back to the community college and get their associates degree, you know, if they come here a semester early or something. So we're really trying to think about that tight coupling and making the pipeline more efficient.

**M. Falkoff:** This is only (microphone not in use) but I'm wondering your opinion on whether the train station in DeKalb would be a real boon to the university for faculty and student recruitment purposes, and if so, I don't know what your thoughts are on that, but if so could the university be proactive in trying to make that happen?

**D. Baker:** I asked that question about a year ago and Bill Nicklas looked into that for me. It looks like to get the train station here you'd have to buy the land and lay the track from Elburn to here and that turned out to be scores of millions of dollars and it would financially, without federal support it didn't look possible. The tax base here couldn't help us. I think there's what 70,000 people in DeKalb county or something like that and the tax burden would have been extraordinary to try and put it on the local taxing authority. So the city has been applying for a bus transit system that would help go out there. So, in the short term, we may need to look at bussing out to the station until we can figure out a rail solution and get more efficient and effective bus transit. It's particularly important for, I think, our students who don't have cars or international students who may come here without transportation and want to get into the city. Now we have what Friday-Sunday service in the bus and that's not enough and not regularly. I know I personally would take the train more often if it was stopping downtown instead of fighting the crazy traffic going in. Every time I'm sitting in stop-and-go traffic by myself going downtown I think: Everybody else is by themselves in these cars. What are we all driving for?

Why aren't we on the train? So I think in the short to medium term that train is not fiscally feasible although conceptionally it would be fantastic. So we're going to have to rely on bus and mass transit and we're looking at those options.

Where are we, 7. At a recent Faculty Senate meeting, some faculty expressed dissatisfaction with networking opportunities. Oh this is the Faculty Club one. I like that idea. Now, where? Where would you put it? And so we've looked at a couple places. One, we looked at the Chandelier Room and I toured that a couple months ago. Nice facility and kind of tired and the plaster is falling off the ceiling and they've had some roof leaks and stuff but we could kind of figure that out but there's no capital. I mean you would have to take it out of your operating budget that pays for salaries and everything else, but it might be a good place. We also have auxiliary budgets. You know there is the capital budget that comes from state dollars that we could carve out of the operating budget and then there's auxiliary dollars. And auxiliary dollars are the ones that student fees pay for, housing, for example, the residence hall but also for this building. So there are some auxiliary dollars there. And, as you probably know, we've recently had an RFQ and then selected firms to look at this building and Neptune to see do we need to rethink those buildings and using those auxiliary dollars to do that. And people have been brainstorming, as you start brainstorming all these kinds of ideas. One of the ideas is to make this room into a faculty lounge/lobby for the hotel. So over here we'd have the bar or whatever and the food. You know downtown if you go to Chicago sometimes the lobby is not on the first floor. You get on the elevator to go up to the lobby. So could you have that, use the express elevator outside, you come up to the lobby and there would be a nice lounge area here. That's one brainstorm. I don't want to say that's anywhere near fruition because it's not. It was just a brainstorming idea. But yeah it's a good idea. And, if you all have suggestions, I'm all ears, now or later. I think it's a good idea to have a place like that and I think for a faculty gathering I think it's also important for this building to be a center for the university where we could pull together students and where it was an active place where students met and interacted with each other on academic and social factors. I recently visited the College of DuPage. Has anybody been up there recently? They've spent a lot of money. \$500 million on capital projects because of their local taxing authority over the last five years. Can you imagine? That's a lot of money. And one of the buildings was their major classroom and student services building. It's kind of an L-shaped building and, in the corner of the L, they created kind of a living room for campus; and one half it's got couches and low tables and electrical plugs; and at the other side they've got tables with electrical plugs and stuff; and in the middle is like a donut shaped table with two people in the middle and that's the help desk, you know the easy button desk. So, if you've got an issue, you can go there and then they triage you. And they said they answer 70 or 80 percent of the questions at the table and, if not, they triage you to the right place. So a student might have a financial aid issue or they might have a counseling issue they need help with or a resource center issue or whatever. And those are all in the surrounding or outside the donut in this place. All of those offices are there so they go over here and they'll help you over there. That place was packed. It was like the social living room hub of the university. We need places like that here. We've got them in pockets. I think Barsema Hall in business kind of acts that way. Some of the residence halls a little bit depending on the space you're in. But we don't have that living room for the university.

**G. Slotsve:** I just wanted to thank you for addressing this question. That's one of the reasons we started the faculty lunches, these monthly faculty lunches, was to try to get some networking and have faculty meet. And I think they've been reasonably well attended over the last year. If you're looking for a faculty space, I guess one thing I would just ask is that you consider something that is reasonably centrally located on campus so that you're not going from one end of campus to another.

**D. Baker:** Good idea.

**G. Slotsve:** That way people can have a place to go and it could even be a place where you just had a long day, you want to go take a break, maybe just have a cup of coffee or something; sit down and you just end up meeting people across the university and that's been sorely lacking.

**D. Baker:** I agree.

**G. Slotsve:** At NIU.

**D. Baker:** That place where we've had the lunches might be it. There's no windows in it so it's a little dark, but it's not a bad place.

**P. Stoddard:** You mentioned turning this room or this building and getting it more centered on student activity and, as the student center I think that's probably a good use for this building. One of the detriments or one of the hindrances for students using this building is if they have a meeting here of any sort, my understanding is that all the food has to come from our food services which can be a lot pricier than Pizza Hut or wherever else they might be tempted to pull in their refreshments. That's going to seriously detract from the students wanting to use this building since money is always very tight with them. Have you given any thought to changing the business model by which this building is operated?

**D. Baker:** I think that's an excellent point and I don't know enough about our contractual obligations to know if there's a union issue or if there's some other issue there, but I'm very willing to look at that. I think it's a good idea. Yeah, unions are a place for students to order a bunch of Domino's pizzas or something and have their club meetings and that kind of stuff. We shouldn't push them out of the building because they can't order a pizza. I will say food service on campus, as I've gone around to the residence halls I've been impressed with. It's different than the providers in this building, but the residence halls, I think, are outstanding and you can buy 20 meals on a ticket and use it at the res halls. So that's another thing, if you want to make relationships with students, go have lunch. You can plop down and talk with students. Anytime I plop down, there's a bunch of students that want to talk to me as you might suspect, but same with you guys. It's pretty rewarding. You find out a lot of interesting things sitting down and having those conversations and I think it's seven bucks for all you can eat. You can't beat that and it's good food. Go to the res halls. I know Gilbert's very busy and New Hall's very busy and even Neptune next door.

8. Could I do rapid fire? I've been approached on that one a couple times we're trying to reduce fees, not increase fees so I'm certainly willing to look at all the fees and do some zero-based

budgeting inside the fees. I'm a little bit reticent about raising fees and the size of the fee that I was approached with was pretty extraordinary so that one I guess I've got concerns.

**R. Schneider:** The notion was either/or so as the students options they may either the athletic fee or the fine arts fee. Same price, student's option.

**D. Baker:** If you withdraw the funding for the athletics budget, then you've created another issue there.

**R. Schneider:** But you've got funding for fine arts.

**D. Baker:** Right, but I think it does challenge the financial model there. So you're giving somebody a budget reduction with unknown how much it's going to be because you're putting this volunteer thing in. I think you'd have to be very planful about that. I don't think you'd want that to happen to your department to say we're gonna have a lottery and we'll see how much budget you're going to get.

**R. Schneider:** Is it a lottery if the students choose what they're interested in?

**D. Baker:** It is if you are on the receiving end. I think we need to support the arts. I agree with that. The funding model with a fee like that that takes money away from somebody without telling them how much you're gonna take and they can't plan for it I think is difficult, but I think we do need to support the arts. I'm very much in support of that. Increasing faculty lines; increasing teaching assistant positions; we'll work through that through the program prioritization process. There are some areas busting at the seams and they absolutely need more people but we've got to do it within our budget and prioritize our revenues in appropriate ways.

I did the org chart. Prairie Park Research Plan, I think there's confusion over that title. This refers to something the trustees approved. It's a little tiny sliver of land. I think it's like, it's a triangle, 15 feet by 3 feet by 1 foot or something out at the Monsanto building. So it's in the Monsanto parking lot and there's a little triangle of land that the adjoining building wanted their people to be able to drive across this little triangle to park and we own that little triangle of land and somehow that was called the Prairie Park Research Plan land. So that little triangle is that little thing. The trustees said, yes, the adjoining neighbors can drive across the triangle to park their cars.

The strategic expenditure rate. There was a question about Douglas being over budget. My understanding is it is exactly on budget for the demolition of it. We had two pieces, one was the asbestos abatement and the other was the demolition and we just recently got the demolition estimate and it looks like it's going to come in at that 4.5 total for both the asbestos abatement and the other so that's good news.

And parking, that's linked to Douglas coming down. When Douglas comes down, there's going to be a straight shot from Lucinda out to all those parking lots. It could be we'd have bus transit, you know the express bus that would go from those parking lots down here and it might be quicker than walking from Chick Evans to here than getting on the bus and coming here. So

there may be opportunities there to really use that underutilized parking out there with an appropriate transit system to get you right into the core campus. So we might not have to spend money on building parking lots.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** (No microphone) Why did we build a parking lot in Lot A area behind engineering and the detention pond?

**D. Baker:** Say that again.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** That 100-space parking that we built back behind engineering is actually in the detention pond so you had to put signs, “don’t park here in case it rains.” What logic was that?

**D. Baker:** I wasn’t involved in the funding of it but I think that is for when the creek overflows.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** That’s not a creek. That’s for the river back up.

**D. Baker:** Well the river backs up so I think they’re warning you if you’re gonna have a major flood, don’t park there.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Well that parking lot’s actually the detention pond.

**D. Baker:** Fair enough but about 364 days of the year it’s not. I think they’re just putting up a warning on that. It seemed like a logical place for a parking lot to serve your needs out on that end of campus. Sorry you don’t agree with it. There’s warnings by the lagoon parking lot as well. All right, well thanks for having me.

**W. Pitney:** Sorry to give you the hook right at 4, but we’ve got some business to get to and I appreciate your time today.

## **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

**W. Pitney:** I don’t believe we have any other announcements so what I’d like to do is go on to reports from our advisory committees. We’ve got some unfinished business we’ve got to get to so, to the extent you can keep your reports as concise as possible, that would be great. Our first report is from Paul Stoddard who filled in for Sonya Armstrong.

**P. Stoddard:** So we met October 17 at Governor’s State. To keep this brief, we got talks from the provost and the president of Governor’s State. The main thing they were talking about was they were going from an institution that catered to upper division and graduate students to now being a full four-year plus graduate program. So they’ve just admitted their first freshman class.



They talked about that and what that does to their relationship with the surrounding community colleges where they've been getting all their students from and they're working very hard to keep that a cordial relationship. They also talked about a cohort model in which their freshmen are taking three of their five classes with the same group of students. So that sounded very interesting. They are also instituting an intercollegiate athletics program. So, if you start hearing about Jaguars in the south of Chicago, that's probably what they're referring to, but you never know.

The main focus of the business for the FAC dealt with academic freedom and shared governance issues. There have been a couple of incidents some of which you may have read about already there was the faculty member whom they had offered – University of Illinois Champaign Urbana – had offered a position to a gentleman and he made some, I would say, ill-advised Twitter comments that many people found very offensive and problematic. And the university ended up rescinding the offer much to the detriment of the individual. So we talked about whether or not that individual should have had academic freedom to say what he wanted to say.

And then Chicago State has had a – their Faculty Senate has been having a battle with the administration and their governing board and essentially the governing board has now dismissed the Faculty Senate. And their Faculty Senate is their governing body. Rather than like we are here, it's more akin to our University Council. So we talked about that and basically there's a limited amount the FAC could really do on any of these issues but we're proposing a reiteration, a reaffirmation of our support of both academic freedom and shared governance. So we're going to be putting together a statement to that effect and I suspect at the November meeting they will vote on that. So if anybody has any input that they would like to see included in that, please feel free to forward that to me and/or Sonya.

**W. Pitney:** Very good. Thank you, Paul. Any questions for Dr. Stoddard? And as we continue through, just a reminder for those giving reports, if you could raise your hand real high so our technician can see and turn on the microphones, that would be helpful for her. And also in case you weren't aware, I think the food's arrived. It was a little late but I think we have some food and some drink. So, not to detract from our reports, but feel free if you're thirsty or if you need a snack.

**P. Stoddard:** You want to make sure that arrives after the president comes so he doesn't know to cut that from our budget.

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

**W. Pitney:** All right our next report, George Slotsve is going to give our report for Brian Mackie.

**G. Slotsve:** Unfortunately, Brian could not be here today and both Brian and I sit on the University Benefits Committee. So I'm just going to quickly highlight a couple of things in the report. One issue or one point I want to make is that faculty and staff are able to use the Disability Resource Center. So if you've got disability issues or you need job accommodation

issues, things like that, you can discuss some of this at the Disability Resource Center as well as contact accommodations at HR. This could be for permanent disabilities or activity limitation issues. They do have someone that they can send to the department to evaluate your desk or your chairs, what type of equipment do you need. Funding and how you upgrade the equipment is another question. They'll do their best, but there is that resource available on campus to faculty and staff. The only other point I want to highlight is that the committee is also looking into what we're calling the Metra pre-tax proposal. It's possible for you to potentially pay for your Metra passes out of your pre-tax dollars. So you take it right out of your paycheck and that way you don't get taxed on it. Kind of like how you could handle parking on campus. So what we're looking at is we're seeking more information about the interest level on campus for this type of a program. How many people would be willing to participate in this type of program as well as looking into the administrative costs of the program. And it appears there are a number of issues there. It might not be an inexpensive program to run. It sounds like it could be quite complicated. Potentially we've talked with some other universities about how they're running the program. Not nice details on that. It's kind of messy is how administratively it's worked out for them. But anyhow we're looking into it and, if it's of interest, please let Brian or myself or let Bill know so we can get an idea of whether people would be interested in this type of a program.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, George. I appreciate the clarification on the DRC. I think that question came up earlier in the year. Thank you for getting to that.

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

**W. Pitney:** Our next report is from the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee, Marc.

**M. Falkoff:** I think everyone's probably aware that at the beginning of the year that there was a bit of a brew-ha-ha about the university's new Acceptable Use Policy for technology. There was an online journal called Beta Beat that reported that an NIU student had been doing some research trying to find some information about the Westborough Baptist Church controversy, got a filter screen that advised him that what he was looking at might be illegal or contrary to university policies implying that his usage might be tracked. There's a screen grab of that filter message which is frankly a little bit intimidating. So, among other things, that screen grab quotes our new Acceptable Use Policy as forbidding political activities including organizing or participating in political meetings or demonstrations. So all of this was a little bit shocking to some of us who were, some of us unaware that we had a new Acceptable Use Policy and certainly thought that language, that broad language, about political activity was over broad. When you look at the Acceptable Use Policy, it's also pretty clear that there are provisions made for tracking your web browsing and, to some extent, your emailing. Some people, me included, didn't think this was really consistent with First Amendment principles, with academic freedom principles. In the law school in particular we were concerned because some of us represent clients in our clinics and, if we know our e-mail messages are being read at least in certain jurisdiction for certain purposes, we've waived our privilege even if it was unintentional. The day after some of us complained about this, there was an NIU official announcement which kind of explained the Acceptable Use Policy and told us "really there's been no drastic change" which the more cynical amongst us figured was a concession that there had been a drastic change of some sort. So to its credit, I'm not a member of the CFAC committee by the way, but CFAC met

to discuss these issues and I think the conversation that I witnessed was very encouraging. I think everyone was pretty much on the same page about protecting academic freedom values. There had been a little bit of preliminary research. The American Association of University Professors has kind of a statement paper recommending best practices in order to be most protective of academic freedom, including, for example, data minimization procedures. I think everyone in the committee seemed pretty much on board with that. The committee is right now looking for models for other schools that have adopted those AUP principles so that we might have a template that we can adapt and adopt here. So that is pretty much where they are with that. But I'm not a member of the committee, I'm just an observer.

**W. Pitney:** Yes, George.

**G. Slotsve:** I just wanted to thank Marc. I'm actually representing the UC and Faculty Senate on the Computer Facilities Advisory Committee and, when this Acceptable Use Policy came up, Marc expressed interest in the issue and coming from the law school and being worried about civil liberties and different things, we found out, we basically got him to serve on the sub-committee or work with the sub-committee to keep an eye on our rights as faculty when the Acceptable Use Policy is being put together. So I just want to thank you Marc for doing that. It's much appreciated.

**W. Pitney:** ?Any questions for Marc?

- 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

**W. Pitney:** All right, so we don't have any Board of Trustees reports. They don't meet until next week. So that moves us to our reports from our standing committees. Our first report is just an update from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Richard.

**R. Siegesmund:** This is a late report that came in and I just wanted to alert the senate that following our meeting of October 1 where we heard the STEM report and one of the action items

reflected concern over FMLA leave policy, the extension of the probationary period and faculty work plans that it was stated that there was need for clarity on what constitutes an appropriate work plan and further clarity about what stop-the-tenure-clock means for administrators. So the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee has been asked to look into this, to draft language. We've met once. We're in an information-gathering stage right now and hope to have a report in the future.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you very much Richard.

- 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

**W. Pitney:** Our next report is Jim Wilson from Resource, Space and Budget.

**J. Wilson:** Yes. This is one of our shorter reports. Not a whole lot to verbalize. We're getting ready to design our priority statement which will be for the spring semester. We are taking some of the ideas and looking at these ideas from the Dickeson book about program and priorities, and we'll meeting for a workshop in November to go over the budget, a budget workshop with Nancy Suttentfield. And some of the details are here. There's not a whole lot of details. Several members went to the Academic Impressions conference in the earlier part of this month and some of those ideas were brought back and we talked at length about them, but it's just part of the process in designing this priority statement. I think that's about all I have at this point.

**W. Pitney:** Very good. Any questions for Jim?

- 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

**W. Pitney:** Well, moving right along that takes us to our unfinished business and we had budgeted some time today to continue our discussion on the NIU Plus. At our October 1 meeting, we had a motion to endorse the concept and framework of the PLUS task force recommendations for the NIUs general education program. I mentioned at that time that it was endorsed by the General Education Committee and well as the Student Association, and I explained that the PLUS program was met with a claim at the conference for the Association of General and Liberal Studies. We had voted – we had postponed the vote on that motion so that we can continue our discussions and so we'll take that up here at that time. Just to recap a little bit, we heard at that October 1 Faculty Senate meeting several concerns. Among these concerns was the

impact of the program on the English Department. Also the concerns about the impact such a program would have on our academic advisors as well as our science laboratories just to name a few. Questions about the implementation have continued to bubble up. There's some consternation about that. So that's continued to surface. And also Greg Long mentioned that diversity is an issue and whether it might be included in the knowledge domain was a concern expressed by the Diversity Task Force.

Since that last meeting, the PLUS Task Force has had numerous faculty and staff forums and has given the opportunity for open comment. The PLUS Task Force took the feedback from these forums and the open comments, have deliberated, weighed and considered that information. Michael Kolb met with the GEC. Just to remind you that's comprised of no less than 11 of our faculty members. He met with them on October 16 at their meeting. The PLUS Task Force, he explained to them where the PLUS Task Force stood in terms of the feedback received and their disposition on many of the concerns. While the General Education Committee had previously endorsed the concept and framework at the October 16 meeting, they drilled down a little bit deeper and took a look at five of the principles that were outlined, and these were actually items 7 to 11 in the executive summary of the initial report if you want to refer back to that. They examined those and ended up endorsing those with some qualifications.

So just to summarize a little bit of what they talked about there and approved: They approved the maximum number of courses taken from any single department used to fulfill the knowledge domain requirements change from three to two and that any courses that had a lab attached to that it would actually count as one course, not two separate ones. They also approved adding science to the nature and technology knowledge domain that was initially proposed. They also looked at approving the grouping of lower and upper division knowledge domain courses into themed pathways of studies that offer optional transcript documentation of a three-course focus and a six-course minor within a single pathway. And they also approved the reduction in the minimum required credit hours from 39 to 33, basically from 13 courses to 11 courses. Just to give you some of the discussions that have transpired since that time. Also on October 24, the PLUS Task Force provided an addendum that was made publically available. That addendum was to the original report and what they had done was, and that's actually in your packet, what they had done was taken the concerns that arose during that open period for comments, concerns that I had spoken with Michael about that were raised at our last Faculty Senate meeting, and they sat down as a task force and systematically went through them to see if any changes were necessary and, if so, what would those changes be and, if not, why not. So that addendum actually provides some rationale and even identifies some changes.

So as I mentioned I also took time and I met with Michael. I shared with him the concerns that came out of our last Faculty Senate meeting and I learned some things that aren't necessarily very apparent in the report. For example, not in the report necessarily has been a detailed budget submitted to the provost that identifies the projected cost for the changes in the general education if we move to the PLUS Program. Within that budget is money dedicated for the training of our on-campus advisors as well as our off-campus advisors that reside at community colleges. They felt that it's important to address both of those constituencies to make sure that community colleges are addressing any students that might transfer to us. Also addressed was the fact that they're going to create an implementation team. I suspect a call for implementation team

members will be forthcoming, and that team will be charged with identifying the logistics of implementing the program. And also he shared some data with me in terms of numbers, where we're at with our current enrollment in our general education courses, etc. And I came away feeling like the status quo how we've always done things probably isn't very tenable. So that's some conversations, some forums, some things that have transpired since then. I'll open up the floor for any comments, concerns, questions. Paul?

**P. Stoddard:** Right. So, last time I raised the issue about the science courses and the reduction that we see and the requirement there including the reduction of the need to have a science lab as part of the program. I was not alone in that concern. The chairs of the various science departments got together, wrote to the task force and seriously questioned the wisdom of that move. I was very disappointed by the response that we got back which was basically: We're gonna add the word science to the one box and everybody else is getting short tripped so feel free to join them. And basically made no change whatsoever to the substance of what they're proposing. I think this is very short sighted. I think we are essentially dumbing down the program to make the students happy. You don't want to take a lab, don't worry you don't have to any more. You don't want to do something extra in art, don't worry you don't have to anymore. Whatever it takes to keep you here and keep you happy, that's what we're going to give you. Whether or not we think it's important for you, that doesn't matter. So we're really catering to the student whims instead of what we think the students need. And I feel that that's a huge mistake and I'm not going to vote in favor of this the way things stand now under any circumstance.

**W. Pitney:** You know, I've listened to the arguments on both sides, read the addendum, etc. and I'm aware of the sciences wanting to address science literacy for example and making sure that's embedded in the general education program and continue to have a lab requirement. I went back and looked at the baccalaureate outcomes and science literacy isn't imbedded in there either but that was from, the latest I could find was 2010, but I think perhaps it should be. Maybe that's something that needs to be in there. Personally as somebody glad I had a strong health science and biological science background, it served me well, but my thought about it as a I thought about this, I went through our current general education requirements and it's conceivable that in our current general education model, if I was a student, I would have to take between 7 and 11 hours of science and math. What we've learned is a lot of students still aren't taking necessarily the lab. Some of them are taking three three-credit courses. I could actually take three courses that probably would deviate from a traditional science curriculum in the current form. Now I could take human nutrition, I could take symbolic logic and I could take a computing science course, for example. And whether or not those would address the science literacy, I don't know. I don't know enough about those courses, but it wouldn't be from the traditional harder sciences such as geology or geography or biology. So even the current model doesn't guarantee that they're getting that.

**P. Stoddard:** That's why this was a lost opportunity then. If the current model doesn't guarantee that, then maybe they should have rearranged it so that it does. I think the biggest concern they had was reducing the number of hours and you know well if we increase it in science literacy then we're going to have to increase it art literacy and this literacy and that literacy and I certainly don't want to take away from the literacy from any other group, I think they're all very

important. I'm arguing that one extra hour, so if it's seven hours then they're more likely to take the lab course. And, yes, they could have taken three three-hour courses if they really hated the lab. They did have that possibility. But we've just made it that much easier for them. Yes, I think a box that said scientific literacy and you have to take at least one course from this as well as some other things. I mean symbolic logic is a pretty good course, I wouldn't want to short sell that one and some of the others you mentioned. But it's a lost opportunity. If there were gaps, if there were cracks in there that students could have fallen through, then we should have taken this time to fix those rather than institutionalize them, make them: Sure don't take a lab.

**W. Pitney:** And, I don't know perhaps there's a I mean in terms of the scientific literacy could they get that from the social sciences as well? I don't know. Joel, you had a comment.

**J. Stafstrom:** Yeah, I'll respond to this both as a biology faculty member and also a member of the task force. Not that this will sit well but the task force had to make a lot of hard decisions. It had to make a lot of compromises. What I will tell you is that the letter that was submitted by the chairs was very well received and especially the strong argument for scientific literacy in the country. And we all see it today. We see people unduly fearful of Ebola because they don't understand the science of it and they don't have the tools to understand the science of it. We get that. I think that the bigger question with regard to PLUS became: Is a laboratory experience necessary to learn the scientific method, to learn what science is? And I don't really want to argue for or against that, but what I will suggest is some ways that we can continue to educate our students to get them the kind of knowledge and approach that we think is important. And I think that this is where the pathways come in. I believe, maybe I'm wrong, but the pathways will be interesting, students will take them, and every pathway will include a course in science. What I would suggest is that your department, geology, as you make your gen ed classes that become part of these pathways, that you find a way to add laboratory experiences in there. Maybe what you do is you offer a three-hour class that has a laboratory as part of it rather than a stand-alone one-hour lab that goes with your three-hour lecture. But I believe that the critical experiences that we want to deliver can be delivered still and will hopefully, I won't say it's a certainty, but that's a way that we can adapt to this model.

**P. Stoddard:** I think the way you put those boxes together, you make it easy for somebody who doesn't want to take the science to totally avoid it. What I hear you saying is take your three-hours course, make it a two-hour lecture and a one-hour lab. We have a lot of trouble fitting everything we'd like in there anyway. I'll take that to the department, however, as a suggestion, but I'm still not particularly satisfied with – I mean especially when you agree that scientific literacy in this country is taking a huge hit and I think we should be strengthening it any way we can rather than looking for ways to...

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Any other comments, questions, discussion point?

**R. Schneider:** I sympathize with Professor Stoddard about content integration being kind of a euphemism for content dilution and, while I understand the principle of the student learning outcomes, governing the content of general education courses, I'm concerned that the general education course will simply become flavorings to a multitude of classes which teach the SOLs over and over and over again. And I'd like to bring up perhaps an odd example of ballet. Ballet

doesn't address any of the student learning outcomes because none of them concern how we should hold our bodies or how we should move our bodies or what is beautiful even in the position of a body or the movement of a body. And yet under the old-fashioned concept of a breadth requirement which universities used to have, I can't imagine anything that would give more breadth to the education of an engineering major than a single semester of ballet. This opportunity is lost under the new plan.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. I think I saw another hand.

**D. Macdonald:** I have similar concerns that I've voiced earlier on implementation and, for better or worse, we have a fairly complex curricular change process. And I see a couple places both in the addendum and in the draft report under implementation where it discusses upon approval of curriculum changes. To me that should be potentially the first step of implementation. Not something that happens outside of implementation. And I haven't seen any discussion of when, how or maybe perhaps curricular changes are in process already but they also seem to take a lot longer than the couple of months that the timeline is proposing. I'm wondering whether anyone has similar concerns or whether someone can speak to that.

**W. Pitney:** David, do you have any insights on that by any chance to answer that, David Gorman?

**D. Gorman:** The short answer to Doris's question is: I have the same concerns. So when the PLUS Task Force was convened, then-Provost Alden said: You have two years to come up with a package of nifty ideas about how to change general education. Then we were told: No, it's only three semesters. Now, in fact, that's 22 months ago, so it ended up being about three-and-a-half semesters. I'm not worried about the timeline particularly. What we worked on the whole time is coming up with the nifty ideas, not out of our own hats, but look at what other people were doing and trying to put together a coherent package. But we didn't really deal with implementation. I mean it came up all the time because you can't talk about changing things without asking; How would that work here? All the meetings I attended, probably more than half over the 23 months, the response was always the same: Well we're not, we can't really worry about that too much right now. That's not our charge. So we have a report which is a package of I think, look I'm on the task force, I endorse it. It's a package of nifty ideas. And the question of implementation is something that concerns me a lot. I'm not complaining about anything that went on on the task force. I think we had a charge and we did it. You know you mentioned the review period. That was three weeks. We worked on something for 20 months and give people 20 days to come up with responses. I'm less worried about the negative response to things like this. People just didn't have time to look at it and come up with... that just seems crazy, right? And then also now Doris put her finger on it, I'm fond of everything in the report, but if you're going to ask me point blank, put me on the spot, thanks a lot, the one odd thing in the report is we have these implementation dates of fall '15 and spring '16. So really that's like last week. What? And then most of the worries that have been raised have had at least an implementation component because look we're proposing something that's different from what we have now. So then the question becomes: Well, okay, how do we get from here to there? Yeah, exactly. Well the task force isn't concerned with that. I mean that was not our charge, nor is it anything that we're



competent to do. So how exactly is that gonna happen? It's not gonna happen in fall '15. It's just not.

**W. Pitney:** Probably not in its entirety, right? I mean it will be phased in.

**D. Gorman:** Certainly things could happen. I mean there are certain things that are happening and I think there are certain things that are very doable but then there are other things, you know, not so much. That's not really a very good answer.

**W. Pitney:** Anybody else? Yes, Michael.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I just have one just simple thought to the people on the task force since I was on the other task force which was the assessment one. Is it possible to take a look at the I mean without completely unraveling it, to say that at least one laboratory-based experience could be included into that without killing the whole project? In other words, there's all these different experiences that are plus lines and could there not be something looked at that gives at least a laboratory experience as part of the structure? Just a quick look back to see if there's structurally something they could do. It could be something that we could do as a group to say there is some compromise into the positions but they have to be a little bit. You know, is it so hard to say that we have to limit that one-credit hour out of the system. Historically we've had a terrible problem with everybody says well we have to shorten the undergraduate experience. Engineering has been the biggest problem with that. Every so many years everybody says you have too many engineering credit hours, yank some out. So our students get less and less experience as engineers and learning knowledge and so we keep shipping out people with just a little bit less knowledge than they did the previous generations of engineers. After a while you keep stripping out the meat and you end up with nothing but bone so we have to think about that.

**W. Pitney:** I don't know the answer to that. I don't know.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** It's a fair question to ask.

**M. Cefaratti:** Pardon my lack of knowledge on this one, but who ultimately says, yes, we're going to implement the PLUS program?

**W. Pitney:** The way our curricular process is structured, the UCC would have the, wouldn't the UCC, Joel, have the final authority there and then it goes as information only up to UC, University Council?

**J. Stafstrom:** We made our report to the provost and through the curricular process (no microphone) says, yes, you could change it, yes, it could be changed. This simply represents our report to the provost of a recommendation. Just as a personal side to Paul, I don't like the science part of this program either, trust me. But it is the task force, the committee decision of the consensus of what's going forward and I'm supporting it from that point of view. And yet I still think there's opportunities to change things, the science curriculum, a lab requirement, probably anything is not done, it's simply our recommendation.

**W. Pitney:** I think there is going to be latitude with any program whether it's a new major in a department or a doc program, etc. to change it as it unfolds and where you see a need. Paul.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, I think if I remember from my days of sitting up there, the Gen Ed Committee should submit its report where it voted on this to the UCC and then UCC would discuss it there. And, if shared governance still means anything here, then they should have the ability to say yes or no on it, or suggest modifications or send it back or do whatever they want to do with it. So our report to provost lets her know what's happening, prepares her for the debate at UCC perhaps, but it should have to still go to UCC for approval.

**W. Pitney:** That's correct and then from there it's just information only to the UC, University Council. Certainly the UC could vote to send it back if there is some dissention and then it's a – I don't know what happens after that. A little tongue in cheek there. Let's go here and then back to you, Richard.

**G. Baker:** ... and I'm in the Department of Chemistry and I look at labs we teach in the introductory chemistry program for example, and I wonder if PLUS is an opportunity to maybe reflect perhaps on some of our practices. More specifically, I hear feedback from students regarding the introductory chem lab experience. They do want to get it over with. It is a program requirement for a lot of programs on campus to have a lab component, but they don't particularly have a positive experience. I think one of the reasons for that is because a lot of labs are structured to take a pinch of this and smidgen of that and follow a recipe and it really doesn't sort of get at the core of what laboratory science, in general, is all about which is maybe inquiry and the practice of doing research and so on and so forth. There's 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. And that's, I think, what we want to try to instill in this overall issue of science literacy. I'm not really certain I see a lot of laboratory courses doing that and I think the frustration that I also see with students that have taken the various labs is related to this. And we can do a better job of addressing this. And maybe, within 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 I think that is in the spirit of what PLUS is intending.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Richard.

**R. Schneider:** The issue of implementation dates, the School of Theater and Dance is not dragging its feet on this at all. We have worked out a series of 12 measures that we can take 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. So we feel somewhat as if we are being asked to dive off of the high board without being fully certain that the swimming pool will be full of water when we arrive.

**W. Pitney:** Very good. I think it's fair to say there's still lots of concerns bubbling up in terms of the implementation. To that end maybe a statement of concern from the Faculty Senate is in order. Depending upon how this vote goes it might read something like: Despite our

endorsement of X, Y, Z we've got some concerns about the implementation and urge due diligence to make sure attention is paid to the components of such and go from there. I don't know, just brainstorming here a little bit. Doris.

**D. Macdonald:** I have a lot of comments today. I'll make two rhetorical comments, one is the use of the terminology, pathways minor, which I find really problematic. A minor, and I'm going to quote the APPM, is a limited curriculum in a designated subject area and I think this is just a rhetorical thing, perhaps we can come up with another term that's not pathways minor. I think it's confusing and I think it violates the spirit of what minors actually are. I love the idea of pathways. I like the focus, the three-course focus, and I like a six-course focus, but I just think the terminology perhaps that could be taken back to whoever.

**W. Pitney:** I think the APPM could then recognize what a pathway is period.

**D. Macdonald:** Maybe the APPM needs to then add what a pathway is and then just use the word pathway, I don't know. That's a rhetorical one. The other rhetorical thing is something that shows up in the report and I think it may just be a misinterpretation on my part, but there are a couple of places and I'm sorry I didn't site where they are, where there's reference to IAI articulation that the Gen Ed Committee will approve. And I'm not sure if that means new articulations or if that means courses that are already approved through IAI that the Gen Ed Committee has already approved in certain knowledge domains. It's about the knowledge domains. I wish I could find the quote.

**W. Pitney:** Correct me if I'm wrong, David, but I think the intent of that was to suggest where current courses that articulate within NIU would fit in the knowledge domain.

**D. Macdonald:** If that's what it is, then I wasn't sure if it meant going forward that the Gen Ed Committee would be responsible for those articulations as opposed to departments being responsible for those articulations. It wasn't clear to me in the report. I'm sorry, Joel, you look like a deer in the headlights.

**J. Stafstrom:** Well, I'm kind of (no microphone) I can say something but I don't think it would be necessarily useful. The entire process, we will follow all appropriate regulations associated with the IAI. I mean we're required to do that. Any course that has a code, we will continue to use that code and find them. The Department of English doesn't have to figure these out. I think one thing that's a little bit different is that some upper-level classes that are approved by the General Education Committee can count for general education credit which is a new feature. If community colleges are not teaching classes at the 300- and 400-level, they probably don't have IAI codes and yet we would still count them. I'm not sure if that's addressing your question or not.

**D. Macdonald:** I'm sorry I forgot to highlight it. It's a rhetorical question so I didn't know if the Gen Ed committee going to start being responsible for articulating courses.

**D. Gorman:** I certainly hope not. But it is a little ambiguous is it not in the report.

D. Macdonald: That's my concern.

D. Gorman: It's my concern too. I don't want the Gen Ed Committee to get into that unless that becomes the only thing. Whatever happens, whatever the Gen Ed Committee does is going to change and, if you look at the report and say what's the implication of what Gen Ed is going to do in the future, there's actually several different directions it goes off in. I certainly hope it would not end up doing that.

**W. Pitney:** I'm gonna offer just a couple of reflections here before we finish up. I think it's important to acknowledge the hard work and effort put forth by the 24 members of this task force. It's easy to take something and chew it up and throw stones at it, etc. I think these folks have done a really good job, 16 of whom were faculty from multiple departments and colleges. I think the research, thought and the diligence, carefulness and willingness to continually solicit input, weigh and consider, that was really, really done well.

I have appreciated the stewardship too. I think a lot of folks on that task force put their own interests aside and looked at the larger good of things. When I first read the report for the first time in a while I was kind of excited about the general education curriculum. It's been a long time since that's been updated. I think the framework for me offers a pretty meaningful and flexible experience for our students that is likely not be matched by our statewide competitors. I also think that it will do a fine job of preparing our students as citizens.

There's always going to be questions. Why must we change what we're doing now because it's not really working very well. Is the proposed program perfect? Nope. Is it foolproof? Probably not. Is the program better than what we currently have? I think so. Will there be challenges to implementing it? Undoubtedly as there always is. Will there be a cost associated with it? Yeah there's a cost for everything. I think, if you look at the challenges and shortcomings and ask the hard questions, it's really important. We've got to do that and I'm proud of this body and others for raising those and having the task force address those.

But I think we've reached a point where we've got to be willing to move on to the next chapter and celebrate the proposed changes. As I think about the many successful programs that we have that have taken root on our campus including the, you know, think about the first-year initiatives. Think about the OCO program and our undergraduate student engagement and how those have flourished. Think about our new degree programs, for example the Ph.D. in health sciences. I think of folks we have on this campus that do clinical trials and the complicated nature of running those and running those well and looking at the logistics and making sure everything matches us and I guess I come away feeling confident that we've got the right people in place to implement a program and modify it as necessary depending upon what we find with it and change if it needs to be changed. I think we've got to look hard at our overall structure in terms of the curricular process and example and make it less of a glacial pace and a little bit more contemporary. That's beside the point so I guess, for me, I think this program is what the students and faculty need. Yes, Robin?

**R. Moremen:** Is it possible to approve the idea behind the PLUS program but not approve the rush to implementation for fall of '15? That, to me, seems like a huge concern from the

individuals from whom I have solicited feedback. The rush to implementation, to me, for all the reasons you expressed about diving into a pool with no water. The students will be confused, the faculty will be confused. Everybody is going to be confused in this rush to implement it by fall. Is there any chance that we can say: Yes, okay, let's do this thing, but I'm thinking about the length of time it takes to change for example, changes in the catalog. The length of that process alone is just glacial and yet here we are trying to do this by next fall. Like they said, it's yesterday as far as the time table is concerned. So is it possible to approve the idea without approving the actual implementation? And, I guess a larger question is: What's the rush? If we're gonna do this, let's do it right. Let's not just throw it at the wall and see what sticks.

**W. Pitney:** Yeah, that's a good clarification. Just as a reminder, the original motion was to endorse the concept and framework of the proposal and to me that doesn't necessarily mean implementation. So if we wanted to endorse the concept and framework and have a friendly amendment to however express concern about the speed of implementation, we could certainly do that. There's nothing that prevents us from doing that. I'm looking over at Ferald because I would need his guidance on how to do that. Does that address your question a little bit?

**R. Moremen:** Yes, it would. I don't know what it necessitates. Does it necessitate a motion? What does it necessitate at this point?

**F. Bryan:** I'd say a separate motion. As you say, we have since we postponed it, this essentially is on the floor. It's been moved and seconded to endorse, as you say, the structure and framework. That's the motion. If you wish, you can have a second motion to encourage delay in implementation.

**W. Pitney:** So, in short, we can do a second motion. The current motion on the floor is endorsement of concept and framework and we could take a second motion to urge caution in the implementation, to do it carefully and do it right, for example.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Clarification, what do you mean by the word, framework?

**W. Pitney:** I think of framework in terms of how that program is structured in terms of knowledge domains, pathways, that sort of thing.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Not necessarily the breakdown in course numbers or anything? I want to make sure that I understand about...

**W. Pitney:** The motion didn't speak to the number of credit hours and those sorts of things. Certainly that's ultimately going to be decided by the UC. I think the general premise of it is what I think of in terms of concept and framework. Do we endorse the premise of this, of this fact that we're moving to broad knowledge domains, that certain courses will be situated within those; this idea that we will have pathways available for students and that the pathways will address specific questions that are threaded across different course, courses from different departments. That sort of thing. Yes ma'am.

**T. Than:** I think the term, “framework,” is quite contentious because on page 10 it says the task force recognizes the importance of foreign language skills, but there is no clear language or the clear description of what level courses will be counted towards the pathway or whether or not the current existent minors will be considered for the new structure. So if we endorse the framework, I think my department will ask me what really did you endorse? Are you agreeing with the current structures or are we going to amend it? I think it will complicate the process even if we have a second motion. So I think we really have to, I’m not sure whether we can separate the, like Robin was saying, separate the idea and the whole structure all together rather than use them together.

**W. Pitney:** I guess, for me, when I thought of concept and framework I was thinking the general idea that this proposal represented. Does that mean we are going to count beans within different areas? I don’t think it represents that. Does it exclude some courses being considered in the knowledge domains? I don’t think so because I think that’s still within the power of the different departments to imbed objectives and into courses that might fit real well into the various knowledge domains. We’ve got that flexibility within our own curriculum to do that. Society and Culture for example, gosh I could see foreign languages as really having a large piece of that knowledge domain. Go ahead.

**T. Than:** But today I am not sure that the people outside of this room can hear this kind of conversation. If they cannot hear, there will be a lot of confusion. So if we don’t have an amendment even to the current report, it will be really hard to understand for the wider community to realize what we have endorsed.

**W. Pitney:** So, what’s your suggestion?

**T. Than:** My suggestion is that I think we do not need to rush to any motions unless there is a general agreement of what this current report really presents.

**W. Pitney:** And, I guess, for me, when I think of concept and framework, that was the framing of the initial motion. Again it’s the overall premise, the overall idea, concept. Is it exclusionary? I don’t know. I mean the GEC has just made some decisions about what they have proposed to endorse and from there it will go to the UCC. And putting the motion on the floor I was hoping this body would dissect it, give some critical feedback, which I think it’s done, but also perhaps weigh and consider some things and either support or not support its faculty colleagues who designed the framework and the concept. Maybe I’m looking at it too simple and maybe somebody with a little bit more intelligence needs to step up and help me articulate that, but that’s kind of how I viewed it. Yes, Richard?

**R. Schneider:** I’m something of an outsider but I think I can explain the framework and I’d like to preface this by saying that I favor the work of the task force and I favor the motion before us. The framework however is absurd. The students complain that their efforts are dispersed over too many different subject areas and that they are forced to take too many classes which they feel are irrelevant to their existing and present concerns or maybe their future concerns as they currently imagine them. And we comfort them by grouping subject areas into vast domains and we tell them that they are no longer studying many disparate subjects but, in fact, only one

gigantic subject, society and culture, for example. So that upstream we are creating the illusion of unity to comfort the students and then we shunt them on to pathways in order to give them direction and now we are, in fact, going in the opposite direction. We're telling them they are going towards a goal because all pathways lead to some place, but these pathways, in fact, become broader and broader until some pathways are indistinguishable from meadows because the pathways all contain subjects culled from many different domains and knowledge areas so that the pathway, which is supposed to give direction, in fact once again gives breadth so that the task force's work is of constant internal struggle between diffusion and concentration. And I think this is part of the paradox of higher education in any case. I think students will always be confronted with the opportunity, even the obligation to learn something which they didn't intend to learn and that they will then have the obligation to somehow make sense of it to see how the crab Rangoon from the Chinese buffet of knowledge that they have just put on their plate somehow relates, or doesn't relate, to the General Tao's chicken and it's absurd. It is literally absurd. It is incoherent but it is part in parcel of higher education which is why I support the motion.

**W. Pitney:** That's hard to beat. I'm gonna just be quiet. We've got a concern that's been expressed, a level of clarification that's been provided and any other concerns, thoughts, replies? Yes, David.

**D. Gorman:** I'll just say in response to earlier considerations, this is not a curriculum committee. I think we 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. The General Education Committee which is a curriculum-type committee endorsed the spirit of the thing in one meeting and then in another meeting sat down and said: Okay, here's five things, which is not the whole report either, but just five things that apply to general education and we went over those separately.

**W. Pitney:** Correct. I appreciate that comment about the general spirit of it.

**D. Gorman:** I mean, we can vote that up or down.

**W. Pitney:** Okay, call the question? Yes, second, okay. If you don't have a clicker, you'll need one. You can grab yourself a cookie or a drink while you're at it back there.

**R. Moremen:** Bill, can you remind us what the question is?

**W. Pitney:** The motion on the floor is to endorse the concept and framework of the report.

**R. Moremen:** Is there going to be a separate vote on the implementation issue?

**W. Pitney:** If there's a secondary motion in terms of the implementation, we can address that after this. So the motion on the floor is to endorse the concept and framework of the PLUS Task Force report. A would be to approve and vote yes to endorse the reports, concept and framework; B would be to vote no you do not endorse it; and C or 3 would be to abstain. A, support yes approve the motion to endorse the concept and framework; B is no; C is abstain. Pat, are we

ready to vote? If you get a smiley face on your clicker, you're in good shape. Has everybody voted? We ready to close the vote? Okay, the vote is closed.

Yes – 22

No – 8

Abstain – 2

**W. Pitney:** The motion carries. Now we've had some discussion here, I know we're past due, but I know we've had some discussions about concerns related to the implementation. Is there a motion that we would like to put forth to express our concerns related to the implementation? Robin, would that – is that the direction you'd like to go with that?

**R. Moremen:** Yes, that sounds fine. The wording, I accept your wording if that's agreeable to all. It gets at my issue of concern about the implementation.

**W. Pitney:** Okay and, Doris, do we have a second? I wish you could remind me of what I said because I'm not exactly sure. I'm teasing. So what we've got is this motion that the Faculty Senate expresses its concern over the speed of implementation, correct? And we want to articulate that it's done right, not just necessarily for speed alone, is the spirit of this motion. Does that capture it? We can wordsmith it a little bit.

**D. Macdonald:** I'll second that.

**W. Pitney:** Doris, we have a second. So A on your clicker would be to.

**R. Schneider:** We need discussion.

**W. Pitney:** Yes thank you, Richard.

**R. Moremen:** Yes.

**R. Schneider:** I'm less concerned about speed than coherence. I don't mind moving quickly with this on condition that the various regulatory bodies and control bodies that, for example, govern curricular affairs or catalog language move at the same speed. All things considered, I'd like to go quickly as long as some units aren't trailing their feet and others are racing ahead.

**W. Pitney:** So, the way you'd capture the implementation is to do it right.

**R. Schneider:** Do it in a coordinated manner.

**W. Pitney:** Of which speed could play a role; it could not perhaps. We don't know. Good. Any other discussion points? Hearing none?

**Unidentified:** Is he putting that forward as a friendly amendment.

**W. Pitney:** Are you putting that forward as a friendly amendment?



**R. Schneider:** I'm not quite certain whether it's compatible, it's certainly not unfriendly.

**W. Pitney:** So, at the end of the day what we want to express is concern over the implementation process and that due diligence is given to that so it's done right.

**R. Schneider:** Modalities of implementation. How about that? That includes speed.

**R. Moremen:** I don't. My concern is the sacrifice of quality for expediency. I'm not sure whether our two motions are, in fact, compatible. As I understand it, we've been presented with a near fait accompli or a wish that this be implemented by fall of '15. And, in my years of experience here, I just see that as potentially a recipe for disaster. And I do not want the expediency of living up to the publicity around this sacrifice the quality of the effort. If we're going to do this and we approve that we are in agreement with the general idea, I want to see it done well, not done to meet a deadline that has been set out there.

**W. Pitney:** And I guess that, you just did a great job as articulating what I viewed as expressing concern over the implementation of this. So, for me, I think that captured it. And, if we like, we could certainly, with the understanding that we could craft the language maybe as a letter of concern to express this motion to the provost or the powers that be. We could certainly do that. Yes, Paul?

**P. Stoddard:** I'd like to offer as a friendly amendment to the original motion that we 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're concerned about the whole thing but the concerns over the implementation of which includes the modalities and the pace, thereof, perhaps.

**R. Moremen:** I like the inclusion of the word, "pace." That captures my concern.

**W. Pitney:** So what we've got is a motion to express concern over the implementation of which includes the modalities and pace thereof, something to that effect. Does that capture the spirit of what we want with those friendly amendments? Any other discussion? So, 1 or A would be to approve that concern of the senate; 2 would be to vote no or reject that concern; and 3 would be to abstain. So 1 is to uphold, approve that concern; 2 no, 3 abstain. Are we ready, Pat? Have everybody voted? We're ready to close the vote. Let's see what we got. Perhaps a less contentious issue, 25, 6 and 2. The motion carries.

Yes – 25

No – 6

Abstain – 2

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

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

**W. Pitney:** I don't think we have any new business. Any comments or 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:** I would accept a motion to adjourn.

**Unidentified:** So moved.

**W. Pitney:** So moved, and a second.

**Unidentified:** Second.

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