FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, August 31, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Allori, Arado, Baker, Hamid, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Bujarski, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chomentowski, Chung, Conderman, Farrell, Garcia, Glatz, Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hathaway, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Manning, Martin (for Hanley), May, McHone-Chase, Millis, Montana, Moraga, Naples, Nejdl, Newman, Novak, Patro, Riley, Rodgers, Ssaborio, Salehinia (for Ryu), Schatteman, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stoddard, Streb, Summers (for Dugas), Tan, Than, VanderSchee, Wilson (for Konen), Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Azad, Briscoe, Campbell, Chen, Chitwood, Demir, Hanley, Khoury, Konen, Mogren, Pavkov, Penrod, Rosenbaum, Ryu, Stephen, Thu

OTHERS PRESENT: Baker, Bryan, Doederlein, Jemison, Reynolds, Ruxton, Stang, Streb

OTHERS ABSENT: Klaper, Nicholson, Shortridge, VandeCreek,

I.   CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. Like to call the meeting to order. My name is Greg Long. I'm the Faculty Senate president and I'd like to welcome you to our first meeting of the fall semester.

Meeting called to order at 3 p.m.

II.   ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: Our first order of business is adoption of the agenda. There are no walk-in items today. I would, however, like to make a motion to amend the agenda to move item X. D, which includes items 1 through 5 of that particular item to follow immediately the President's Announcements, business portion of the meeting to get that done as soon as possible. May I have a second to that motion? Janet Hathaway. Okay, any discussion? All in favor of that change say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstain? Okay, we have an agenda.

III.   APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 27, 2016 FS MEETING

G. Long: The next item is the approval of the minutes from the April 27 meeting. We need a motion to accept the minutes. Laura Beemer, okay. Second, Richard Siegesmund. Any changes, additions, typos to anything that you saw? Okay. All right. So all in favor of accepting the minutes say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstention? Okay we approved the minutes. Very good.

IV.   PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A.   Review of the Executive Vice President and Provost per NIU Bylaws, Article 19.3.1.2 –
         President Doug Baker – Page 4

G. Long: Moving along, President's Announcements. I would like to welcome you here for the 2016-2017 academic year. My name again is Greg Long, my second year as Faculty Senate president, also my last year. As this position works, you have up to potentially five years, depending on your time on University Council. I'm on my sixth year of University Council so I'm automatically off University Council at the end of this year. So I've got one more year up here in front of you and then I'll not be at the senate or council meetings from an official standpoint.

I'd like to start out with, how many of you are new to the senate? Raise your hands. Are you in the room? Okay, so not a lot. I would welcome all of you who are new. Last year I sent out invitations to everyone on senate to schedule a meeting with me. Those – probably not going to send out those same invitations again this year, but if you're new or have any questions, please don't hesitate to send me an email, I'd be more than happy to meet with you, talk about any of the issues we're dealing with here at senate. I'm typically on campus Monday through Friday during the day. I'm happy to meet with any of you. Would encourage you to do that.

I would like to introduce some of the people you see up here. To my right, your left, is Pat Erickson. Pat is the brains behind the operation, she's the administrative assistant for University Council and Faculty Senate and you're not going to find someone more knowledgeable about how the university works and policies and procedures. I've been blessed to have her as an administrative assistant. Next to her is Ferald Bryan, our parliamentarian, assuming that on the consent agenda you endorse him. He's been the parliamentarian for a number of years and a great resource to us as a body and I've taken advantage of him many times to ask how we do this or what are the considerations. He's been a huge asset to me. Also like to introduce Zach Bohn, new in the Altgeld 103 office, the new administrative assistant, support person for Operating Staff Council and SPS Council. Brought this to your attention a little last year. There was a little unfairness when you think about shared governance. As Faculty Senate president, I have release time from courses and other service – my job is being Faculty Senate president and executive secretary of the University Council. Now we also have two other governing – three other governing councils, the Student Association, but also the Operating Staff Council and the SPS Council. The individuals – the constituencies of Operating Staff Council and SPS Council outnumber us faculty by far and yet from a participation standpoint their councils, and particularly their presidents of councils, have no release time, no clerical support, no technology support. One of the things we argued for last year successfully was to provide clerical support, office support and space. And so Zach – August 16. Brand new in the office and a great asset. Looking forward to the support that we're able to offer with our fellow councils. If you get things done at the university, it does require coordination and collaboration. Pleased to have you. And then you may have noticed that you're seeing captioning going on up there. All right? Our captioner is Cathy Rajcan, she can't say hi; she's occupied right now. What we found is that as a group, and we do the same in University Council, that we have to have a transcript, right? Given

2

that we have to have a transcript, why not provide things in a more accessible fashion during the meeting? And so we tried this as a first, last year in both Faculty Senate and University Council. And the overwhelming response we had was positive. I mean, if you think about this room, you've got blowers on the side, other people's distraction. It's sometimes hard to hear. Being able to look up there and see what was just said is a value, is a benefit. Plus for us it gives us a pretty immediate transcript to work from.

Having said all that, it does require us to talk one at a time, also when you grab the microphone, say your name and also use the microphone because over time Cathy is going to come to learn many of your names, and so it won't be an issue, particularly as we're starting out, need to say your name and then speak into the microphone. And then we should be okay. If you don't, I'm going to apologize ahead of time, but I'll probably be rude and cut you off and say: By the way, and your name is... So that's how we will work that, all right?

And generally from an overall kind of standpoint in terms of I do appreciate your attendance and willingness to serve and your participation in Faculty Senate, as well as anyone on University Council as well. It's critical this year. These are unprecedented times. I've been at NIU since 1991, so getting up there in age and experience. But these are times unlike anything I've ever experienced in the university in terms of the state budget impasse, Program Prioritization, faculty unionization, declining enrollment, continued loss of tenure, tenure-track faculty. These are new times for us. And questions arise regarding what are we going to look like in five or ten years and those are serious issues. I'm hoping as the senate and University Council that we take proactive steps to ensure our continued viability, that we work to increase our roles in decision making, particularly as related to academic and curricular matters. That's my opening hello.

At this time I'd like to turn the microphone over to President Baker, as you'll know on the schedule, he's going to talk to us about upcoming review of Provost Freeman, the executive vice president provost.

D. Baker: And as I start, I'd like to note that as a former faculty senator and Faculty Senate chair, I want to thank you for your service on this body and for the leadership. It's a lot of work. It's a lot of work to come to these meetings and prepare, a lot of work to go back and communicate with your stakeholders. This is an unprecedented environment. Let's keep each other informed and work through our issues. We're an institution making a lot of changes right now, addressing our challenges and I'm very proud of this institution and how it's dealing with these difficult times.

I'm here to talk with you about the review and reappointment of the executive vice president provost process. And so I'm going to refer to the bylaws that you have. This is the last year of Executive Vice President and Provost Freeman's term. And so, according to the bylaws, we need to do a process. So let me read you a little bit about it and then we can have some discussion. So, "prior to the fall semester of the last year of the executive vice president and provost's term of service, the president shall confer with the executive vice president and provost to determine whether an additional term is feasible." We've had that conversation, and we believe it's feasible.

"If the president and executive vice president provost agree upon the feasibility of the term, the president shall consult with the deans and Faculty Senate separately at the beginning of the fall

semester to initiate a comprehensive review of the executive vice president and provost's performance, and, subsequently to determine whether or not an additional term should be offered to the incumbent. This review and consultation shall be completed and the resultant decision reported no later than six weeks subsequent to the beginning of the fall semester of the last year of the vice president's provost's term of office."

We've got a six-week window here. We've gone a week and a half. We have four and a half weeks to go. This is our first meeting, so here we are. We've worked over the summer to develop a questionnaire. And the plan would be to share that with you early next week. For you to get feedback and it's got a number of categories for you to rate the provost on. Goals and priorities, communication, and there are multiple questions under all these. Goals and priorities, ommunications, functional competencies, resource allocation, management, leadership, personal characteristics, overall evaluation. And there's a section for narrative comments for you to add your comments on performance.

And in addition to the deans and you, I'll solicit feedback from other people who have worked closely with the provost. Those include department chairs, vice provost, associate vice provosts, office staff, HR folks, Faculty Senate, staff representatives, students, external groups, Board of Trustees, professor selection committee, Program Prioritization Task Force chairs, coordinating team, the Northern Illinois Research Foundation board, representatives from the legal staff, ombudsperson. So comprehensive and large set of folks to give feedback in addition to the senate, which is critical and noted in the bylaws. I wanted to come to you with that and give you a heads-up it's coming, see if you have any reactions to that and to that body of folks, and see if you have any suggestions on any of the process or comments. I'll open it up. No? Okay. So we'll ask you to fill it out, and it's going to be an anonymous survey. The results will go to Pat. Make sure they're all anonymized, is that a word? It is a word. And I'll get those summary documents and those will be forwarded on to you. So this is an important process. And important feedback. And we all get that feedback in our annual reviews or more periodic reviews. This is a periodic one that's fairly intense. So it will be good feedback and we'll learn from it.

R. Siegesmund: Richard Siegesmund, School of Art. Will the senators be getting the forms or will the entire faculty be getting the forms?

D. Baker: The senators.

R. Siegemund: Is there a process for the senators to poll their constituents and get feedback from them?

D. Baker: I think that's up to you and how you want to run it.

R. Siegesmund: Kind of scary.

D. Baker: Anybody else? All right. I want to give you a heads-up that it's coming. My current plan is to email it out to you Tuesday and ask that you get it back to us in two weeks so that then we've got about ten days to compile the results or Pat has ten days and we want her to sleep once in a

while during that period. I think that will be September 30, is that the dead line for it to come back, I think?

G. Slotsve: Wanted to double-check. Department of Economics. I just wanted to mention that Matt and I are in the senate but we're also co-chairs of the Program Prioritization [Administrative Task Force]. I assume you just want us to fill out one.

D. Baker: Unlike some places in Chicago, you only need to vote once.

G. Slotsve: Whichever one you want.

D. Baker: I think it asks if you're – Pat, does it ask what you're filling out, are you a senator or something else?

P. Erickson: I did not see that on the draft, but everybody on the contact list will get an email. So George wouldn't get two emails.

D. Baker: You won't get two emails.

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to make sure of that.

D. Baker: Anybody else? And if for some reason you do get two, fess up. Fill it out. Anything else I can do for you? All right. I'll let you get back to business.Thank you for taking some time. Please do fill it out. Thank you.

<mark>[NOTE: Per approved amended agenda, the business related to Items X. D. 1-5 was addressed at this point in the meeting.]</mark>

V.   ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A.   NIU Risk Assessment Team –
        Michael Stang, Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs
        Brooke Ruxton, Executive Director, Counseling and Consultation Services

G. Long: Next under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, we have two presentations, the first one was prompted by a request from the senate last year. The body wanted to learn more about risk Assessment, and so we've asked Mike Stang and Brooke Ruxton to come over and give us a brief presentation on that. Following that presentation we'll also hear from Ferald Bryan to give us perspective on parliamentary procedure, given the number of things we're trying to accomplish and move forward I thought words from him would be helpful as well. At this point I'm turn it over to Mike and Brooke and let you begin.

B. Ruxton: Good afternoon. Again my name is Brooke Ruxton, I am the executive director of the Counseling and Consultation Services Center. Is this on?

G. Long: Up a little on the mic?

A/V Technician: Should be good.

B. Ruxton: Okay, so I'm here as the director of the Counseling and Consultation Services Center. Our approach to this discussion is typically to come and just talk with you a little bit about what we do, but without a formal presentation really, we just want to be able to open this up for some discussion or questions if you all have discussion and questions, and maybe to give you a kind of broad overview of some things that we know are of significant concern to faculty across the university, so that, if this is something that your constituency would want to learn more about or have us come and talk about, or discuss specific incidents, we're happy to do that.

So today really we just wanted to share a few talking points with you. And so I'm going to start rather than just jumping right into risk assessment, just by mentioning I think as folks who work in a university setting, we are all aware of what has become sort of a public notion of a college student mental health crisis that's occurring on our campuses. That might be a kind of sensationalized way of talking about it but we've been seeing quite a bit in the media, conversations about the increasing severity of mental health concerns of college students. We are certainly seeing that here at NIU. You all are seeing that in your classrooms. We are seeing that over the past several years with the students that we're seeing who are presenting to Counseling and Consultation Services. So we know that there are significant numbers of students who are really struggling with some pretty substantial mental health concerns. And they're coming to class and trying to be students and trying to navigate all of what that looks like.

We also know that faculty I think are often forced to make pretty difficult decisions in areas that you may not have a lot of education about when it comes to having students that you're concerned about. And those concerns can be a pretty broad ranging from a student who's just emotionally upset or distraught, to students who are at times suicidal or a danger to themselves, to students who might be disruptive in class, all the way up to students who could potentially be a threat or could be seen as threatening or concerning by their behavior in a classroom setting. And as faculty there's also that balance between classroom management and how to deal with issues of disruption versus how to care for or attend to an individual student.

So those can be really complicating kinds of issues. And I don't think we're going to give you answers to all of that today. But just want to say really that there are a lot of resources available to help faculty navigate that. I think what we find is that the best way to do so and that is really by having conversations and just kind of raising awareness of what is there to help folks. So some of the resources that I want to make sure to mention: One is myself and my staff at Counseling and Consultation Services. We have psychologists and therapists who are on call 24/7. So during the day you can contact our office. If there's a student that you're concerned about and not sure how to manage it or make a referral, faculty can contact our office to talk through that situation. And at night anyone can contact the non-emergency police number, 531-1212 and talk to a counselor about those same issues.

The vice president and assistant vice president's office for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management is also a great resource to talk through one of those things we passed around what we call the red folder to all of you. So the red folder is something that's been around at NIU for

probably a decade. And this is a resource that has been given alternately every other year to incoming faculty and staff and then to all faculty and staff. We had not yet updated it this year because we're actually hoping to kind of change up the content a little bit. The ones that we passed out are from last year, but the idea behind this is a campaign that's at several campuses across the country. Having something that might be easily accessible in a place where folks can store, maybe relevant information, is a good resource to have on hand. When you have the time to stop and think about some of these issues, and often times obviously when you're reacting to a crisis situation, you don't have time to kind of pause and pull out a folder, but it is a resource that we have and we're going to be working on updating. It is also available online.

Another thing that's available online that I again I wanted to mention and is listed on that red folder, something called the Student Reform Reporting form. Mike's going to talk more about that and where that goes. But that's housed on the website www.niu.edu/care and is a form where folks can just let people know about students that they're concerned about so that we can help those students get connected to resources.

And then the final kind of resource that I wanted to mention is I guess actually twofold. One is oftentimes when these situations come up I think faculty do really wrestle with how do I manage my classroom and also show empathy and care and concern for a student? But a resource that sometimes I think we forget in the moment is the departmental and university policies and procedures you have in place regarding classroom management. Those still apply even if a student is struggling with a mental health concern when it comes to how do you respond to a situation that's disruptive in a classroom. You still have those policies and procedures that can assist what you're doing in the moment.

And so that's kind of a really broad overview and then I'll let Mike talk more specifically about risk.

M. Stang: Thanks, Brooke. I thought that that might be helpful context for folks so we don't jump right in to trying to assess risk which I think is what we were asked to talk about today. Each of the state universities in Illinois is expected to have a campus violence prevention plan. And so that's coordinated through the university police office. And as part of that plan the university has adopted two assessment teams, one for students and one for staff and faculty. And those teams are designed to basically review behavior that is concerning and try to determine what to do about that behavior, in essence.

And so we do occasionally have some crossover where there are students, also employees, but generally we try to split those two into two separate segments. So I wanted to talk with you today about the student assessment team because that's the team that I chair. So in essence what we do is we collect information regarding students who have brought attention to themselves through actions or significant concern or threatening behaviors. And we get that information in a number of different ways. As Brooke suggested, we get it through the student of concern form. We get it through police reports, through student conduct incident reports. Sometimes we get it from staff and faculty who call me directly and say I want to talk with you about a situation. And at NIU we've chosen to combine in essence our risk assessment team along with our student concern team, mostly for efficiency purposes because it's the same people who are on both of those teams.

So we treat all of those students as students of concern, a small percentage, probably less than 10 percent of those rise to the level of some kind of risk assessment, threat assessment where we would actually be rating them in terms of some level of assessment. The vast majority of those students are students of concern that we address in a variety of ways. Let me also say that if, for whatever reason, you ever need immediate response, there's an emergency situation or there's a crisis or you're feeling immediately threatened, you should call the police.

So the threat assessment team is not really an emergency response team. We meet once a week. And in essence our role is to try to connect the dots at the university. So there have been a number of campus and other issues across the country over the last roughly decade, and really what we've learned through that process is that oftentimes there was enough information that perhaps those individuals or those situations could be avoided, but there was no mechanism to connect the dots. People had information but it was siloed and people didn't talk to one another. Frankly our role is to connect the dots. So we have variety of representatives from across campus and so if we get information about student A, typically what we do then is the various campus offices come together and share whatever information they have about student A.

And then we make some decisions about some coordinated response. So that's the second piece of what the threat assessment team does. We gather information, and then we coordinate the response. So as Brooke suggested even with the classroom management processes we don't take the place of what happens in Student Conduct, or the Police Department or Brooke's office or other agencies across campus. But we coordinate that response so we can make sure that students' concerns are being addressed without having four different offices all contacting the students and trying to provide them with some assistance.

So we pull those folks together, we coordinate a response. And then, depending upon the situation, sometimes it resolves itself. Sometimes we actually have an extended coordinating period where we in essence monitor the response to those individual students and maintain awareness of where they're at in either the Student Conduct process, the legal process, the academic process, to make sure that we are aware of what's going on with those students as they progress throughout the year.

The last thing that I wanted to say and then we'll try to open this up for questions, is our focus is really on student behavior. So this is not a tracking mechanism where we monitor the students who are, for example, going to the Counseling Center. There's already a process for doing that within Brooke's office. There's already a process for the University Police in terms of how they respond. There's already a process for Student Conduct as far as how they respond. But what we try to do is we try to look at individual student behaviors and try to determine is there some level of threat here and if there is, what should we do about it. If there's not, but there's still a student of concern, how do we make sure that they are connected with the right resources on campus so that they can be successful here at NIU?

I don't know if that answers the questions that you had initially or not, so we'll stop there and see what questions you all might have that we might be able to answer or information that we could provide.

V. Naples: Let's see if this works. Virginia Naples from Biology. While I applaud what you were doing, I'm also concerned about how do you balance a need for privacy of the individual versus the need for security of the university community? Do you have mechanisms in place to assess this issue?

M. Stang: We do. What I would say first is that the standard confidentiality procedures are in place. So for example, a student is coming to the Counseling Center, the standard processes are in place. The police have certain confidentiality processes, Health Services has processes. So that doesn't really change. What we do, is try again to focus on the behaviors and try to understand are our students exhibiting those behaviors in multiple arenas? A student might be behaving in one way in your classroom, but we might also notice similar behaviors in a residence hall, similar behaviors that would result in communication with University Police. And without the role or the threat assessment team, we don't have a way to connect those pieces together. And that's really the primary purpose. So we're generally connecting information about specific behaviors, not necessarily looking at a transcript of the student's grades or an understanding of other services that they're accessing that would be completely unrelated to the behavior that we're trying to assess. Does that help?

V. Naples: It does help but I'm still a little concerned if students believe that if they come to the attention of a faculty member or another staff member, that they will become known or get some kind of a reputation and that might discourage them from seeking assistance if they need counseling or other sorts of things.

B. Ruxton: We may be thinking different things. Some of what we're really conscious of when we're trying to collect some of that information is those kind of issues, are that of a student's right to privacy. And so for example, as faculty members, it would be extremely rare, or probably never that you're going to get a call from Mike saying there's a student that we are concerned about and having conversations about, so tell me about what's happening in your class. We have other mechanisms for trying to get that information in such a way that it's not going to alert you then to somehow discriminate against them or respond differently to them. It's not going to alarm you unless, of course, there's a need at some point that something has risen to a level of needing to alert people. So we try to be really conscious of balancing those kind of things for students so that they have the best opportunities to be successful. Really what we're trying to do with most of the students that we're talking about is really just make sure that they're connected to resources. And so again Mike mentioned my role as a psychologist and director of the Counseling Center, is really much more as a consultant. So I would never disclose to that team yes, this is a student who's receiving services at our center. So those same laws and privacy acts are in place to protect students.

M. Stang: A couple things. We're not an investigative body. If the police are doing an investigation, then they do their thing. The Student Conduct is doing an investigation, they're doing their thing. We're not out gathering information. We're really mostly focussed on connecting the dots and trying to make sure that, if there are students that are of concern in a number of arenas across campus, that there's some way to connect those pieces and figure out how we might coordinate some kind of a response. So yes, I would agree with Brooke, rarely do we go out and solicit

information about specific students. It's generally much more – and again, we're talking about a handful of students, so we're not certainly talking about every suicidal student on campus. We're certainly not talking about – frankly, every student who comes through on a student of concern form because, in many cases, those students have their issues resolved through standard response processes at the university. Really we're talking in general about a very small number of students. And generally they have been involved in some kind of behavior that's been pretty public and that is pretty well known in whatever arena that behavior existed in. And really all we're trying to do is figure out is that an isolated incident or is it connected with other pieces on campus.

G. Long: Paul.

P. Stoddard: So sorry. They got that. In terms of the confidentiality and so forth, I mean, and this is really for all the agencies, counseling, the police, etc. What steps is the university taking to ensure that confidential material does not get inadvertently released to the public, either through malicious hacking or emails, etc.? I mean, do you keep your files on machines that are not linked to the Internet? How do you do that?

M. Stang: I don't know that I can speak to the Internet security on campus. No, we keep relatively few notes. And each one of the agencies, whether it's the Health Service, the police, or the Counseling Center, would keep track of that using their resources as they would typically do. Again, we don't oversee or override any of the existing processes. And I don't know if you know the answer to the question about the security of the Counseling Center so that might be a question. I mean, if I understand your question, that might be a question for the IT folks because I don't know the answer to that question.

B. Ruxton: I'm going to say I don't know the answer to that question but will take a stab at what I do know. Within our office is that, because of the nature of that, the personal health records that we keep within our office, IT has a – I am so not a computer person – but there are certainly extra levels of security in the ways that the information is stored and firewalls and those types of things that the IT security folks work with us on. The actual documentation for our team is maintained through a similar database and so again, I don't know the answer specifically, but I'm going to assume it has those same thresholds.

P. Stoddard: I understand that you're not an expert in this and that's not your field, but as someone dealing with confidential information, I would hope that you'd take a bit more interest in ensuring that that information actually is secure and not subject to malicious action. Those Russians are on top of us, you know.

G. Long: From a timing standpoint let's take maybe one more question.

M. Cefaratti: Meghan Cefaratti, Department of Accountancy. I have not seen the form for student of concern. So could you walk me through maybe a little bit of the process of who knows about what, what information is on there, and then I do see like, for example, what would warrant reporting? If I see some concerning behavior listed on here, as a example, if you could tell me a little more about the form and the process and who knows what and what the student hears or doesn't hear.

M. Stang: The form is mostly a standard incident report form. There's a place where the student is identified and the reporting agent is identified. And then there's basically a description of whatever the incident was. That information is fed into our incident report database that's used at the university called Maxient. That information is shared with a distribution list of people who monitor the student of concern listing. So it comes to my office, it goes to Brooke's office, goes to a number of agencies on campus. And then there's some determination about what resolution or how can we provide assistance to that particular student. So staff and faculty, other students, parents use that student of concern form for lots of different reasons to report situations that they want to make the university aware of. And those are, again, stored in a system called Maxient. I can't guarantee that the Russians can't hack into it, but it's designed for that kind of a process. And it's a standard, typically used in student conduct situations, but it's designed for that. And then what we do is we have an extra security layer for the folks that are involved in the threat assessment team so that only the members of the threat assessment team can see the records for the students of concern that are considered through that process.

M. Cefaratti: Is the student notified in the –

M. Stang: Typically the student doesn't know we've got it. Typically we try to be – this [Faculty Senhate meeting] is pretty public for us – usually we try to be behind the scenes only because we want people to feel like they can report this information. And our goal really is to provide support to students, and so depending upon the nature of the circumstance, sometimes someone at the university will reach out to the student. Sometimes that's the reporting person, if that seems to make the most sense. Sometimes it's an invitation from the Student Conduct office to come in and have a conversation. Sometimes it's a conversation with the police. But in almost all cases the student wouldn't be surprised by the person who is coming to visit with them because it's pretty rare that something gets reported that the student doesn't know was an issue because typically it wouldn't get reported unless it was an issue, that they were involved in it. And again, some kind of behavior that they were exhibiting that would cause their behavior to rise to a level of some kind of significance that was out of the norm. But no, so there's generally not a circular process. And generally if it was a student being called in, let's say to the Student Conduct Office, typically that would not come through a student of concern, that would come on an incident report that there would be a student conduct file created for that student. Or if there was a reason to meet with a faculty member or an academic advisor, it would typically come from those people and then we would strategize with let's say an academic advisor about how to circle back around for that student. So as Brooke was saying it would be pretty unusual that you would get a call from someone on the threat assessment team to say what do you know about Suzie? Occasionally that happens, but it's pretty rare because usually we have enough information, and the whole point is not to be out investigating, the whole point is to be coordinating information that we already have.

G. Long: And I would say I would imagine that we could easily use the rest of our meeting to talk about this, but we'll have to cut you off at this point. But certainly thank you very much for the information and I think we now have better perspective on it as well as contact ideas and so forth. So I would say thank you very much. And from the senate standpoint, if we have any additional questions, please don't hesitate to write them to me or write directly to Mike or Brooke to get answers. I do know there's significant effort out there to try to communicate this information in a

way that does respect individuals' privacy but also provides sufficient protection on campus for us to function effectively. So with that I would say thank you very much.

B.   [Parliamentary Procedure: A Primer](#) – Ferald Bryan, Faculty Senate Parliamentarian and Professor, Department of Communication – Pages 5-24

G. Long: I'd like to turn it over to Ferald Bryan, our parliamentarian. He's going to give us a two-part presentation. We'll get Part 1 today. We'll have Part 2 concluding next month. With that, turn it over to Ferald Bryan.

F. Bryan: Thank you, Greg. I want to begin by thanking you for asking me to do this. And also to give ten minutes, because I could probably talk a long time about this. Yeah, I have ten minutes or ten slides, whichever comes first. I want to thank Pat for having this coordinated. Start with the first slide. I'm used to being seen and not heard. I'm here in the meeting, and most of the time you really don't need me. But there are a few things that I want to talk about that I'm calling a primer. I will begin with some of the basics.

Besides good old Robert's which is often what you talk about, I remind you that the rules that govern organizations like this take up this entire list. That is we're all governed by our constitution, both Illinois and the United States constitution. We're also governed by the Board of Trustees Bylaws and Regulations. We're also governed by the NIU Constitution and Bylaws, which by the way is 151 pages, right? It's a little longer and more complex. On the other hand, our Faculty Senate are only 20 pages, very efficient, very lean, easy to understand. We should all know what they are. And then that protects you. Knowing your rights, I think helps protect you. And certainly always is, as I will say in a moment, if you're not clear on something, there's always a motion, we call point of order where you can bring that up.

We also have what we call standing rules. Those of you that have been here at Northern know that the Faculty Senate always meets before the University Council, on a Wednesday at three o'clock in this room. Usually it's on the first Wednesday. And that essentially has been the tradition. Robert's calls that standing rules. And it's rarely changed unless there's some big urgency. And we should just know that.

Please note that, yes, our senate bylaws specifically designate Robert's rules as our parliamentary authority. As I'll say in a few minutes, that was a choice. Most people don't realize that there are other parliamentary authorities. In fact, there's some a lot simpler than Robert's. I'll mention those in a moment. But Thomas Jefferson wrote one, Floyd Riddick, the long time parliamentarian of the United States Senate, wrote Riddick's Manual. There's a number of them that could be used. And Robert's, I guess they have good marketing, it's been around a long time. And we'll talk about him in just a minute. But one important point, the last point on this first slide I think is critical. Our governance document, our senate bylaws, always takes precedence over any parliamentary authority. That's something that usually applies also to any organization that we are a member of. Most people, I don't know of Robert's Rules, they don't know all the details. That's fine. What's most important is you know your own organization's bylaws, constitution, whatever they're called. Because those do take precedence. So simply put, parliamentary procedure is a set of rules that

govern the way we conduct business. Most of us have been introduced to it at some point. Although as I keep finding out, maybe not as much as depth as is perhaps helpful. But it's a system of laws and procedures that allows an organization to run effectively, to do business. But again, Robert's rules is only one of those. The American Institute of Parliamentarians, which is one of the two national organizations that promotes parliamentary procedure, they have their own parliamentary procedure manual. It's sometimes calls Robert's Lite. It's a lot simpler and easier in many ways than Robert's. But Robert's like I say, it has the brand and it's been well promoted. So that's what we use. The official document is the one we use. And, of course, designated parliamentarians, like myself, is helpful if a dispute arises.

And one thing I want to tell you, the very first lesson that I learned in doing this job since I don't have all 716 pages of Robert's memorized – I hope you wouldn't expect me to – but there is a privilege motion in Robert's that says that we can go into recess for however long the body chooses. So at that time the very helpful president of the body – been doing this job for 20 years, so I won't mention what president that was – you can probably guess – reminded me we can always going into recess if you don't know. And that was reassuring, because it can take some time, it's a complex situation, take a parliamentary recess and figure it out. It will help your organization.

The basics of parliamentary procedure focus on one item at a time, no more than one issue to be discussed. That's why we have motions, that's why we have an established structure. It extends courtesy to everyone. All members have an equal opportunity to participate. And, of course, we observe the rule of majority. No group decision is granted without a majority vote. In fact as a rule, any motion or action that would affect the members' rights, almost always requires much more than a majority, usually two thirds. So cut off debate, to suspend the rules, that's almost always a two thirds vote, which, as we learned, is a very challenging threshold to meet.

So on top of that, of course, parliamentary procedure also protects the right of the minority. All members have equal access to decision-making, and their voices are heard. Hopefully this is going to sound familiar to you as citizens of a democracy where we try really hard to put these principles in practice.

First things first. Why is an agenda important? It's very important and we spend time at the beginning of the meeting – actually we – before the meeting to set the agenda because it really is important. And I point out it must be approved, so we all agree that this is the order that we're going to do things. By the way, we handled the changes very well. Greg, you did a good job. And we should all feel good that we switched things around. And we did that because we know that we needed you all here and toward the end of the meeting sometimes people slip away. So we move things up. And that is certainly allowed in Robert's Rules to do that in the agenda. The agenda should be presented in advance. The organization should do that. It's just a courtesy so people know what to expect. And if you have a well planned agenda, most of the meeting should run pretty smoothly.

The next slide gives you a sample agenda. I only throw this up here because I wanted to clarify a few things that are common misconceptions about Robert's rules. Notice that, for example, Henry Martin Roberts was an Army Corps. of Engineers officer. And a lot of his terms that sound militaristic are still in the – when he talks about special orders, orders of the day, as we'll talk in a

minute, you can sense his military background. But special orders are what are referred to – yes, we had some of those. He always talks about unfinished business rather than old business. I always thought that was rhetorically a better choice since these are things the organization hadn't finished. So it's not old business. It's unfinished business. And this is fairly predictable. Of course, I remind you that the senate, like the University Council, in our bylaws has the established agenda. That's also fairly common that organizations designate their own agendas.

Next slide will remind us all of your role. I mean besides all of us up here in the front, you have a job, you have a responsibility to establish and maintain your own structure, to recognize your rights and responsibilities, to participate; to educate yourself in the university constitution, especially with the senate bylaws, and to have interaction. And usually we're not shy like in our classes, I'm sure. That will help make stronger decisions if we all participate.

The next slide gets us down to business. And here I'm only dealing with a few of them. Parliamentary procedure and the rules governing the conduct of business is based on motions. And that's what everyone is familiar with about Robert's. There's a total of 86 in Robert's and no, I don't have them all memorized. But mostly only about 18 to 20 are most common. So I'm going to categorize and just talk about the first half of them. They're classified into three basic categories. That talks about – and these are order of priority. All privileged motions must be dealt with first. They don't relate to a pending question. However, they are of such great importance that they require precedence over everything else. And we'll get to what those are in a moment. Incidental motions usually arise from another question that is pending and you have to decide it before you move on. And that's often where we get into trouble, talking about – and there are subsidiary motions, which apply to ways of disposing.

So first we'll talk about privileged motions in the next slide. It's important that you recognize first and foremost that the first big privileged motion is to adjourn. And it's important. It allows the meeting to officially be over. You have to gain recognition from the chair. Second required, not debatable, not amendable, majority vote. It's really important, not something to trifle with. And a lot of organizations do that because sometimes especially in the end of the semester we're getting tired because we've been here two hours. But it is very important because it ends business for the day.

I also secondly remind you that you have the question of privilege. If you're uncomfortable, if you can't hear, if there's a problem, too much noise, you have the right to, you know, I can't hear, speak up, it's not something that needs to be seconded. It's not debatable, amendable. You don't vote on it. You just respond to the needs of the member. And you all have that privilege. It's a privilege motion. So we have to address it when it comes up.

Next slide begins with a third privilege motion, which is affix a time to adjourn. We don't use this very often. But it allows for continuance of a meeting. I bring this up because many of you probably are part of national organizations that sometimes meet over a series of days. And I want to explain that it allows the organization to essentially go into a suspended meeting. And then come back. So if the day's getting late and you know you're meeting tomorrow, fixing a time to adjourn allows you to end at a reasonable time and move on. Has to have a second, nondebatable, not amendable, must be voted on immediately. As a way of getting to the time.

Next is recess, a short break or intermission in the proceeding which does not close the meeting. A motion to adjourn does that, right? We don't use that probably as much as we should. I think in the time I've done this job, maybe only a handful of times. Mainly when we need to take a break, we've been deliberating long. But you need to second that. It's not debatable or amendable. So you go with the amount that's designated.

Next slide is two – I'll talk about that – [inaudible] of the day. I mention this – I never heard this used in this room, but I think it could be very interesting. When a group deviates from the agenda and you simply want us to get back to the agenda, call for the orders of the day. The secretary would read the agenda – and please note, if you choose not to follow the agenda, that's going to take two thirds vote because that will suspend the rules.

And that I think probably is enough time for it to – but it takes a little bit of practice. Those of you that are new today, that's part of my job to help you. And this is the first kind of education in the major motions, the first three categories. So hope you find them useful. Robertsrules.org, if you're ever wondering, is a website that has most of this current edition available. If you want to take a look at it. It's Robertsrules.org. American Institute of Parliamentarians publishes a journal and they also have a good frequently asked questions about parliamentary procedure. So I can direct you to that. I'm fbryan@niu.edu if you have a question, happy to help. Thank you.

G. Long: Thank you very much, Ferald.

VI.   CONSENT AGENDA

G. Long: Next thing we have is our consent agenda, which represents those items which don't require discussion. Includes items related to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the University Council Steering Committee, and the approved of Professor Ferald Bryan, Department of Communications to serve as parliamentarian. The process, we take a motion and a second. Don't discuss it. If there's something on the Consent Agenda you don't want, you have to make a motion to remove it from the Consent Agenda, okay? So unless there are any objections, I need a motion to accept the Consent Agenda. Motion to approve anyone? Terese Arado. Second? Virginia Naples. All in favor? Opposed? All right, that was quick. Thank you.

A.   Faculty Senate Standing Committees – Per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3, approve the 2016-17 membership rosters – Page 25

B.   University Council Steering Committee – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 2.1.1, approvethe faculty members of the 2016-17 UC-Steering Committee – Page 26

C.   Parliamentarian – Per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.2, approve Professor Ferald Bryan, Department of Communication, to serve as the Faculty Senate parliamentarian for the 2016-17 academic year.

VII.   UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A.   Program Prioritization update

G. Long: Moving on, Unfinished Business. You'll notice that we have a Program Prioritization update. We'll tell you that, as Ferald mentioned, we meet the week before the Faculty Senate meetings to have a Steering Committee meeting to come up with the agenda to talk about things. And during this month's meeting, the question was raised: So how do we deal with updates on Program Prioritization? And so what we've done is we're going to put Program Prioritization as a heading in each and every one of our meetings until, you know, we get some greater resolution or some greater knowledge of that.

I have talked with Provost Freeman. We're doing the same thing in University Council as well so both bodies will be getting monthly updates in terms of progress. Unfortunately, our meeting with the Steering Committee was last Wednesday, and relaying this to the provost, she didn't really have an opportunity to prepare something for today's meeting. But she did reference for us – we've got on the president's page for the university, there is a PDF on Program Prioritization that was presented at leadership retreat earlier in August. And if you pull that up, there's an entire PowerPoint on Program Prioritizations. If you're inclined to see what was presented during the leadership academy, leadership retreat, that is available to look at. There's also a September 22 town hall meeting that's going to be provided on Program Prioritization. As an intermediate step I would encourage you to look at the pdf, attend the town meeting and henceforth in our meetings we will have formal representation and presentation toss keep us on track on things. Any questions about that?

VIII.   NEW BUSINESS

G. Long: Okay, moving on then under New Business, we have no new business. Quick category.

IX.   REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A.   FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

G. Long: Then under IX we have reports from advisory committees. And so first would be Paul Stoddard, our Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE, our representative.

P. Stoddard: Okay, for those of you new to the senate, the FAC is a representative body of faculty from various institutions of higher ed across the state. All the four-years are represented, many of the community colleges and privates also have representatives on this body. We meet once a month at different campuses around Illinois. And twice a year we meet with the IBHE, sort of meet with them. We attend their meeting. And if we're lucky we get to have lunch with them. And basically what we do is we're a liaison between the IBHE and the individual campuses. Concerns that we have, can come through the FAC representatives and get relayed onto the IBHE. And ultimately if necessary, to the legislature and the governor.One of those issues I'll be reporting on as we go forward.

So our most recent meeting was June 21 at Illinois State. And this was one of the meetings where we also met with the IBHE. The main concern for the FAC has been recently the FAC or the faculty of Illinois are supposed to get a seat on the IBHE. We are supposed to provide a voice for people who are involved in the day-to-day business of educating college students in Illinois. And the legislature four or five years ago created that seat on the IBHE for the faculty. There was an opening that arose last year. The FAC asked for nominations and vetted two candidates, both of whom were determined to be acceptable. And we forwarded those two names on to the governor, who then chose to ignore that recommendation and name an adjunct faculty member, part-time faculty member whose primary business is, ironically enough, computer security. And who, well, who's not full time, not tenure track faculty. And this has really irked those on the FAC. We registered our disapproval of that move. This body sent a letter to legislators and the governor expressing our disapproval of that idea. That appointment ultimately does have to be approved by the legislature, which is not in any hurry to do so. And until they make a decision one way or the other, Mr. Bambenek is, in fact, sitting on the board. The FAC has tried to work with the governor and pointed out that there is another vacancy that the governor could name Mr. Bambenek to and then actually appoint a real faculty member, a full-time faculty member to the board. The governor wrote back last week and said, na, he didn't see any reason to do that. Mr. Bambenek, he thought, would be an excellent choice. His chief of staff, not the governor himself. So anyway, yeah, that's going to continue to simmer for a while, I think.

We discussed in our meeting at ISU in addition to that, what we might want to talk about with the IBHE at lunch in an informal setting. That had varying degrees of success. Then mostly the rest of it's kind of nothing interesting.

What is interesting is the first meeting this year will be next Friday, and we will be meeting with the association of American publishers who we've met with before. We're really looking at different alternatives to how we deliver textbook-type content. You know, we have the normal paper hard back – when I was first – it was: Do you want a hard back book or soft back book? And then we got clever and: Do you want it color or black and white? Now we have all these different ways of delivering content. All the different things that can go with it with the electronic age that we're in. And there are various concerns and challenges that that brings up. But that's what we're going to be talking about next Friday so that should be an interesting meeting. And again, if you have any thoughts about that, that you would like me to present, please feel free to forward those to me. and I'll be happy to raise those issues next week.

After that we had lunch and then we met – we watched – the IBHE. Tom Cross is the new chair of the IBHE. His main point was to remind everybody that Illinois has excellent institutions, despite a few hiccups. Remember this was all taking place before we had gotten any funding for last fiscal year. And certainly before we got in last year's funding for this year. Things were dire then. They're slightly better now, but not entirely. Jim Applegate is the executive director of the board. Said things are not always as bad as they seem. He cited some statistics. These are like the BATs 312 with runners on the scoring position with – later on Thursdays in months with an R. He found a few in there that were good.

We lead the completion rate, as – Illinois has the highest completion rate in the country among adult learners. So good for us. He also talked about the miracle on the Hudson, which had its roots in

improvement driven by studies of airline disasters. So I think what he's saying is Illinois in a disaster state in terms of education right now but there's a lot we could be learning from this so perhaps we should take a stab at that. The other thing that I found particularly interesting in the board reports is their discussion of employers and colleges working together and trying to identify areas of shortages of trained employees and how the universities and colleges of Illinois can fill gaps in employment opportunities. I find this a little troubling personally that we're becoming vocational schools rather than educational institutions, but we'll see how that goes.

G. Long: Thank you, Paul.

B.   University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
         Cathy Doederlein, Greg Long, Holly Nicholson,
         Rebecca Shortridge, Kendall Thu, Leanne VandeCreek

G. Long: The next item on our agenda is the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. I don't have a formal report. I just want to give you a very little background information on that. The members of the UAC consist of three faculty members as well as the presidents of the Operating Staff Council, the SPS Council and Faculty Senate. The Board of Trustees has several committees and ad hoc groups that meet quarterly in preparation for the Board of Trustees meeting. President Baker calls the UAC together to discuss items on the agenda. And I will say as with a lot of things, we have worked hard to change our role from simply being listeners to actually being advisory. That's a challenge in a lot of cases. And I would say that President Baker has – and the board has listened to our requests to have more meaningful input and participation in the process. We've even had a discussion session or two on how we can make the UAC members actually more informed and also be individuals who are sought out for advice more frequently. I'm cautiously optimistic that we're making some good headway in that regard.

Also I would, rather than trying to summarize the Board of Trustees meetings for you, the entire Board of Trustees meetings and minutes are available online and they're fairly lengthy. And a lot of what they do has certainly implications for the university but, in terms of your particular function, may or may not. So what I would encourage you to do is, as you have time, go to the BOT website, NIU, and just search Board of Trustees. Take you to the website and read through some of the past minutes and get your own sense. I'd rather you do that than rely on me deciding what out of a full day's meeting I'm going to come and talk to you ten minutes about. So I'm typically not going to give you a report specifically on the Board of Trustees, because you got much more detailed information available to you I think it would be much more helpful than what I can provide. So there's that.

X.   REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A.   Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report

B.   Academic Affairs Committee – John Novak, Chair – no report

C.   Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair – no report

G. Long: As far as moving from there we go to Reports from Standing Committees and since it's the beginning of a year, most of the committees have not met. Paul, did you have anything you wanted to say about Economic Status of the Profession?

P. Stoddard: This one is going to be an interesting committee. I'm not sure how much work – we might have a lot of work, we might have very little work going forward. With the formation and certification of the union, for those of you who missed the news, we are a union now. A lot of what Economic Status is supposed to do I think is going to be covered by the union. But I see the committee perhaps as being another representative voice to help inform the union and their deliberations about issues that are important to the faculty. I'd like to see as much representation, as many different voices go forward to the union, so that when they negotiate with the administration, they're representing as many individuals on the faculty as possible. And so I see this committee as being another way to get input from the general faculty to the union itself.

G. Long: Thanks. And I would also mention many of you may be aware that the university is undertaking a salary study. Back in April, spring, Provost Freeman and CFO Phillips contacted me and said: Let's do a salary study. And since you're the Faculty Senate president, would you organize a task force to get this done? And so have been working on identifying individuals to participate. We have two individuals who have agreed to lead: Virginia Wilcox from the Department of Economics, she does labor relations, her specialty and teaching a class this fall on the topic. She's got a very good handle on the quantitative aspects of it. And we also have Kristen Meyers, who's in Sociology. Kristen has agreed to be a co-chair and lead the qualitative review of things.

Our goal is to have an executive task force and out of that group, individuals who want to work more specifically on quantitative or qualitative issues will have that opportunity. But we don't want to put anyone doing more work than they anticipate. For most people it will be like a monthly meeting that you'll attend. We do have graduate assistant support to pull this off. Again, as far as looking at faculty and asking for commitment and time, it should be a minimal effort on anyone's part to participate. I did want to let you know that that's in process. The goal on this is to be very transparent, to create something that is replicable. This is a model that hopefully can be done in the future. As an outcome, one of the things we're going to do too is there have been other salary studies in 2005, 2008, 2011. Some of the major, I should say one of the major criticisms against those studies were they're primarily executive summaries. And so what we're looking at is yeah, we will produce an executive summary, but there will also be a technical report that goes along with it for individuals that want to look at any of the details in greater depth. So did want to let you know that that's something that is now just getting underway, invitations are just being sent out. And if you have any particular interest or concerns, please don't hesitate to let me know or importantly, don't hesitate to touch base with professors Wilcox or Meyers, as we go forward. Okay, so any questions on that? Okay.

D.   Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Rebecca Hunt, Liaison/Spokesperson

[NOTE: Per approved amended agenda, the business related to Items X. D. 1-5 was addressed earlier in the meeting, just after President's Announcements.]

G. Long: I'm doing my best to get out of as much work as possible so I'd like to call on Becqui Hunt to lead the next section of the meeting. This is the part of the agenda that we're going to be changing.

R. Hunt: Good afternoon, everyone. We'll hold several elections today. While some ballots have been placed at your seats, please vote only if you're a voting member of the Faculty Senate.

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

R. Hunt: First we will elect University Council alternates from among the Faculty Senators. As an alternate, you might be called upon during the year to serve on University Council should a University Council member from your college be unable to attend the meeting. These ballots are color coded and will be distributed by college. Faculty Senators as well as faculty members of the University Council who are present today are all eligible to vote for these alternates. When you receive your college ballot, please vote for the number of people noted at the top of the ballot. Once you have voted, leave your ballot at your place and it will be collected after the meeting adjourns. When I call your college, would you please raise your hands? First is the College of Business. Everyone from the College of Business have their ballot? Okay, the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. And finally the College of liberal Arts. Everyone from the college of Liberal Arts have a ballot?

2. Hearing Panel elections – ballots will be distributed at the FS meeting

R. Hunt: Okay, next is the Hearing Panel election. The Hearing Panel is used for appeals based on Bylaw Article 7.3 regarding due process for faculty dismissal issues. The ballot is printed on white paper and is already at your place. It contains the names of 34 tenured faculty members selected randomly. Please vote for 20 by placing a check mark next to those 20 names you wish to vote for. When you're finished, please leave the ballot at your place and it will be collected after the meeting adjourns.

3. By-lot election of Faculty Grievance Panel members

G. Long: Next, per NIU bylaw Article 11.5.3.1 B, the Faculty Senate is asked to forward the names of 15 members of its faculty constituency to serve as a panel from which a grievance committee can be chosen should one be needed to review a Step III grievance during the academic year. These 15 panel members will be selected by lot from all University Council and Faculty Senate faculty members who are tenured and not currently serving in an administrative role. Paul and I will draw 15 names at this time.

P. Stoddard: And the first winner is Mitch Irwin from Anthropology. Next is Doris MacDonald from English. Evidently a very popular choice. Next is Jimmie Manning from Communication. Might have a beef because his piece of paper is longer than most. Dhiman Chakraborty from Physics. If I mispronounce names, I apologize. Valia Allori, from Philosophy. Gary Baker from Chemistry and Biochemistry. Brian May from English. Morse Tan, from Law. Meghann Cefaratti from Accountancy. Somebody should be keeping track of how these are.

P. Erickson: Nine.

G. Long: Told you she's good.

P. Stoddard: Buck Stephen from Math, also known as Joseph. Andreas Glatz, from Physics. Mark Rosenbaum from Marketing. Mark Riley from Accountancy. Diane Rodgers from Sociology. And here you are, the lucky winner, Sarah McHone-Chase, from the libraries. Diane was an alternate.

P. Erickson: Why don't you pick one more in case we find that Diane Rodgers is no longer with us.

P. Stoddard: And just in case, we have Cynthia Campbell from Educational Technologies, Research and Assessment.

R. Hunt: Thank you.

4.   Election of a Faculty Senate Vice President per NIU Bylaws, Article 2.2

R. Hunt: Next is the election of a Faculty Senate Vice President. I open the floor for nominations at this time.

G. Long: Becqui, you've got someone...

M. Riley: I nominate George Slotsve.

T. Arado: Second.

P. Stoddard: I move we close nominations and accept George by acclamation.

G. Long: Need a second?

T. Arado: Second.

G. Long: Paul Stoddard made that motion.

P. Stoddard: We have to vote.

R. Hunt: All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

R. Hunt: Opposes? Abstentions? Motion carries.

G. Long: Okay, thank you, George.

5.   Selection of one Faculty Senate member to serve on the 2016 BOT Professorship Award Selection Committee. Committee members review approximately 10

applications online and the committee meets 2-3 times (Nov/Dec and Jan/Feb). <u>The person selected to serve on this committee cannot be a candidate for the award, nor have submitted a nomination for the award.</u>

R. Hunt: At the beginning of each fall semester, we ask a faculty volunteer to serve on the Board of Trustees Professorship Award Selection Committee. The assignment includes reviewing approximately 10 to 15 applications online and the committee meets two or three times around November, December, and again in January, February. I believe Jimmie Manning, Department of Communication served last year. Also John Novak, School of Music, has served in the past. Could we have a volunteer to serve on this selection committee again for this year? Dhiman Chakraborty.

G. Long: Unless there's anyone else who wants to do this, we have to vote on it, I think we can probably accept that.

R. Hunt: Yes? Thank you.

      6.   Constitution & Bylaws Review and Policy Library update

G. Long: Then we do have Item 6, that was from the Rules, Governance, and Elections Committee, with regard to Constitution and Bylaws review and Policy Library update. Rebecca is the chair of that, the liaison, Faculty Senate liaison, in that committee. It's a shared committee that includes both University Council members and Faculty Senate members. We're fortunate also to have Therese Arado here, who is the chair of the University Council section of Rules, Governance and Elections. Rebecca, did you have anything or did you want...

R. Hunt: Would you mind speaking a little bit about -- (inaudible).

G. Long: Sure. Given the opportunity to talk, I rarely turn that down. As opening comment, I would certainly say listen to what Ferald had to say about becoming familiar with our governing documents. I've noted this last year when I made this presentation prior to becoming Faculty Senate president. I had looked at a couple of parts of the APPM, parts of the Constitution and Bylaws, but only as they related to specific questions and ideas that I had. Now that I'm in this role, I've had the opportunity to read those documents in their entirety and – we mentioned that a bit last year – that our governance documents are challenging right now. In 1985 our constitution was written with express intent of being very inclusive and also being resistant to change. They were very successful with that. We mentioned that last year. Because we codified most everything as bylaws. To give you a visual – and I apologize for those of you who saw this last year – I just feel the need to show you again. We have collected constitution and bylaws from a number of other institutions. And so this is Illinois State. This is Kent State. This is North Carolina. This is Western Michigan. This is University of Virginia. This is NIU.

This is – these are our governing – this is our Constitution and Bylaws. I also threw in the Board of Trustees. We take them out, we still have this as our document. Pat, do we have available, content, a table of contents for the bylaws because I want you to – again, I would – I would be surprised if everyone in this room has read the Constitution and Bylaws. I mean if – that's remarkable. Given that you haven't, one of the things I want to point out on this is because they went to codify

everything again, we were feeling that there was a threat from outside, regency system, we wanted to maintain our own destiny, if you would. That's the short version of why this was set up as it was. And our biggest problem with it was that, when you codify everything as a bylaw, I mean there are no other institutions in – my summer project this summer has been working on the Constitution and Bylaws and reading others. Our is significantly longer than any others that I have come across and includes significantly more detail than any I've come across.

And if you look at the articles here, started article V, the academic personnel process, and work your way down to article 13, those are our policies and procedures related to grievances and personnel issues. Those are very – how should I say this – those are not typically found in constitution and bylaws. There's a certain model of what is normally included in a constitution and bylaws. That level of detail is not. There's, I guarantee you have not found anyplace that has a bylaw specifically devoted to placement of critical personnel matters. That does not rise to the level of a bylaw. And our challenge – and we talked about this a lot last year – when you have something like this with all this specificity, making change is difficult.

And particularly the way that we were set up prior to April. Prior to April we changed the amendment for making bylaw changes. In the past in University Council, which is where these things happen, you had to have two thirds of the entire body vote to endorse a bylaw change. Well, the body is roughly 60 people. Two thirds is 40. And our typical attendance was 42, 43 people. So you can imagine that the challenge that provided because we had many, many votes taken over my previous four years of being a University Council member where you'd have 90 percent of the members in attendance vote yes, but because we didn't reach that 40-person threshold, it didn't pass. So that was one of our major additional goals last year was to change the voting threshold such that we're in a much more reasonable position right now.

Don't have everything memorized yet. I will just very quickly – basically an amendment requires at this point the presence of 60 percent plus 1 of the total membership of the University Council, so 60 percent of one – not a quorum, it's – you have to have 60 percent plus 1 here. And then to become effective, the amendment must be approved by the greater of; a) a majority of the total voting membership at University Council, or b) two thirds of the voting members in attendance. So without getting into the real specific details on this, this gives us an opportunity to potentially make change. Because you make change there's going to be some dissent much that's normal. In the past, dissent would kill us because two or three people could tank a motion that 90 percent of people endorsed. This provides a lot more flexibility. So that was a change.

And then the other thing that we've done is look at the, you know, you've got that. And you can imagine why like, particularly articles 5 through 13, doesn't seem like perhaps that's the right place for them. That's part of a discussion that the Rules, Governance and Election Committee is having.

The other document I'd like to take a quick look at – pull up the (inaudible). Again, as a typical faculty member, I had zero experience with the APPM other than when I needed to look up something specific. If you haven't looked at the Academic Policies and Procedure Manual I would encourage you to do so. It has 81 separate policies across five different content areas. And each of those policies exists as a separate pdf. You are not able to search the entire document at once. I've had a graduate student working with me, we have our own personalized version of it that's not

formatted but I do have an entire APPM as a solid document. Otherwise it's a very challenging document to use. Also we find, if you look across the Constitution and Bylaws and the APPM, Board of Trustees regs that there are policies out there that don't agree or that are confusing. Consider, for example, that there are at least three different published protocols for evaluating the president. You're looking at president's contract, versus the Board of Trustees regulations, versus our Constitution and Bylaws. There are three different ways in which we evaluate the president. Strikes me as that's probably not the best way to go about things. We spent a lot of time this summer collecting policies, putting them – just so we even know where things are at. And the notion on this is a policy library. Right now the APPM is our policy library, okay? It's where a lot of – majority of – policies live.

But you also have a Business Procedure Manual. Many other universities consolidate this information into either a policies office or policies Web page, a policy library, if you would. So rather than having policies in all sorts of different places, the suggestion is: Let's put policies in a readily accessed, easily found source and kind of move forward from there. And so that was a discussion within the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee last week, week before. Talking about moving this or what needs to be done because, again, if you think about even this, the APPM as a, "policy library," what's the process for getting things into the APPM? Who oversees it? How often are they reviewed? There are a lot of questions. One of the things I learned over the summer, many of you are familiar of the fact that we have a workload policy. Do you know how that workload policy happened? President – not president – but Provost Alden when he was here had a blue ribbon panel and talked to a number of people, came up with a workload policy, went to the APPM committee, they endorsed it. It's now policy. I'm sorry if in my role as Faculty Senate president, I think that's not the procedure we want to see happen. I think that something like a workload policy that has impact on so many of us should be vetted or at least shared with us rather than automatically becoming a policy that we don't know about.

And the same thing, do you know that we have a University Collegiality Policy? And if you look here, if you were to scroll down on – scroll down, Pat, if you would – to Section 2, Item 22. And I only know this because I was at a meeting last week. If you look at the table of contents in the APPM, Section 2, Item 22 is labeled, Statement on Professional Behavior of Employees. Who would know that there's a colon that follows that and when you actually look at that article itself it's the University Collegiality Policy? We have things in here that you wouldn't even necessarily know about, plus this as a collegiality isn't tied to a grievance policy or anything along those lines. Some of it just doesn't make sense.

So in short, that's basically what I wanted to share with you. The Rules, Governance and Elections Committee seems to be very enthusiastic about looking at these ideas in more depth. They've agreed to meet basically every other week for as long as it takes to get some ideas to bring back to you and share with you as Faculty Senate and also to bring it up for a vote at University Council. So that's what's happening there. Any questions?

Just as a heads-up, when we talk about even reorganizing our, or putting things in different place, please understand that right now we are not suggesting any rewrite of content, all right? That the focus is, I mean, other than maybe a word here or there. But in terms of like going in and saying oh, this is an area that needs significant revision, don't want to do that because right now I think the

major goal would be can we review everything we've got and put things in the right place? So put things in the Constitution and Bylaws that belong there, the policy library, things that belong there should be there. To basically right-place, if you would, many of our policies for the university. That's what the Rules, Governance, Elections Committee has been charged with the last year. And I've been working over summer with them. And we'll continue to do so. We have some graduate assistant support for this as well. Any questions on that?

E.   Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Jimmie Manning, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

G. Long: Okay, then I think we're getting, we have no report from the Resource, Space and Budget committee.

XI.   COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

G. Long: Any comments or questions from the floor? John?

J. Novak: As a matter of etiquette, we have computers in here, they have mutes. We don't need to hear email coming in because you – when we have a tablet or computer, could you turn it on mute, please? Thank you.

G. Long: All right. Those are distractions. It's also, I think it's one of the reasons we have the CART reporter here because distractions make it hard to hear. And I will tell you right now, total side point, just an article published on captioning. And we were able to show that when you show students captions, that they actually retain and recall information better than when you don't. And it has nothing to do with whether they're deaf or hard of hearing, but instructional media generally showed them a Ted Talk, and the captions they scored notably better than when they saw without. Just as a perspective. Yeah, try to keep the distractions down to a minimum as much as possible. Anything else? Any other questions, comments from the floor? Virginia.

V. Naples: Yeah, there is going to be a bylaws informational session tomorrow at 10 and also at 11 for the union bylaws that we're going to be voting on very shortly. And those, that will take place at Engineering 354, both of those. And there's also a social that started at 4:30 at Fatty's that everyone is invited to as well.

G. Long: Very good.

V. Naples: Today.

G. Long: Today. Very good, anyone else?

XII.   INFORMATION ITEMS

A.   Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B.   Minutes, Athletic Board
C.   Minutes, Baccalaureate Council

D.   [Minutes,](#) Board of Trustees
E.   [Minutes,](#) Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
F.   [Minutes,](#) Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
G.   [Minutes,](#) General Education Committee
H.   [Minutes,](#) Graduate Council
I.   [Minutes,](#) Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
J.   [Minutes,](#) Honors Committee
K.   [Minutes,](#) Operating Staff Council
L.   [Minutes,](#) Supportive Professional Staff Council
M.   [Minutes,](#) University Assessment Panel
N.   [Minutes,](#) University Benefits Committee
O.   [Minutes,](#) Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
P.   [Minutes,](#) University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
Q.   [2016-17 Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 27

G. Long: The last thing I would do before calling for adjournment is to just have you note under the information items, item **Q**, our meeting schedule, if you would, make sure you put our meetings into your calendar. Really do need people to attend this year. I think in both aculty Senate and University Council, we have great opportunities to potentially make change. During times of disruption which we're currently right in the middle of, that's when change happens, change does not happen when we're satisfied with the status quo. Let's take advantage of this opportunity and go forward in a positive direction. Anything else?

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: Do I have a motion for adjournment?

G. Slotsve: So moved.

T. Arado: Second.

G. Long: All right, thank you, take care.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.