

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, September 28, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Carlson, Chakraborty, Chomentowski, Clark (for Streb), Conderman, Demir, Fang (for Pavkov), Garcia, Glatz, Grund, Hanley, Hathaway, Hoffman (for Montana), Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Karonis, Khoury, Lampi, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Manning, May, McHone-Chase, Millis, Naples, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Olson (for Chung), Roberts (for Dugas), Ryu, Saborio, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Subramony (for Mooney), Tan, Tonks (for VanderSchee), Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Allori, Azad, Baker, Briscoe, Bujarski, Campbell, Cefaratti, Chen, Chitwood, Chung, Farrell, Haji-Sheikh, Konen, Mogren, Montana, Mooney, Moraga, Patro, Pavkov, Penrod, Riley, Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Schatteman, Siegesmund, Streb, Than, Thu, VanderSchee, Xu

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Doederlein, Jemison, Klaper, Reynolds

OTHERS ABSENT: Falkoff, Johns, Nicholson, Shortridge, Thu, VandeCreek

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome you all to the second Faculty Senate meeting of the 2016-17 academic year. Let's call the meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: Our first item of business is adoption of the agenda. There are no walk-in items. May I have a motion to accept the agenda? Therese Arado, okay. Second? Laura Beamer, okay. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstentions, okay. One thing as a reminder, you'll notice that I've got a colleague up here sitting with me. It feels nice to have some company up here, I will say, but her job is as a computer assisted real time captionist and so she's taking down and putting up there everything we say. It's important, however, that we use the microphones because, if we don't use the microphones, difficult for her to hear, difficult for others to hear. So, if you do have something to say today, please speak into the microphone and also give us your name so that, as we create a transcript for the meeting, names will be much easier to deal with that way. All right? Tremendous, thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 31, 2016 FS MEETING

G. Long: Moving on our agenda, the next thing we have is approval of minutes of the August 31 meeting. We need a motion to accept the minutes. Sarah McHone-Chase, okay. We need a second. Rebecca Hunt, okay. Any changes, corrections, additions to the minutes? Okay, all in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Abstain? Okay, we've got an agenda and we've got minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: Moving right along, under President's Announcements, I'm going to keep it relatively short today. I know you're disappointed on that. We do have Provost Freeman coming in to talk to us in a bit about Program Prioritization. We also have the second half of the presentation from Professor Ferald Bryan, our parliamentarian. So we've got people coming in and I don't want to take too much time. I will give you a couple of quick updates, though.

Certainly one thing we're always concerned about is money. And there's not been much movement on that one certainly from the state level. We are however, I had mentioned this in past meetings, having four faculty a salary study that's being done and the first meeting of that, they meet tomorrow. People who have already participated, I mean agreed to participate, we had a good turnout. We issued about 32 invitations and we've got 25 or 26 people who said yes. So I'm very pleased with people being willing to step up and being willing to participate on that. Again that is a project that is being led by Professors Virginia Wilcox and Kristen Myers. So that will come up through as reports get generated and all that will come through the Economic Status of the Profession, that committee of the Faculty Senate so that we'll be kept informed as that goes along.

The other item of interest from a financial standpoint that may be, you know, something you want to know is having talked to Provost Freeman several times about this, the idea of furloughs, they're off the table. That in all the budget scenarios that they have run, Provost Freeman was suggesting that it does not seem that furloughs would be a cost effective way of dealing with things. And so, I know some of the other universities have pursued this. It is a strategy that's being done elsewhere, but at least as far as I have been told, furloughs are off the table, okay?

Another thing just really quickly to mention is we talked about this several times last year and would encourage you to continue to do so, you know, write your legislators, call your legislators. Don't use NIU materials or time, of course, but keep in touch because our financial situation and the legislative situation is no better than it was six months ago or last year at this time. We have lots of concerns and so, if you've all written one letter, that's great, but try writing another. And if you haven't written anything or made any calls, would encourage you to do so.

And from another governance standpoint, we're continuing to look at organization of the Constitution and Bylaws as well as the different policies and procedures we have going on.

The last thing I would say is related to academic and curricular concerns and would like to encourage us potentially to have a future meeting on this. I was just in a meeting and people were talking about diversity and multi-curriculum issues; and, if we look specifically, I think many of us may not have a good grasp of who our students are as far as how many of them are first generation or low-income or minority or whatever. And, so, when we look at that, there may be some value in getting a better sense of who our students are as well as they're putting together some information now talking about equity gaps in graduation rates and seeing how certainly different constituencies have, you know, respond and do. So I think, from our standpoint, there may be some value in getting a little more information on that. I don't want to give you any specifics. I think this would be something that Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden, our chief diversity officer, would be probably the person to come in and give this or a designee. But I do want to let you know that that is something I think we should most likely talk about as we move forward.

And at the end of today, our hope is that we're going to get to the end of our presentations, our meeting, a little bit early and we'll have a little bit of time to talk at the end. One thing I would just like you to put in the back of your mind is: What is the role of the Faculty Senate? You know, we're talking about a lot of bigger things in terms of the university but, particularly as a curricular body, in many universities faculty senates have much more curricular authority than we do. We're primarily a caucus body and, while it's good to have the opportunity to get together and talk, many other universities in a similar situation have a faculty senate that does make a lot of decisions relative to curricular matters. So I would, again, just throw that out as something that we may want to talk about.

J. Stephen: Do they also have a university council like we do?

G. Long: So the question, take the mic, I don't necessarily want to repeat.

J. Stephen: Do these more active in the curricular matters of faculty senates also exist in an environment where there's a university council which oversees curricular matters too?

G. Long: Right, so, if we're talking about how do these other universities exist and how are they structured, our structure is still relatively unique. Having spent a whole year now looking at other universities and constitutions and bylaws, ours are pretty unique. For example, most, many many universities have what they call a faculty assembly, and that's, you know, once or twice a year the entire faculty get together and meet with the president. We have nothing comparable here. So our structure in terms of how we set up the constitution and bylaws, is not typical.

J. Stephen: That's what I wondered, and whether it was reasonable to try to take on a curricular role in this body.

G. Long: Well, right. And I'm mentioning that in terms of reasonableness as: Is this something the body wants to look at. I'm, you've heard me talk, and we'll talk more about this, I'm very, very focused on looking at the larger constitution and bylaws and the number of bylaws we have that are policies that aren't really bylaws and looking at that at that level. The Faculty Senate Bylaws have

not spent a lot of time with, but as a group, if that's something we'd like to have more involvement in this, that's an open discussion because, in times of disruption, that's when you make change.

J. Stephen: Okay, thank you, Greg.

G. Long: Certainly. That's it in terms of my president's announcements.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. [Parliamentary Procedure: A Primer](#) Part 2 – Ferald Bryan, Faculty Senate Parliamentarian and Professor, Department of Communication – Pages 3-22

G. Long: At this point, I'd like to turn the program over to part 2 of Professor Bryan's introduction to parliamentary procedure. And with that, I'd like to and also say thank you for your willingness to share your knowledge and expertise.

F. Bryan: Thank you, Greg, and good afternoon. I'll do a very brief recap and I'm always happy to take questions. The first several slides that I talked about last month, and I know it's been a month so I'll do a quick recap. I was trying to deal with some of the basic questions about what are the rules that govern organizations like this. What is parliamentary procedure? A little bit about its purposes, a little bit of its traditions. We talked about the agenda and your role. And I was just finishing a discussion about the classification of motions, which is how things are done. And I'd finished talking about privileged motions and I was summarizing privileged motions are those which must be acted on right away by the organization and things like setting the time to adjourn, going into recess, or if anyone feels we've veered from the established agenda, you can always ask that we return to that, points of order, appeals, always in order because they are, indeed, privileged in that context.

Today I want to move on to incidental motions, which typically relate to, you know, very specific questions that are already in front of the body, the deliberative body that we are. And most importantly, I'll talk about first the fact that you always have the power as an organization to suspend the rules. And we can use it to deviate from the agenda...I'm on the wrong page, I apologize, we'll get organized here, okay.

Incidental motions. First one, point of order. Any time any of you think that I or Greg have made a mistake, you don't need to be recognized, you just need to say you have a point of concern and you need to raise it. A few minutes ago, you should have said, hey, we're out of order, I don't know what slide you're on. That's always appropriate. You know, if the glare of the sun, which a few minutes ago was a problem, is not right now. Even that can be a point that you could bring up. So points of order are always important to deal with.

An appeal. This is rare. I don't know that it's ever happened, although occasionally with issues if you believe the chair has made a decision that's not in agreement with your understanding of our discussion, you have a right to, you know, to make that appeal. And it's not debatable, I mean it is debatable, not amendable, but through a majority vote we could, you know, technically overrule what the chair wanted to do.

Now on slide 16, talk about suspend the rules. Deliberative bodies have this unique power in Robert's that says that, if we decide that we want to completely deviate from the stated agenda and, even with the provost coming, we wanted to send something completely different, we have the power to do that. Someone makes the motion to suspend the rules, seconded, we can't debate it, but if two-thirds of us agree, we can talk about whatever we want to talk about and that's a unique power. And this is a reminder to tell you that any action that's taken that might affect your rights like if you intended to follow the agenda or you're here and you don't want your time wasted, the motions that would affect your rights usually require at least a two-thirds vote. In other words, it's not something that's taken very lightly by Robert's. It has to be dealt with with an extraordinary majority.

Incidental motion of division of the house. This is when a member agrees with the, usually a voice vote stated by the chair. Again, this is somewhat rare, but I know it happens occasionally, and I think Greg and almost all presidents of this body as well as the University Council are sensitive to the fact that a voice vote on a motion sounds very close that usually the chair has the right to ask for a division or an actual headcount. But, if the chair doesn't do it, a member, any member of the senate or the council has the right to ask for that. You don't need to be recognized. There's no second or it's not debatable, amendable, you don't vote on it. You just have that power to make that request, and it's very important.

On the next slide, we talk about the motion to withdraw. Most of us have seen this happen more than once. It's always tough to amend or to even wordsmith from the floor, as we call it, and if we reach a point, the person who's made a motion has the right to withdraw it. It's not debatable, there's no second, amendable. You own your motion is what it comes down to. If you choose to take it from the floor, it is your right to do so. It just simply ceases to exist at that point.

Point 11, a division of the house. If you believe that we're debating such a complex issue that it needs to be broken down, especially into two different motions, you have the power to do that. You say, I believe we should divide the question. It does have to be seconded. It's not debatable but it could be amendable as to how it's divided. You know, if you think it really is three different items. And I say that because sometimes we do discuss some very complex matters, and it may be better to break them into pieces and talk about them separately.

On slide 18, point 12 talks about objection to consideration of the question. We rarely, I think in this body, have ever faced this, but if, for some reason, we chose to make a motion objecting to hearing something or to hear something or someone, you have the power to at least make the motion, have it seconded. It's not debatable or amendable, but please notice again, because this involves your rights, a two-thirds vote would be required. Again, to my many years of experience in this chair, I don't think we've ever had this. Most of the time, we've been very open to allow discussion about any issue or hear from, you know, any representative that chooses to request the opportunity to address this body, but you do have that right.

On slide 19, I'm sorry, we're going to slide 19, we go to subsidiary motions. These come up when they're applied to other motions that are already on the floor. So these apply to things we are currently discussing and is, hopefully, a way to dispose of them. And the first of these is the ever popular lay on the table, which is the formal language that Robert's used to what most of us simply

saying is to table a motion. Professional parliamentarians get all excited about talking about lay on the table because it's in some of the books of parliamentary procedure – and I remind you there are more than one and we talked about a few of them. Robert's is the most popular, most widely used 11th edition been in print since the late, I mean the early 1800s, early 1900s. To lay on the table is really designed to postpone a decision. The American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code puts it pretty bluntly. They argue that the motion to table essentially is a motion to kill a motion.

For most of you, and this has happened occasionally, when you simply want to say to postpone the discussion of a matter until say next month, you probably want number 14 to postpone definitely, that is move an issue from the floor to be brought up at the very next meeting. What makes it different from lay on the table is that, if it passes and is approved by a majority vote, a second motion is required. That is, a month from now or two months from now, a formal motion has to be made to take it from the table, and that has to be made, seconded, and voted on by a majority, and then brought back to the table. It's a very awkward motion to have to deal with. I strongly recommend that, if you simply wish to postpone it to a certain time or especially to an upcoming meeting, just use the word, postpone. That's the more appropriate motion to just deal with something later rather than to lay on the table or to table it because that requires a separate motion to bring it back and it gets a little awkward sometimes.

Slide 20 takes us another great parliamentary discussion – previous question. Most of you probably have heard this called simply call the question. Well it's a little more complicated than that. In fact, other handbooks on parliamentary procedure say it should be called something else. In fact, the Standard Code says it should be called a motion to end the debate and, you know, force a vote on the main motion because to call the question or to move the previous question, which is still what Robert's, after all the editions, insists on calling it, it requires a motion, a second. It's not debatable or amendable, it must be voted on immediately, but it's a two-thirds vote. And the power of this is simply to cut off debate. If it passes by that two-thirds, we have to go immediately to vote on the main question. And most of us probably don't want to do that in most occasions. Most of us like to, you know, fully discuss an item. But, if we choose to call the question, it's seconded, voted on immediately, if two-thirds of us agree that we're done talking about it, we can vote for this, it's rare, but again, it's moving the previous question. Its power is to cut off debate and force us to vote on the main motion.

Number 17 on page 21, this is something we've got a lot of experience with and, hopefully, I think we do a pretty good job at this. Amend a motion – used to change a motion but never the intent of a motion and Robert's is very clear about this. If we see the wording of an amendment. Or, I'm sorry, we see the wording of a motion that we don't like or we think we can improve it, we offer an amendment. Robert's tries to make it a little more precise. It gives you three options, and we usually don't use this language, but typically this is what happens when we go to amend. We want to add something, add a word or phrase; we want to strike out or take something out, remove part of the motion; or we just want to substitute, you know, remove part or, in fact, completely, you know, rephrase a whole segment of it. We don't often enforce the fact that amendments, or motions to amend can only be made twice. They do require recognition and a second, are debatable and amendable, and they require a majority vote. And sometimes when we get amendments to amendments, it gets complicated, but amendments have to be taken, you know, in the order they've been made and it's, I guess the best analogy that was taught to me is that you take it like a layer

cake. You take each layer of the amendment until you finally get back to your main motion. If you keep amending beyond the two that Robert's says you're supposed to do, again, that's rarely enforced but technically, you know, if we want to speed things along, someone could bring that up as a point of order that Robert's says we should only amend it twice.

And, finally, getting back to the main motion. Like I say, we get to the top of the layer cake. It's essentially used to bring an item of business before this or any other body and two main motions. Sometimes people have said, well you can't have two motions on the floor. Well, yes, of course you can if you're amending and things of that sort. You can't have two main motion on the floor at any one time and you, of course, should be recognized, should be seconded. Of course, they're debatable. Of course, we just talked about they are amendable, and you have a majority vote. But, given all that we've talked about, it seems ironic that it's essentially the lowest ranked of all motions. It's really how we get most of our business done.

And most of the time, as you know, as I started a month ago, I prefer to be seen and not heard. I'm here as a consultant, an advisor to this body. I have no power other than the fact I know a little bit about and have some experience with Robert's Rules and have learned a lot about our constitution and bylaws. But most of the time I don't interject unless someone brings up a point of order or unless we're really getting into a dark hole that we don't want to go into. I'm not that technical, but one can get very technical at these 716 pages of Robert's Rules and our very lengthy constitution that Greg wants to try to trim down. But I am always available for consultations. I've reviewed and assisted several colleges and schools with revisions of bylaws. Again, I have no power but I'm happy to try to offer advice if I'm asked. I can be contacted very simply at fbryan@niu.edu, and I'm certainly open to questions that you may have about some of just the basics of Robert's Rules, a real primer for why parliamentary procedure is important.

J. Novak: I'm happy to learn more about the details of how the fine distinctions of these rules, but I'm wondering how they will apply to this body. For instance, if someone decides to table something, will somebody correct them and say, no, you mean postpone. If someone says call the question, is someone going to say no, you mean the previous question. How much of what we've just learned is really going to be applied.

F. Bryan: Well, John, thank you. It's a good question and, on those two issues, I have often interjected. In fact, whether it's Greg or someone else, I have said, you know, if your intention is to debate this or you'd rather wait and debate this next month rather than right now, we're running out of time, you probably just want to postpone it rather than to table it. And I have interjected on that matter. In my experience, there's only been one occasion, I think the University Council, where we've ever had an actual case where there was a vote on call the question. And I just remind everybody that its intent is to end debate. And it was a very heated discussion a few years ago. It does require a two-thirds vote. There I just remind people of what its purpose is and the fact that it would cut off debate. And if we're ready to do that, then certainly the super majority rules in that case. I just offer advice, that's my purpose, and to try to interpret Robert's as best I can. That's why Robert's is silent on the difference between lay on the table vs. postpone. Other sources and other commentary on it say its real intent, lay on the table is really more to kill a measure. And that's why it's used in congress. In the U.S. Congress, any time they table something, it's never coming back

on the table, or very rarely is it coming back on the table. But our purpose is usually simply to postpone, and we do want to deal with it at a specific time.

J. Novak: Thank you.

F. Bryan: Yes, Buck.

J. Stephen: I think over 30 years of this I've seen four things come up a lot. And I've called the question a couple times. But generally any objections [inaudible] it's pretty informal on that. But our main problems that I remember are what's often said instead of separation, divide the question, especially when we recognize a problem when somebody tries to incorporate a solution in the motion. And you always tell us, are you sure you want to table that. And, I can't read my other note.

F. Bryan: The few times, you're right I think, in this body that someone has asked or moved the previous question, if there are no objections and if the chair assumes that there is consent, you know, he takes that as essentially meeting the two-thirds requirement, but just, you know, if you think it needs to be voted on.

J. Stephen: We get sidetracked sometimes.

F. Bryan: We do get sidetracked. But again, if you want to vote, you know, a division of the question or we need a vote, a show of hands, you have the power to request that. And that's the way I. A lot of people look at Robert's Rules as more, as technical, and it can be very arcane, I would agree with that, but it's also very empowering if you understand that most of these rules exist to protect your rights, to deliberate, to critically evaluate a question, and it's really there just if we get into trouble, you know, if we get way off track. It helps steer us back to where we should be.

J. Stephen: And I just remembered what my third note was.

F. Bryan: Yes.

J. Stephen: The number of times that we make clumsy motions, and we no, no, again we should just take it back and work on it. That happens a lot.

F. Bryan: Yes, they should always be, I mean, technically Robert's says, you know, motions should always be in writing and that's not just for the helpful deliberation, but it's also for the minutes if we're making a record of this, we want an accurate, complete copy of it.

J. Stephen: Well there have been times when we've actually worked on writing it...Thank you.

F. Bryan: Sure. Other questions. Again, I'm always available and thank you for your patience.

G. Long: Thank you very much, Ferald. I appreciate that. And I will certainly say in my role as Faculty Senate president, I have consulted with Ferald many times just even on how to present something, how to talk about it, because this doesn't come natural to me. The other thing I would mention before we introduce Provost Freeman to talk about Program Prioritization and it's

following up on what Ferald was saying is, if you have not done so, take some time out and read the constitution, read our constitution and bylaws. And I will tell you, I admitted this last year. Prior to becoming Faculty Senate president, I had not read the constitution and bylaws. I'd read aspects of them that might pertain to a particular project, but in terms of getting a sense of the overall document, had not read it. And now that I've read it through multiple times at this point, I think there is some real value in at least familiarizing yourself with its construction and some of the topics. I would not ask that you go through and try to read all 20 pages of, you know, Article 12 in terms of, you know, grievances and so forth. Don't worry about the details because the document is really quite cumbersome. But from the standpoint of having a sense of what we're talking about, I think there's great value in that. In the same way, I think as most of us as typical faculty members, we have very little reason to look at the constitution and bylaws or to look at the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, the APPM. And again, as you have a few minutes, take a glance at the APPM and you'll see why, from a policy standpoint, it's such a challenging document because it's got 80 plus policies, they're all individual pdfs. Many of the things in the table of contents don't really clearly identify what's being discussed. So again, as we move forward on a number of these topics, do a little self education on the constitution and bylaws as well as the APPM so you have a sense of when we're saying, gosh, this is really confusing or it's really complex, it's not just you relying on what we're telling you. I think it won't take long for you to see the same issues.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

G. Long: And I would just like to compliment the group because, even though we had Ferald's presentation, none of you yelled out, "point of order" because, if you're looking at your agenda, I skipped the consent agenda. I made a mistake.

T. Bishop: Point of order.

G. Long: All right, we're set.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Program Prioritization update – Lisa Freeman, Provost

G. Long: With that, it's my pleasure to introduce Provost Lisa Freeman. She's going to be here today to tell us a little bit about update on Program Prioritization. In future meetings, we'll typically have Matt Streb. Matt is one of our faculty senators and he's very actively involved in the ongoing process of Program Prioritization so he will typically be here to answer our questions. He's not available today so Provost Freeman volunteered to come in and play that role.

L. Freeman: Thank you, Greg. And thank you, Ferald. I was fortunate enough to overhear the end of the review of Robert's Rules, and I am definitely someone who can't hear that enough because a little more sticks each time. But I still rely a lot either on the parliamentarian or on Robert's Rules for Dummies which is well worn on my book shelf.

I have agreed, and I think it's a wonderful idea, for both Faculty Senate and University Council to periodically be updated on Program Prioritization so that you can understand that there is stuff

going on every single day even though it may not always be completely obvious. How many people either saw through media streaming, or attended, the Town Hall last week where I gave an update? So a good number of you. I guess I'll start out by saying one thing that's new since then that I think will be of real interest to this body, and then I'll just open it up for questions.

So, the end of last week, the requests to authorize searches for faculty members were received from all of the colleges. The provost's staff reviewed those yesterday, in fact, late yesterday afternoon. I'll be bringing forward recommendations for discussion to the president and to the CFO before the end of the week. In anticipation of approval of the majority of our recommendations, Chris Atherton is already reaching out to the colleges asking for more information, position numbers, to get the ball rolling. And I'm very hopeful that we'll be authorizing somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 searches for tenure line faculty to take place this academic year so those faculty can start next academic year, and I'll keep you posted on that. I think everything will be very obvious within the course of the next week, I just have those two meetings left, so wish me luck. And, with that, I'll just ask for questions from the audience. Yes, Beatrix.

B. Hoffman: Hi, I'm subbing for Ismael Montana from the Dept. of History. I just wonder if you have figures on how many faculty have departed in the past year?

L. Freeman: I don't have those handy. I can certainly make those available to Faculty Senate through Greg. There's no problem in doing that.

J. Stephen: Do you have numbers on the decrease in FTEs from say 2005 until now?

L. Freeman: You know, I gave a table to Faculty Senate in the presentation that I gave last spring that showed a decrease over the epoch of about the last five years, and it showed the decrease in the number of tenured faculty over that period, I want to say, it was about 720 to 640, but it would really be better to look back at the presentation. Associated with that was an increase in the number of temporary faculty. Our numbers, our presentative faculty or tenure line are still very, actually, high compared to most institutions with our research profile. But certainly over at least the past three years when I've been in the provost's office as we held off replacing tenured faculty and we relied more, because of the budget, but also because we knew Program Prioritization was being effected, as we did more temporary stop-gap measures, I'm looking forward to hiring more tenure line faculty in the programs that have been severely impacted. But we are always happy to make those data available from HR, there's no problem with that. And so I'll just have a table sent to you and you can share it with everybody, not an issue.

J. Stephen: I was interested in what included this year. How about our continued use of part-time employees? There's always been a problem in our perception that they aren't the best treated of our appointments.

L. Freeman: The majority of the faculty who we employ at NIU who are not tenured or tenure-track are actually full-time instructors. We employ temporary employees in a number of areas. Sometimes it's last-minute instructional staffing. In some programs that are professional programs, there's actually an intentional employment of part-time faculty who play the roles of professors of practice who have experience in the profession and; in fact, some accrediting agencies applaud that.

I think probably the perception that part-time employees are less effective depends on less effective in what measure. So, would I say that they are less engaged in the fabric of the campus, less involved in service? Obviously, that's probably true. If you're talking about a professional program where you're really looking for somebody who spends part of their life in the work place and part of their life in the classroom with graduate students, then I would say that the goal there is such that a part-time person is probably the appropriate person to be in front of that classroom.

J. Stephen: I'm not worried about their effectiveness. Generally, the ones I know are very effective. But what I'm worried about is I don't want us to get into the position of abusing adjuncts. Are you committed to our continued use of full-time faculty?

L. Freeman: I'm fully committed to the use of full-time faculty and to the replacement of tenure line faculty. Tenure line faculty are the backbone of the university. They're what make us a university. Faculty who come here and engage our students in their research and artistry and engage them in activities are what make us NIU, what make us a student-centered, research-focused, regionally engaged university, and I'm very committed to hiring faculty. At the same time, as I bring forward these requests for faculty hires, I know that I'm bringing forward a request to hire 40 tenure-track faculty at a time when we had a 70 percent budget cut last year and we've received only 50 percent of our budget to date for this year. And the data from Springfield suggests that we may not see the other half of the budget until the end of the fiscal year and still, because of the faculty hiring cycle, because we need to search now to have faculty on our campus next year, we're going forward with these searches. And I know that CFO Phillips is very supportive. The question is not, "will we hire." The question is "how many will we hire."

J. Stephen: Forty sounds great to me. How many requests did you get, just to be curious?

L. Freeman: You know, the requests that came from the colleges were prioritized: high priority, medium priority, and low priority. And even though we went through these last night, I honestly can't tell you how many requests we had. But that's not a secret, we'll be happy to share that. I just don't remember. I would say that, as we went down the requests, the things that mattered to us, in addition to Program Prioritization and the way that the colleges prioritized their faculty hiring requests, were things related to accreditation. So, if we had programs where we needed to hire faculty to maintain a program's accreditation and we knew accreditation was coming up, that was importantly weighted. We looked at safety issues in laboratories, student-advising faculty ratios, the kind of things that you would expect us to look at. My feeling is we got pretty far down the list in most cases.

In a few cases, we've actually flagged searches very intentionally for the searching in the next academic year and that was either because the colleges themselves suggested that that would be okay, they had a one-year alternative that was viable, but not an alternative beyond that, or because we knew there would be hiring at a dean or chair level that would make it more attractive if the faculty positions weren't permanently filled. So those are the kinds of conversations that we had, and by next week, everybody will know what's going on. I just need to make sure that I have a president and a CFO who buy in to the exact proposal that I'm bringing forward.

I want to compliment anyone in this room and all of your deans for how well the arguments were made. They took full advantage of the template. They articulated arguments for faculty extremely well. When the Program Prioritization Task Force recommendations were countered, the reason for the counter was very well expressed, and I think really people did a very good job justifying hires of faculty, and we need to hire faculty.

J. Stephen: Thank you.

G. Long: Any other questions for the provost?

L. Freeman: All right, Pat, if you would send me a reminder on the data requests, we'll get that out as soon as possible. Thank you all.

G. Long: Thank you very much.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

G. Long: Number IX, Reports from Advisory Committees, Paul, you have a report from the FAC to the IBHE, please?

P. Stoddard: Yes, I actually do. The FAC to the IBHE met September 9 at Northeastern Illinois University. We had a discussion with the head of the Faculty Senate there and the UPI president from there and the provost from NEIU. Basically, they were talking about the effects the state lack of a budget has had on the university, a lot of the same things we've heard throughout the state throughout the last year or two, so I won't repeat all that.

A couple of points they did raise that I thought were interesting. They're really stressing the number of NEIU alumni who have stayed in Illinois and are, therefore, contributing to the economy, the standard of living, the culture, and so forth, of the state. So they're trying to say that their people stay in Illinois, contribute to Illinois, and therefore they're a worthwhile institution to have in order of preparing citizens for life in the state of Illinois. I thought that was interesting and something we might want to think more about if we aren't already.

They talked about, they did have to undergo a furlough program. I think they voted for the tenured/tenure-track people would actually accept 14 furlough days. They used seven. They did negotiate that people in their last, or best, four years, would not have their pensions affected by the fact that they're being furloughed and, therefore, their salaries are going down during that critical period. There was some accommodation made for that.

They said that, despite the fact that they were able to keep their sabbaticals and various other awards, furloughs had hurt faculty retention and recruitment. So it is good news that the provost thinks we will not have to resort to that here. We also talked about lobbying the legislature.

Somebody, I believe it was the representative from Northern, suggested that getting students to help out would have more of an impact with the legislators. They, folks were not so convinced that that was true because the legislators know that the students, unfortunately, don't make a very strong voting block. And so, if we have any students here, I would suggest that, if the state of their education is important to them, they might want to actually make a better effort at getting to the voting booths in November and beyond. Also, when you do talk to your legislators, always end your conversation with two words, "I vote." That seems to make an impression on them.

Another order of business, some concern has been expressed about dealing, or getting military veterans educational opportunities. There is going to be two free, key word there – free, faculty workshops February 7 at DePaul and February 9 at ISU on how to better serve veterans in our higher education system. So if anybody's interested in those, let me know and I will help you get involved with them.

I think those are the main things that came up. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to answer them. Otherwise, that's it.

G. Long: Any questions for Paul? Yes, Mitch.

M. Irwin: Any news on Rauner's appointee. Is he still there?

P. Stoddard: He is still there. He will be there until he is voted on. If he's approved, then he will be there for longer. If he is not approved, then shorter. The FAC, through our chair, did offer a compromise pointing out that there is another public seat that's a governor's appointee seat and they can name Mr. Bombanek to that and then honor the FAC's request for a full tenure-track or tenured faculty member to sit on that. The secretary of education said that that wouldn't be necessary, that the governor was very happy with Mr. Bombanek's appointment. In response, the FAC is going to work with friendly legislators to pass a bill that would require that that seat be a tenured faculty member. And actually, we're looking at maybe, there are two student seats on the IBHE. We're thinking maybe we should have two faculty seats on the IBHE to balance that. So, that's not the last word, we're still fighting that fight.

G. Long: Other questions, comments? Okay, 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: Okay, next on the list is the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. There's no report on that. I would say that the most recent Board of Trustees meeting took place a couple weeks ago and, from an open meeting standpoint, lasted about 20 minutes, 30 minutes, and then they went into closed session. So not much to report from that. Would again, much like I've encouraged you to read the constitution and bylaws, would encourage you all to also take a look at the Board of Trustees website because they post when their meetings are. They post reports. They post the minutes from past meetings. So, if you want to get a sense of what the Board of Trustees does, that's probably your best way of doing it. The next meeting that they've got is October 20 in

the morning and it will be several of the ad hoc committees that are going to be discussing items. Again, board meetings are open to the public and so they're typically held in Altgeld 315, the Board of Trustees room and would, like I say, if you have any interest, it's valuable to attend just to see kind of what the process is, see who the players are. And even in thinking about the players, I think how many, there are eight trustees? Eight or nine? Eight. Okay, four of the eight trustees have terms that are expiring this year and so one of the interesting/concerning things is that our governor will be making four appointments to the Board of Trustees and he is under no obligation to, you know, say well like half Democrats, half Republicans. It's entirely his choice. So that might be a very interesting dilemma, not dilemma, development, sorry. That might be very interesting development as it moves forward. We'll have to see how that plays out. Virginia.

V. Naples: One addendum you forgot to mention, Greg, is that the actual transcripts of the Board of Trustees' meetings are on that website, you can access them, because that gives you verbatim what was discussed. The minutes just give you the agenda list as we've had with summations of minutes from other meetings as well. And those have proven to be extremely useful.

G. Long: Thank you for making that clarification. I appreciate it. All right, any questions?

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

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

G. Long: Okay, moving along to reports from standing committees, we're still early enough in the year that we don't have a lot. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Katy, we have no report, right?

K. Jaekel: We have no report.

G. Long: Okay.

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

G. Long: And Academic Affairs, John, no report yet?

J. Novak: No report.

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

G. Long: Okay, Economic Status of the Profession, Paul.

P. Stoddard: I would like to report that we have no report.

G. Long: Okay, thank you.

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

G. Long: I do know we have one person who will at least say a few words, Becqui Hunt for the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee.

R. Hunt: I'd like to report that we are meeting regularly working on the policy library.

G. Long: Thank you.

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

G. Long: And then the Resources, Space and Budget Committee, Jimmie?

J. Manning: No report.

G. Long: Okay, all right.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

G. Long: So, would like to open it at this point to any questions and comments from the floor. We have a number of things going on at the university. I want to give you the chance, if you want to say anything or bring up questions, now would be the time to do it. Anything going on that people would like to ask about or comment on?

P. Stoddard: Oh, I guess. Yes, I've been asked to update this body on union doings. So the union, I think we've gotten the word out, did, in fact, pass the bylaws. We are now in the process of electing officers so there's been a pretty good slate of candidates named. There is a meeting this very afternoon at 4:30 over at the Universalist Unitarian Fellowship Hall on Fourth Street and some other street in downtown DeKalb, a block north of Lincoln Highway, and all union members are invited to attend that. The idea is to meet the various people who have been nominated and see if anybody else is interested in being nominated at that meeting. So this is an excellent time to help shape the direction and color of the union.

G. Long: Does anyone have any questions for Paul with regard to the union or any comments, anything to add? Well we are a remarkably quiet group today. Any other topics that are of particular interest or importance that you'd like to bring up at this point?

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: That being the case, do we have a motion for adjournment.

J. Stephen: So moved.

J. Novak: Second.

G. Long: All right, thank you very much.

Meetings adjourned at 3:57 p.m.