

ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL

March 2, 2020

3:00 p.m. Altgeld 315

Minutes

Present: Bateni, Blazey, Cripe, Douglass, Gordon, Ingram, Kortegast, Nesterov, Peters, Reynolds, Siblik, Thurmaier, VandeCreek, Zinger

Guests: Kendall Thu, Professor, Department of Anthropology, President of Faculty Senate, Executive Secretary University Council

Meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. Approval of minutes from February 10, 2020

- a. Beth Ingram asked if any corrections were needed.
 - i. Minutes were approved.

2. Changes to APC

- a. Kendall Thu discussed the overview of consolidation of committees.
 - i. Carolinda Douglass asked Thu to discuss the context of the proposed changes to the APC.
 1. This is an ongoing proposal to revamp the shared governance system.
 - ii. There are three components to discuss about of our shared governance structure:
 1. First, moving academic matters out of the University Council and over to Faculty Senate.
 - a. While completing a benchmarking exercise last fall, Thu compared NIU's governance structure to sisters' structures.
 - i. We have a University Council (UC), and most universities only have a Faculty Senate (FS).
 - b. At NIU, our constitution says faculty should prevail in academic matters including admission. However, the constitution does not give any authority to the FS.
 - c. For years, we have discussed moving the academic piece to FS and authorizing them to address these matters.
 - d. Thu discussed the flowchart.
 - i. White and red boxes on the left represent the current structure of the UC.
 - ii. The "swoop" is to move the academic committees in UC into the FS.
 2. Second, making our shared governance smaller, more nimble, and efficient.
 - a. Currently, we have similar committees on both UC and FS.
 - b. Reducing the number of committees makes the reporting lines more efficient.
 3. Third, we are proposing to reform UC entirely.

- a. UC still has important functions besides the academic pieces.
 - b. Downsizing makes the membership on UC more equitable to stakeholders.
- iii. This has been going on in shared governance all year.
- iv. Thu was gratified to have Ingram and Douglass approach him.
 - 1. They considered changing APC along with these larger changes.
 - 2. Part of this process involved him looking at the duties of committees.
 - 3. Thu displayed a document with the Academic Affairs and APC duties.
 - a. They are not exactly the same language, but the green and blue show the similarities.
 - b. When we think about whether we need both committees, we can see they have similar duties.
 - c. Ingram and Douglass's idea involved improving the functionality of these committees.
- v. Thu asked if there were any questions.
 - 1. Brad Peters asked if Thu could send this document to everyone.
 - 2. Hamid Bateni said he was wondering if Thu had any statistics on how many committees or faculty members would be free.
 - a. Thu said he asked Patricia Erickson to count the number of university wide committees, which was about 104. He is unsure how to benchmark this.
 - b. When Erickson has asked the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) to find a faculty member to serve a committee, they do not have anyone left because they are spread so thin.
 - c. Thu referenced the diagram again.
 - i. There are five committees in the deletions mark.
 - ii. One has been deleted already and there are four more now.
 - iii. Each committee has maybe twelve to fifteen members.
 - d. Besides freeing up faculty and staff, it also frees up student members, which we cannot get enough of.
 - 3. Evgueni Nesterov asked if all those committees are under the FS in the university structure.
 - a. Thu said there are committees that fall under FS and some that fall under UC. There are two committees at the university that are joint between these. We are proposing to remove the five committees that are currently under UC and revamping UC too.
 - b. There currently is a steering committee for UC. We are proposing to remove this committee because UC can be downsized and there does not need to be a Resource and Space Budget Committee for UC.
 - 4. Nesterov asked if all those committees are FS.
 - a. Thu said this is correct. These are all academic committees. The former Economic Status of the Profession Committee

- (ECPC) gets moved over to the FS side and becomes the FS Personnel Committee (FSPC).
 - b. There is no change to what this committee is doing.
 - c. These are faculty affairs that should be dealt with by the FS.
 - d. The first candidate on campus for the Dean of CLAS met with the shared governance group and one of her concerns was that she could not figure out the university's shared governance system.
- b. Ingram addressed the decentralization of Program Review (PR).
 - i. When considering streamlining, an important consideration is how we conduct APC.
 - ii. She suggests decentralizing PR.
 - iii. There are two external groups involved with PR: the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE).
 - 1. HLC cares that we do PR, report on the structure, and provide documentation that we respond to PR.
 - 2. IBHE requires us to submit a report that has responses to four questions that are asked by them. We submit the responses of these questions to the Board of Trustees and then the IBHE.
 - 3. Neither group specifies how to do PR.
 - 4. Ingram suggests using accreditation reviews as PR for the accredited programs and allowing the deans to run the processes in their own colleges.
 - 5. In conjunction with this change, it frees up APC to be more policy orientated for advice to the provost on larger issues.
 - 6. As Thu said, the UC's Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee will be going away.
 - a. Their responsibilities were duplicated.
 - b. The responsibilities of this committee would be shifted over to the APC.
 - iv. Ingram asked if there were any thoughts or concerns moving in this direction.
 - 1. Nesterov said it makes sense to streamline the process.
 - 2. Bateni asked out of curiosity, are there any programs at NIU that do not go through academic accreditation?
 - a. Ingram said yes. Most of the departments in CLAS are not accredited.
 - 3. Peters asked for clarification. Are you saying for example, teaching licensure is getting moved to this committee or moved to the college?
 - a. Ingram said the college. The accreditation review would serve as the PR.
 - 4. Carrie Kortegast asked if there would be separate committees in the colleges.
 - a. Ingram said each of the colleges would create their own processes.
- c. Douglass discussed the changes to APC in membership and duties.
 - i. Faculty representation would be reduced.

1. We would ask for one faculty member from each college, the library, then student representation would be changed from two to one.
2. Administrative representation would most likely be gone.
 - a. Douglass would continue to serve on the APC, but all the other Vice Provosts would not need to attend.
3. The duties then show instead of working with other committees like Baccalaureate Council and Graduate Council, new programs would be approved by them instead of this body. The new reporting as Thu mentioned would not be to UC, it would be to FS now.
- ii. This review would now happen within colleges and the library. This group would then focus on the reporting of these at the end of the year as an information item.
 1. Ingram confirmed it would come here, the Board of Trustees, and the IBHE.
 2. Douglass confirmed that the APC would still see it, but would not be a part of the PR process.
- iii. Ingram discussed an email she received earlier today from Kurt Thurmaier.
 1. It would be great if this council worked on policy within the strategic action planning framework.
 - a. This is the direction she sees the APC moving towards instead of PR.
- iv. Peters asked if there ever was a conversation about reducing the amount of times we could even meet.
 1. Ingram said we meet about once a month.
 2. Douglass said in the bylaws it says we meet on Mondays, but it does not specify the amount of times.
- v. Thu said to clarify the process, the first reading will come to UC on April 1st, and then the second reading would occur at the last meeting on April 29th.
- vi. Thurmaier asked if the new APC would be essentially discussing these big issues with the Provost, but would not have any actual decision authority.
 1. Thu said the APC would report out to FS with consultation of the Provost. The FS would have the authority to adopt or reject whatever recommendations were made by the APC.
 2. Ingram contributed that the FS could also listen to the discussion.
 - a. One of the things you raised was policies about interdisciplinary work. That might be something that this committee can make recommendations on. The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women is to have a couple important policies changes related to leave and breast feeding policies.
 - i. This came out of this group, but they could not actually push the policy forward; however, they made the recommendations.
 3. Thurmaier said the other reason he wanted to confirm this was if they had decision-making authority, he would be more concerned about only one person from each college being on the APC. The conversations would need to bring a lot of different people into it.

- a. Thu said to remember when it gets to FS, the preponderance of votes come from representation by departments.
- b. Thurmaier clarified he was not talking about votes. He was referring to the interdisciplinary aspect of it.
 - i. For example, English has intensive writing courses. There might be one person from CLAS that is a biology person leading and representing this discussion. You want to think about how you would bring people together on these kinds of issues. You could also invite specific people to come when these issues are being discussed.
 - ii. Ingram said this was really important. She is not aware of anything that stops us from inviting other people to the discussion. She imagines setting the agenda and asking who else needs to be part of the conversation. She does not think anything in the bylaws stops us from doing this.
- c. Thu said we do not do an exquisite job of having representatives go back to their units to report out and bring it back. Some departments do this better than others. We are trying to change this culture piece of shared governance.
- d. Nesterov asked how many members is a good amount?
 - i. Thu said FS would be the same number – thirty four. We have added ten students since we need to discuss curricular matters. We also added a few staff instructors since they have been completely left out of shared governance. Faculty is the majority since they are tenured.
 - ii. Nesterov asked about the representation from each college and department.
 - iii. Thu said this representation is the same as it currently is. It is one from every department. He said it is a reflection of our academic units on campus. Hopefully, this makes faculty feel more invested.
- vii. Ingram said if anyone else had any thoughts or concerns, she encouraged them to email her. Thu is also interested in soliciting feedback before the presentation for UC as well.

3. Program Review

B.S. in Mathematical Sciences, M.S. in Mathematics and Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences

- a. Geoff Gordon, Subcommittee B
 - i. Ingram asked if there were any questions about the report.
 - ii. Gordon said one of the things they discussed involved more faculty and instructors working with students at lower level math courses.
 - 1. They have the data and the facts to show this, the retention of students, and preparing students for graduation across different departments.

2. It is working and this is why an investment result point of view was worth it.
3. Gordon considered his own time as the Department of Marketing's chair. The most valuable thing he ever did was put together their Master of Science in Digital Marketing (MSDM) program.
 - a. The budget said this is the amount of students we expect, the amount of money we expect, and the revenue we expect in.
 - b. This is the same thing as math. They might use different numbers, but their argument was it was cost worthy.
 - c. Maybe a template should be made for departments or programs to record their data and quantitative information to move forward a proposal.
 - d. A standardized format of why we think this will work, here are the numbers we think we would need.
4. Ingram confirmed this was a good idea.
5. Thurmaier said the other important component of the conversation was under the decentralized system, this does not happen.
6. Peters asked if he was referring to the CHANCE program and the movement towards the corequisite course.
7. Ingram said she thinks it impacts more than just CHANCE for MATH 110.
8. Thurmaier said there is no recognition of this in the current program right now.
9. Ingram said thinking about university wide initiatives is the next step.

4. Other

- a. Ingram asked if there were any questions or announcements.
- b. Douglass said the next subcommittee meeting was on March 16th, and Hamid Bateni and Carrie Kortegast will be chairing the meeting. Since you are both new, we asked Brad Cripe to help since Chad McEvoy is no longer here in place for that.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Crystal Doyle and Paige Cosgrove

Planning\APC\Agendas\2019-2020\March 2, 2020