

Northern Illinois University
Huskie Commons

University Council Archives

Administration & Leadership Archives

9-2-2015

UC Transcript 2015-09-02

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2015-09-02" (2015). *University Council Archives*. 1.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/1>

This Transcript is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Council Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, September 2, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Voting Members Present: Allori, Arado, Arriola, Baker, Beamer, Bishop, Brubaker, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chen, Conderman, Demir, Downing, Feurer, Gilson, Glatz, Grund, Hanley, Hathaway, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Jaffee, Johnson (for Lonergan), Konen, Long, Macdonald, Manning, May, Millis, Mooney, Moraga, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Pavkov, Pitney, Riley, Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Ryu, Saborio, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stoddard, Than, Un, Xie

Voting Members Absent: Abdel-Motaleb, Azad, Bujarski, Campbell, Chakraborty, Deng, Farrell, Giese, Hedin, Hou, Khoury, Lee, Lonergan, Mogren, Penrod, Scherer, Stephen, Thu

Others Present: Adeboje, Armstrong, Bryan, Doederlein, Haliczzer, Holly, Hulseberg, Klaper, Streb

Others Absent: Gebo, Shortridge, VandeCreek

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: I'd like to call the meeting to order. Like to welcome you to the first meeting of the NIU Faculty Senate. I suppose since I'm going to be telling you to use the microphone, I should do the same. I'd like to welcome you to the first meeting of the NIU Faculty Senate for the 2015-2016 academic year. My name is Greg Long; I'm the president. This is my first meeting of the Faculty Senate so help me out if I get stuck and feel free to participate.

I'd like to introduce a few people. One person that is invaluable if you've not met her, you should get to know her, Pat Erickson, Pat is the administrative assistant for the Faculty Senate/University Council office. Pat's been there five years, six years, I think. And she makes things run. She makes my life really, really easy. I would say publicly thank you for her work.

Couple other people I'd like to recognize in the room. We've been making an effort to have a little more collaboration with our colleagues in the other councils. And so we've got the president of the SPS Council, Deborah Haliczzer, and Holly Nicholson, who is the president of the Operating Staff Council. Making eye contact, John Hulseberg in the back who's the vice president of the Operating Staff Council. And also I would like to thank the SA members for being here. SA, are you -- maybe -- okay. Great. I'm sure some are downstairs in the town hall meeting. Thank you. And then also remind you that we typically have Northern Star from a media standpoint. So as we say things, understand that it may be shared with others.

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: So our first order of business is adoption of our agenda. We have no walk-in motions, or items, I should say; but I do need a motion to accept the agenda.

Unidentified: So moved.

G. Long: So moved -- I should mention something. I apologize. You probably noticed something very different today. We have computer-assisted real time captioners. Cathy Rajcan and Dionne Horner. We as a body have to create a transcript for this meeting, so we pay for the transcript. For only a little bit more money what we're able to do is provide open captioning, like the evening news. If you miss something that's said, you will be able to catch what they've got there, plus that then gives us a real good transcript have to work from, from an overall cost standpoint it's not excessively more expensive. The hope is some of you will find this useful. I know oftentimes when I have sat out there certainly I'm getting older and my hearing isn't quite what it was and I find it difficult to hear what's being said. This should give us a chance if those things happen to catch up. So, we'll see how it works. And with -- would be very much open to your feedback. All right?

So that being said, there's even more of a cause to use your microphones right now because we're still working this out. But they're not yet tied into the overall audio system right now. So they hear what you're hearing. So, Theresa, would you mind seconding us again, or make the motion to accept the agenda?

T. Arado: I move to accept the agenda and it's Therese Arado.

G. Long: Do I have a second?

V. Naples: Virginia Naples from biology. I give a second. I will also like to make a proposal. I love the idea of making the captioning but could you expand it to fill the screen, because not only is my hearing less acute than it used to be, about ten years ago the entire world conspired to reduce font size, and I have a harder time seeing font.

G. Long: I appreciate that feedback. This is the first time we've ever used this as a strategy in our meeting. And so I figure that anytime we use it in the future it will be better. Great. There we go. Okay. We have a motion and a second. Are there any changes, corrections, additions? Typos, anything that you found in the minutes? Not seeing any changes. All in favor of accepting the minutes say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Same? Okay. Looks like we have -- approve the minutes.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 22, 2015 FS MEETING

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: The next thing on the agenda is President's Announcements. And I'm sure in the future I'll probably have more specific information to talk to you about, but today I want to mention a few broader kinds of issues. The first thing is to say thank you, thank you for being on the Faculty Senate, for giving up your afternoon. We're all in a time where we're very busy and we have multiple responsibilities instead of giving up your time to come here is something that I very much appreciate. Because you know, as you all know, we're in a very critical time for university. You know, just left budget -- the town hall meeting with President Baker, and then earlier today -- and during that meeting he had a meeting of the staff leadership and committee and the Student Association leaders to talk about budget concerns and share strategies for we might work together collaboratively across councils or with the students. Because higher education isn't getting much push for legislature, you know, attention, if you would, in Springfield right now. So that's a concern for us.

And one of the things he brought up, MAP funding. A lot of us don't think about this, but MAP funding provides supports for 5,800 students on campus. A total of about \$20 million. That money has not yet been formally appropriated by the State. Hope is that there's a vote on that today or tomorrow. The Illinois public institutions have made a commitment to the students, however, that they're going to honor the MAP grants regardless. I know -- I can't speak for the other universities, but I know President Baker has said that is certainly within our plan. We'll hope that money comes through, because if not that's a very significant hit to the university budget.

My role as Faculty Senate president is to encourage faculty representation and participation in governance and also to talk about and promote policy and procedure development that has an impact on our overall welfare as faculty in the universe. That's pretty much from the constitution.

I'll tell you in response I'm trying to do three different things. The first is we're changing our meeting structure a bit. I'm going to miss on -- I've been on this committee for a long time, the senate for a long time, and we spend a lot of time listening to reports, don't have a lot of time to talk about things. We're changing that up a bit. We're going to -- instead of having reports being just part of the routine of what gets read to us, we're asking people if they have something to report, write it down. And if they have something significant to say, they share it with the group. But just simply sharing a report because you have a report isn't something we're going to continue doing.

We're also going to occasionally provide recesses for discussion. We haven't had much of an opportunity to do that. And if we have enough time about 4:15, I have a five-minute for us to talk about, how time allows.

There may be clickers in here for feedback, rather than simply vote. I want to get us a bit more engaged in how we're doing things within this body. I've had a number of people tell me about how bored they are when they come to Faculty Senate. And let's change that. This is a time to stand up and make a difference.

So we're going to change the meeting structure a bit. I'm also going to do something -- this is not to be offensive to anyone. I know that many of you have lots of background in shared governance, but

I also look around this room -- and I've been here since 1991 -- there are many of you I don't know. Many of you are new faces to me. I assume that you may not have necessarily a lot of background in shared governance. Part of each meeting I'm going to give a real brief snippet of shared governance as a way to build kind of our background knowledge on this topic. We'll have that.

Hopefully all of you received an invitation from me. If not, it was an oversight, because I spent all Friday afternoon writing notes saying, hey, come talk to me. And those were sincere. I'm more than willing to make the commitment to meet with everyone in this room individually and find out what your concerns are, share any ideas, suggestions you have. I'm charged with this responsibility of being our representative to the upper administration. And the more I hear from you, the more I understand what our concerns are, as a group, the better off I can represent us. So I'm very sincere. Pat is awesome in terms of managing, figuring out times we can meet. So it's just a reminder, please take advantage of that. No obligation if you don't. But it's a sincere offer.

We've got meeting structure change; want to have governance conversations. We're going to try a third thing too. This is a change. I recognize change isn't always welcome, but for Faculty Club -- all right -- in the past, we have had three meetings a semester, try to alternate them on dates. This year what we're doing is we have three months where we have Faculty Club meetings, but we've scheduled the lunches for a consecutive Tuesday and Wednesday. If you want to come -- most of us don't have teaching schedules that keep us, you know, out of the lunch hour on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. And you also got an invitation for the Faculty Club luncheon, I suspect. I wanted to let you know the intent is still to have a social hour, still to interact with one another, to have a chance to meet some of our colleagues. But it's also been my experience when I go to these things that you can only do that so much. And from my standpoint, what a prime opportunity to have a chance to talk about issues informally so we can get informed about shared governance and what it means to us.

Understand our constitution was put forth in 1985 in terms of this particular body. It's 30 years ago. And what it was created, it was created to make change difficult. Having talked to some of the writers from back then, they're like, yes, we were concerned and made a constitution that was rock solid and really difficult to change. Well, in 1985 for example -- a quick note -- the university had -- in the committee book we had 58 committees. In 2014 we have 74 committees, in terms of showing how things have changed over time. Our participation, we had the constitution in 1985, 815 people participated in shared governance. Last year, nearly 1400. So we've changed a lot over time, and we've gotten significantly more responsibilities in terms of what we're doing. So like I said, I want to use some of the Faculty Club time to talk about that.

Another update that you get in terms of communication is the Faculty Matters newsletter. Were it not for formatting problems. We had, you would have already had it. Technology glitch that hopefully will be resolved, and you'll get that from us by the end of the week.

We have a few speakers that are going to come in for future meetings. Next month, September 23, Al Phillips, the CFO, said he'd come and talk to us. I know budgetary issues are top on many of our minds. And in November Provost Freeman will come in and give us the update on the Program Prioritization. So those -- that's basic information.

Put up that one graphic if you might. True to form, as I said, our intro today is really simple. As we talk about shared governance. Okay. John?

J. Novak: John Novak, music. Can I address the elephant in the room? Why is it as hot as Houston in here? What's going on?

G. Long: I've been here lots of years, and never been this hot in here before.

J. Novak: Someone on the way to help?

P. Erickson: It is much cooler than it was at 1:45. They are working on it, and there is now cold air coming out of the side vents.

J. Novak: Thank you.

G. Long: Do we have a motion to get the room cooler? It might be helpful. All right. So other things -- how about -- documented speakers. Shared governance. Just really quickly for those of you -- I expect many of you know this already. I want to make it quite brief. Excuse me. Hard to sit down and do these meetings. I'm not in the classroom this semester for the first time in 20-some years. It's hard not to be a teacher. I'm going to stand up and talk.

The Board of Trustees is the statutory body responsible for the entire university. They answer to the governor and legislature. The Board of Trustees is the body that sets a lot of policy for NIU. From our standpoint, and this is significant, what I think of University Council, University Council is where basic policy decisions get final approval. Right? It was established in 1961. For the history, not terribly important. But that was established a little over 50 years ago. And it -- part of that that was important was it brought into shared governance operating staff, it brought in professional staff, students as well as faculty.

So the concept behind that was that we get together and jointly make decisions that affect the university. So each of those bodies, the Student Association, they represent -- Student University Council. They have 16 of them. Operating staff Council and SPS Council, they have two representatives per council. And we as the Faculty Senate have 32 representatives on University Council. Can we have a show of hands, who here in the room is on University Council? One, two, three, four -- as a faculty representative? Yes? Okay. Good. Excellent. I'm glad you're here.

There's been confusion in the past -- and I would be guilty of this as well. This is my fifth year on University Council. It took me a couple years to realize, oh, I'm also on Faculty Senate. So I'm bringing that up as a point for people that as University Council representatives, you are considered elected representatives from the Faculty Senate. So there is that distinction. Want to be sure that we're all clear on that.

That's basically it for today. I think -- I'm open to -- I certainly have other topics that I'm thinking of for future meetings. But if any of you have topics that you want me to touch on, or if we think of these faculty luncheons as opportunities to -- like the article that I'm hoping you'll read for next week if you come, it's only two pages, something short, simple. But that stimulates discussion.

That's kind of my goal and a lot of this kind of stuff. Are there any questions on this? I'm guessing you all -- this hopefully is not new to anyone. Every department in terms of the Faculty Senate has a representative. If you're a department that has over 50 people in it, you have two representatives. So the nice thing about our body is that we have representatives from all over campus. But we move to the next higher level, we still have representation, it's just not as great. Questions? Okay. And with these changes, basically -- I basically ask you to be patient. Let's try this out for a semester and see how these things work. I recognize we're suggesting some changes to how we have traditionally operated. But let's give it a semester and see. And I'm certainly open to change if it's not working. But I think, hopefully, some of these strategies may make us a little more involved, have better relationships with each other and collaborate a little more freely. There's at least some intent behind what we're doing. If it works, great. If not, we'll change it. Fair enough? Cool. All right.

As far as additional communication, there's one thing you'll see too. We have this as a representation. One of my problems for a long time in dealing with this body as well as -- as you read the Constitution and Bylaws, or you read the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, the text on those things is really, really difficult to go through. I mean, even the student discipline procedure, if you read it, it's challenging.

Sarah Klaper -- did I -- Sarah Klaper on the first -- she's another huge asset from campus. That's -- her interns came over, and we were talking about the student discipline procedure and -- yeah, it's really hard. And these are students who are masters or getting their J.D. and still struggling to get through things. While we have proposed a talk to the Executive Committee on this, is that we have -- we start to visually represent a number of our policies, procedures and so forth so we see -- if I were to go back to that thing, if I were to say we got the Board of Trustees, president and all that, that's good but it makes more sense if you can see it.

We have approval from the president's office to hire a -- a ten-hour-a-week grad assistant to help us create visual communication, to not replace the text, but to have things that, if a student comes in and has a grievance, wouldn't it be nice to have, here's the timeline or here's the map of how this should look. Here's the text; you've got to pay attention and make sure we're okay. But we have that available. So that is something that we're also putting in place. I would encourage any of you who have any interest in that -- I recognize it may not be the most exciting task in the world, but from the standpoint of helping out the university, identifying redundancies, finding places where we may have gaps, Provost Freeman was behind this, President Baker seems to think it would be helpful. We're going to move forward on this, and if you would like to have involvement, let me know. Would love to have extra eyes on this. Our goal is to come up with some of these images, and the student that we hired has the technical skills, computer skills to make it look nice. That's where we're at with this from my standpoint. Anything else? Have any questions of me? First announcement? All right. Let's move on. There's nothing worse than being in a hot room like this with a tie and jacket on, you know?

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

G. Long: Item number IV [V]; no items brought in for Faculty Senate Consideration.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Faculty Senate Standing Committees – Per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3, approve the [2015-16 membership rosters](#) – Pages 4-5
- B. University Council Steering Committee – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 2.1.1, approve the [faculty members of the 2015-16 UC-Steering Committee](#) – Page 6
- 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 2015-16 academic year.

G. Long: Number VI, Consent Agenda. For those of you who are new to the process, consent agenda items usually are things that we would assume don't generate discussion. You know, membership rosters and so on and so forth. So consent agenda is really bring it up -- if you have a particular concern or objection, you can certainly raise that as a motion. But historically it's just been we need a motion to accept the consent agenda, and then once accepted, we'll vote on it. So can we have a motion to accept the consent agenda? Richard Siegesmund. Do I have a second? George Slotsve, second. Okay. Okay. With that in mind, do we have any objections to the consent agenda? All right. So we have a motion, we have a second. All in favor say aye?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? (None) okay. We have our consent agenda.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws [Article 3](#) – Pages 7-8
Rules & Governance Committee and Elections & Legislative Oversight Committee
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: We're moving on to Item number VII, Unfinished Business. You look at unfinished business, it's a revision to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article number 3. Before that, we'd like to get a sense of attendance. If you're a voting Faculty Senate member here...that you -- grab a clicker if you don't already have one. And the reason we're doing the vote on this is, from a voting standpoint, attendance is an issue. The item that we're going to talk about was originally going to be shared with you in May as a Faculty Senate. But we did not have enough people here to meet our two-thirds requirement for voting, so we postponed it. That's why it's being brought back today. Before we make a motion on it, I'd like to see that we have enough people here to have it be legitimate. So we ready? So if -- if you're here -- Anybody who is a Faculty Senate voting member press 1. You know? Or A. Whatever, yes. Or actually -- press whatever you want. It will come up again. Is it not okay?

P. Erickson: Try again.

G. Long: Technology here.

P. Erickson: Here we go.

G. Long: Okay. So...if you haven't already, cast your presence. Let's do. All right. We good?

P. Erickson: No. We need 46 and we have 43.

G. Long: If you would, here's the thing. We need 46 people to hopefully from an attendance standpoint be here. We have 43. If you are a voting Faculty Senate member, and you haven't clicked in, please do so.

Unidentified: We're having technology problems.

G. Long: We have air. Yes. Okay. Well, as we're dealing with this, let me segue into another broader issue for us. Because this issue has relevance particularly as relates to University Council. Quick update. Right now we're struggling with the idea of we don't have potentially enough people in the room here to have a vote. All right? That is very much a problem for us at the University Council level. At least at Faculty Senate level we need to have two thirds of the membership who are present with a minimum of -- Pat, majority plus one, right? For getting a voting body in here.

P. Erickson: We need two thirds of our membership.

G. Long: Must be present. Right. And of that then --

P. Erickson: Two thirds must be present to vote, yes.

G. Long: To approve. At the University Council, on the other hand, it goes on the absolute number of people on University Council. University Council has 60 people. Right? We -- we did the -- looked at the average attendance for last year -- so we have University Council, you have 60 people in the body, to have anything passed, you have to have two thirds pass it. So that's 40 people out of 60. Our average attendance in University Council is 46 people. 46. So you think about that, we start any vote at University Council with 14 no's. And that is problematic. As an example, in May, this is -- really has motivated me a lot, the baccalaureate curriculum council was proposed. Little discussion, this body, but if went to University Council -- and basically it was the consolidation of a couple of University-level curriculum committees into a body that would basically make much more sense and be more efficient. Our vote on that missed by one or two numbers, but 38 to 2 to 1. The measure failed. Okay? Despite having lots of effort put into it, despite having 90 percent plus endorsement on it, the measure failed because we did not reach our 40 percent criteria -- person criteria. As we think about things, talk about, that's one of my pushes at the University Council level is can we think about a bylaws change at that level that allows us to, you know, have a voting pattern that's similar to here. Because if we start off with an average

attendance of 46, you really have so little wiggle room to get anything done. Just kind of letting you know how that's working.

P. Erickson: We have enough, just barely.

G. Long: Pat says we have enough, I can stop from the floor.

G. Long: We have enough to vote. So I need a motion to accept before we can discuss. Do I have a motion to accept the revision to Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 3. First, George Slotsve. Second, Bill Pitney. Okay. Now, discussion? Let me share a little discussion on this and open it to you. As I mentioned, this particular motion was slated for a vote in May. We did not have the people here to be able to vote on it. So we didn't. But we have enough today. This particular measure is described more completely on Page 7 of your agenda packet. And this motion has two aspects to it. All right? What we're trying to do with this motion is to consolidate the rules and governance committee with the elections and oversight committee. All right? And then take that merged committee, and it will then be merged with -- consolidated with the corresponding committee on University Council. We have the same arrangement with regard to the resource base and budget committee. We're just saying it creates an efficiency and creates an opportunity for us to have greater input at the beginning of the process. So those would be my comments on it. Open it for discussion to the group, please. Particularly if you're opposed to it, please feel free to share. here's no intimidation here, please. But the idea we use clickers, other ways. If there's opposition, this is our chance to bring it up. If not, that's great. But want to encourage you, if you don't like this or have concerns, please share it. I'm seeing no -- all right. Shall we call the question?

All right. So -- should we use clickers for this? All right. So if you support the bylaw, okay, if you support the consolidation of the committees as described, that's A. If you oppose, B. And abstain, don't click, or vote C. So A is that you support. B is that you oppose. And C is abstain. If you would, take a moment and vote. So could we -- Pat? All right. We need one more? Got to have 46. There we go. Thank you. Okay. We've got it. Let's see what the vote is. Excellent. All right. First motion passed. Excellent. Thank you. All right. That takes care of our current unfinished business.

Yes – 46

No – 1

Abstain - 0

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws [Article 3.1](#) – Page 9
Faculty Senate Executive Committee revised to Faculty Senate Steering Committee
FIRST READING

G. Long: We go on to new business. It's a first reading. This doesn't require a motion. This is simply an effort to make language a little clearer. At the Faculty Senate our internal advisory group is called the Executive Committee. University Council, it's called a Steering Committee. Pat and I, we can't keep that straight in our office; and I figure if we can't keep it straight, maybe others can't as well. There's no functional difference between the two, we just have different terms. The

suggestion that we're offering here -- it's on Page 9 -- is to simply call the Faculty Senate leadership group a Steering Committee rather than an Executive Committee. Just a suggestion. Any comments on this? This is the first reading. Bring it up next month. But any concerns. It's just a clarification to make life easier for us. Because we talk about it as the Faculty Senate or University. But always executive or steering, let's just have it -- both of them happen to be steering committees. That's essentially what they're doing. There's no difference in function. Comments or questions?

J. Novak: U.S. Government, executive is a whole different branch. I think this is really more what's happening, what they are.

G. Long: Thank you. All right. Anyone else? Okay. Well, then, going to move on. Takes care of new business. We'll bring that back next month for a second reading.

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report
[May 15, 2015](#) – Page 10
[June 19, 2015](#) – Page 11

G. Long: Number -- our next thing is reports from advisory committees. As I mentioned in my president's announcements, we're only going to have reports from people who feel that they have something to share rather than be a perfunctory aspect of what happens in here. That being said, you know, we have a lot of committees, but we don't have a lot of reports this time. The one report that I would ask for is from Sonya Armstrong; she is our Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE representative.

S. Armstrong: Hello. Actually, both of these reports are quite dated at this point. For the May meeting, I really don't have anything to report that's new. For the June meeting, I actually did not attend that meeting. So I would defer to Dr. Stoddard to see if he has anything to add to the written report.

P. Stoddard: No.

S. Armstrong: I think most of this is old news at this point.

G. Long: Does anyone have any questions for Sonya? Okay. I'm going to go on a very temporary tangent from an introductory standpoint. I didn't introduce Paul Stoddard; he's the Faculty and SPS representative when you have issues, questions, whatever. He's a great resource. Sarah, as ombudsperson has the responsibility to maintain neutrality. Paul has the ability to be an advocate as needed, you know, what is appropriate. Do you have any roles you'd like to say about your role, Paul?

P. Stoddard: In that role, I do get to see some of the things that -- some of the areas we're making - - maybe the University isn't working as smoothly as we'd all like. Some of the things that have been coming up in the last year that I have been in this office, I think faculty rights and responsibility are going to be taking a look at during the course of this upcoming year. So that's going to be a

combined report from the faculty and SPS personnel advisor. And the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

G. Long: Great. Thanks. Any questions from the group? Okay.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge, Leanne VandeCreek,
Deborah Haliczzer, Holly Nicholson

1. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee
[May 28, 2015](#) – Page 12
2. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee
[May 28, 2015](#) – Page 13
3. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee
[June 15, 2015](#) – Page 14
4. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee
[June 15, 2015](#) – Page 15
5. Board of Trustees
[May 7, 2015](#) – special meeting – Page 16
[May 28, 2015](#) – special meeting – Page 17
[June 18, 2015](#) – meeting – Page 18-19

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Paul Stoddard, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs – Jimmie Manning, Chair – no report
- C. Economic Status of the Profession – no report
- D. Rules and Governance – no report
- E. Resources, Space and Budget – Laura Beamer, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report
- F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado – report

G. Long: Standing committees, as you'll note, while we've established them, many of the same committees -- most have certainly not yet met, and so there's not much in the way of reports. The only person we have a report from then is Therese Arado.

1. Election of a Faculty Senate Vice President per NIU Bylaws 2.2

T. Arado: All right. A number of things to go through here. Because this is for the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, which I believe just voted to be merged with something else. So - - We still had to get this done the first meeting. We have five elections to handle today. And so now that we all did our clicker and our attendance here, just want to remind everyone that at your places there are also print ballots. And only use one of those if you're a voting member of Faculty Senate. And I will get to the print ballot at your seat is for in a few minutes.

The first election we're going to do is the election of a Faculty Senate vice president per the NIU Bylaws 2.2. At this moment, I would like to take nominations from the floor for the election of a Faculty Senate vice president candidate, or candidates.

R. Hunt: I would like to –

G. Long: Rebecca Hunt.

R. Hunt: I'd like to nominate George Slotsve.

T. Arado: Rebecca has nominated George Slotsve. Do I have any other ones? Sorry. Maybe not a good microphone user, I guess. Okay. All right. Any more nominations? Seeing no more nominations, I declare the nominations closed. Since we only have one candidate, we can do this by a voice vote. So all those in favor of George Slotsve being the Faculty Senate vice president for the current year, say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: Any opposed? Congratulations, George. Any abstentions? George has abstained. Congratulations.

G. Long: Thank you, George.

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

T. Arado: Our second election is the Hearing Panel election. This is the election for the Hearing Panel. It's used for the appeals based on bylaws Article 7.3 regarding new process for faculty dismissal issues. The ballot is printed on white paper and contains the name of 34 tenured NIU faculty members selected randomly. This is the white page at your seats. For this -- and you don't have to do this right now; this needs to take place by the end of the meeting -- please vote for 20 individuals by placing check mark next to those 20 names you wish to vote for. And I just have a note here that the list is created from current records, but it is possible that one or more people are no longer here. If you see that is the case on here, could you let us know so that people could not vote for that person. Otherwise we'll have to have another process to get the right number. So if you see that, if you take a look at the list just for that purpose at the moment and let us know if there's anyone who recently retired. And you cannot say you don't want us to vote for you. That doesn't count. Okay. I think our list is good for that. Two down, three to go.

3. By-lot election of Faculty Grievance Panel members

T. Arado: All right. The third one is the by-lot election of the faculty grievance panel members. Per NIU Bylaws Article 11.5.3.1 (b), the Faculty Senate is asked to forward the names of 15 members of the faculty constituency to serve as a panel from which a grievance committee can be chosen should one be needed to review a Step 3 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. I'm going to draw the names of this envelope at this time. This is totally random. No one with against -- thank you. And I apologize if I completely mispronounce your name. Joseph Stephen. Minmei Hou. Sean Farrell. Xiaolin Xie. Therese Arado.

G. Long: Now we know it's stacked.

T. Arado: Now you know it is random. Kryssi Staikidis. Mark Riley. Jozef Bujarski. Michael Konen. Valia Allori. Five more. Greg Conderman. Linda Saborio. Richard -- I always say this wrong -- Siegesmund. Gary Baker. One more.

P. Erickson: That's it.

T. Arado: That's it?

P. Erickson: Yeah.

T. Arado: I think I tossed mine aside. That was 15.

[In actuality, following the meeting, it was determined that only 14 names had been drawn. To correct this error, another name was randomly drawn by Pat Erickson. The name drawn was Mark Rosenbaum.]

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

T. Arado: Okay. All right. Now we have the election of university -- actually, I'm sorry; with that, Pat will keep that list and take care of it. If any of you forget. Next we will elect University Council alternates from among the Faculty Senate. 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 able -- unable to attend a meeting. These ballots are color coded and will -- we will distribute them per college. Faculty Senates as well as faculty members with University Council who might be present today are eligible to vote for alternates. When you receive your color ballot, vote for the number of people noted at the top of the ballot. Once you have voted, leave your ballot at the place and it will be collected after the meeting adjourns. I'm going to call your college. And raise your hand until we can get the appropriate ballot to you. For this round there are only two colleges that will need to do this. If I don't call your college, I'm not ignoring you, we only have two colleges to do. So hang on. We're going to start with Liberal Arts and Sciences. If you'll keep your hand up if you're from Liberal Arts and Sciences until we get you a...thank you, a ballot. You take some too? Okay. So

everybody from Liberal Arts and Sciences who needed a ballot got one? Excellent. Our other college is the College of Business. If you're from College of Business, if you would raise your hand. Thank you. All right. So everyone from College of Business should have gotten a green sheet. Liberal Arts and Sciences should have gotten a pink sheet. You can place your vote on those and leave them at your spot, and they will be collected after the meeting. All right.

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 (November/December and January/February). The person selected to serve on this committee cannot be a candidate for the award, nor have submitted a nomination for the award.

T. Arado: Our last one. This is the selection of one Faculty Senate member to serve on the 2016 Board of Universities Professorship Award selection committee. The committee reviews approximately 10 applications online, and the committee meets two to three times between November, December, January, February. Persons selected to serve on this committee cannot be a candidate for the award or have submitted a nomination for the award. I would actually like to ask for a volunteer to serve on this selection committee for the year. That's...could you tell me your name, please?

J. Manning: Jimmie Manning.

T. Arado: You served on it before.

G. Long: Thank you.

T. Arado: Thank you. Pat, do we have to vote on that?

P. Erickson: Why don't we endorse that with a voice vote.

T. Arado: Do I have any other nominations before I...okay. All those in favor of Jimmie Manning being the representative to Board of Trustees Professorship Award selection committee say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: All those opposed? Any abstentions? None? Thank you. I am done. And I have to give Pat credit because, as you can see, I read a script. Pat does the work. I just stand up and speak. So thank you, Pat.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

G. Long: Thank all of you for that. As we move through the agenda now, only two parts left. One is questions and comments from the floor, and the other is information items. What I'd like to do is quickly just mention the information items. We would not normally go through those. I'm not going to go through them now, I would just call your attention to, on that, item No. T, the meeting

schedule. So that we do have a meeting schedule for the year, and I hope certainly you've already put that in your calendars. If not, please do so.

That being the case, we go back to questions -- Comments and Questions From the Floor. I'd like to try something a little different today. And I do have to also apologize: I missed one of my introductions that's very important. Ferald Bryan is our parliamentarian, is a professor in the Department of Communication. And we talked earlier this summer about how to liven up these meetings a bit. And one of the things that Ferald suggested -- and I think let's give it a shot today -- there's no reason if we have a little bit of time available to us that we couldn't have like a five or ten-minute recess to talk to each other and come back. I'm betting many of you are sitting beside people you don't know yet; right? That was the case when I was here. So what I would like you to do -- we're going to try this -- again, this is a fall semester. If at the end of fall semester you think these things are a bad idea, let us know. We don't have to go with this. For the time being humor me, if you would. What I'd like is to ask you -- we'll take five minutes, and I would like you to get together with, you know, the three or four people sitting next to you; all right? We're not going to number off or anything like that. That structure.

That idea, if I gave you five minute, we take five minutes. And what I had want is for each group of people to identify their top three concerns and/or suggestions that are affecting us as faculty right now. The more information I have from you, the better I can present that to the upper administration. This is a chance for us to get some sense of what we're all seeing as major issues, and that also gives me better data to share forward on our behalf. So like I said, humor me for this one. The only thing I'm asking is introduce yourself to the people on either side of you, and it's supposed to be about six minutes to 4:00. At four o'clock we will reconvene. After four o'clock after this brief recess, I'm going to ask members of the different groups to share with us what some of their suggestions and ideas were. So there will be a reporting function. But no names, nothing significant in terms of written. But let's just use this as a moment to meet your neighbor and give us some suggestions or concerns with regard to your perspective on things at NIU as a faculty member. Fair enough? Any questions? Okay. We're at a five-minute recess. We'll resume at four o'clock.

(Break)

G. Long: I feel such power. Awesome. The main reason I gave you a recess, because I wanted a second chance to use the gavel. Thank you for -- I -- sincerely I was very interested to see how this would work. My fear was we'd take a break and half of you would leave. It gives me confidence we can move forward in a much more positive way. We're having technology problems. I apologize for that. I was going to have Pat, as we go around, type up so we could see them on the screen. That's not possible because we're having technology problems. You will see it on the -- the television screen, but that scrolls through, so it's not going to be helpful for a long-term image. I would like to go around the groups, to hear what you have to say. We are recording this, and we'll send it back out to you so you have a chance to see what people said, help stimulate ongoing discussion.

P. Erickson: We're going to try.

G. Long: Okay. I lied to you. Sorry. All right. So let's start with just -- identify a couple of topics.

Rich, you want to -- you're in a group there. Whoever wants to represent your group.

R. Grund: Rich Grund. Second-year faculty. I still have that new faculty smell. My third Faculty Senate meeting. Thank you for letting me go first.

G. Long: Trial by fire.

R. Grund: It's so nice to meet some new folks. Coming on new, right away program prioritization in the budget fills the room, sucks the air out. Try to get a leg and a feel for what we can accomplish here. Maybe I have missed a whole lot. But on that note I think one thing that I can share from our faculty and department and in our short discussion is because of the overwhelming loom over us, you know, there is a priority there and even if -- and we all know that there's no movement in Springfield. And there may not be a lot to say. Would be great if Alan could come and do maybe two minutes, you know, per meeting. We'll see him next meeting.

G. Long: Okay.

R. Grund: I like the emails from the -- Baker. I get it. There's not a lot out there to hang on to. But two minutes: Yes, we care. I know that they had a lot of proactive -- remember the last time we spoke in the spring of charges to come forward. So there is something that is happening and coming about. I know we're not sitting on our hands.

G. Long: Right.

R. Grund: Be great to come into the semester and have that and attack that right off the bat.

G. Long: Good. Thank you. Moving along. That took care of that entire table there -- or Holly, were you part of another group?

H. Nicholson: Yes.

G. Long: Okay. I was going -- directing at Holly. Sorry.

M. Cefaratti: Thank you. Meghann Cefaratti with Department of Accountancy. Our group was talking about just transparency and things happening and just being notified that things are happening. And we had a small example with when the tagline changed to University, and we had a great explanation as to why it was changed. And that would have been really neat to share with the faculty, because we did have one department that expressed they had a program that they developed based on leading today -- or learning today, leading tomorrow. And so when the department developed that program based on a tagline, using those key terms, now that we have a tagline change, that would just need to be changed. Which isn't a problem, but it would be really nice to be notified we're changing this and we're going to -- your future, our focus. Because the words are more focussed on the students. And bringing "your" and "we" and "us" and things like that in there. So just would have been a nice explanation and just a head's up that it happened. So with transparency even with little things.

The other thing that we discussed as well was one person had their students look out into the news and pick up news about NIU. And just trying to keep a focus on the positive things that are happening at NIU. And so they're both positive and challenging things happening. And it was an insightful task for both her and her students to see how much challenging -- how many challenging issues popped up when her students did a search.

G. Long: Great. Thank you. Good. About the next group?

T. Gilson: Todd Gilson from Kinesiology and Physical Education. Our group talked about that -- I think everyone in the room completely understands the budget and program prioritization issues take precedent right now. The university really needs to focus on, you know, making sure that we are solvent, for lack of a better word, today, tomorrow, next week, next month. We'd really appreciate it if President Baker could articulate more of a concrete vision of where he sees NIU going long term. There's been some general discussions, you know, premiere midwest university, things of that nature. But a little more concrete ideas, either articulated to us, that we could take back to our faculty that we could start to get working on.

G. Long: Okay. Kind of the idea what is he hoping his legacy would be, what do you want to lead people?

T. Gilson: Yes.

G. Long: Thank you. Janet, anyone in the back? Come on, back row doesn't excuse you. Just conversation -- Back row does not excuse you. I teach a large classroom, I don't care if you're in the back. What you got?

J. Hathaway: I got lucky enough to sit next to Cathy Doederlein, and we were talking about internship and student career successes. And our conversation was revolving around and different ways of getting connected with different schools, colleges, and some of the resources being offered. My good fortune I was sitting next to her.

G. Long: Great. Okay. At your table -- I think if we're going around the back there. Oh, okay. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes? That corner, please.

Unidentified: John, we just -- one more thing please. Very few -- just talking about how our own -- over the years in past five years, maybe the other universities here online programs, taking students from us. In general as the most number of students going out from the -- from this state. Having so many other schools coming to Chicago and taking students from us. Just this kind of stuff.

G. Long: Okay. And that issue of online education from a Faculty Senate standpoint is something that seems to be a topic for future discussion. I know that it's not -- getting a lot of discussion at the highest level sometimes it seems. And I have mixed feelings on it as well. But from an overall university standpoint, figuring out how we're going to approach this should be done in a logical and progressive kind of fashion with supports for -- and want to look that as well. Good. How about -- Sharon, back there?

B. May: Brian May, Department of English. I was in a two-person group. BMA group, I was the secretary. Faculty salaries. A serious concern. And a concern, highly related to the first one, low morale. As a consequence, my group mentioned -- one member of our group mentioned that this is a 16th year that he had been behind the cost of living, rise -- rising cost of living. He had tracked it over 16 years -- he's an accountant or something, so he knows how to do this. I do not. And you know, it's a little depressing, I think. You do the numbers. But that's pretty much it. He also -- well, we also talked about the possibility of setting up some sort of incentive structure, some sort of structured accountability that would take care of some of the problems mentioned by Greg early on that have to do with attendance. That's pretty much it. Thank you.

G. Long: Robin, since you got the microphone.

R. Moremen: I'm Robin Moremen, I'm in sociology. I actually initiated the discussion in our group, and that is transparency, greater transparency about the retirement process. I -- this is a personal issue for me because, like so many others on campus, I'm going to be affected by the actuarial change after the first year, and am in a position where I, quote, have to retire because it will have a significant impact on me based on my age and my years of service in the -- purchase formula. What I would like to say is we get lots of memos about various components of retirement process. But I don't think as faculty we are educated enough about all of the details that contribute to the faculty process such as age, years of service, whether you're in the traditional portable or self-managed plan, whether you're under the money purchase formula or the general formula. Whether you can purchase service credit from another institution, what the restrictions and opportunities are for subsequent and post retirement employment. All of these are issues that come at us piecemeal. And I feel like as a sociologist, I can't resist saying, it seems like a very individualistic perspective and not so much a structural perspective where we're being given an overarching big picture of what this means for us. My group of four here is really important because two of the four are newcomers. But one is coming here after having retired elsewhere, and the other one -- yeah --

G. Long: Welcome.

R. Moremen: Is coming as a new faculty. And the circumstances that affect their retirement are vastly different from what affects my retirement, or what's -- you know, what affects anybody else's retirement in the room. Now, I'm not pointing any fingers, but I think that there could be a more comprehensive -- well, we felt there could be a more comprehensive effort to really take all the individual pieces and put them together so that we as faculty are better informed about what our options are so we can plan. Right now I feel sort of like a deer caught in the headlights, because this has all just sort of emerged over the last several months. And I would have appreciated having a better understanding of all this. And I have read every memo that has come out up to this point, and I have been a diligent individual as far as going to the SURS website and reading all their information. But it's so complicated and it's so -- it depends on your own individual circumstances. I feel like we could get a lot more information than we are getting. George, your hand has been up the entire time I've been talking.

G. Long: Go ahead.

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to say that HR will be writing retirement sessions on how to retire NIU coming this fall. But I'm also your university benefit committee representative for Faculty Senate. So if you would like to send me just a ressummary of what you'd like to see -- I've got a meeting tomorrow, actually. But I'll get it to the committee, we'll see if I can address some of this with the benefits committee and try to get certain things. Because we got the annuitants meet with us on that committee, and see if we can kind of get some groups together, try to address some of your concerns.

R. Moremen: I'm not just my --

G. Long: No --

R. Moremen: I don't want this to be my particular agenda. I think this is an issue that affects everyone in the room and that we need to have information, all of us, so that we can make informed decisions about our future.

G. Long: Thank you. I agree with you. Good. Around the back corner side here. Mark?

M. Rosenbaum: Mark Rosenbaum from marketing department. Of course, our group talked about budget, prioritization, faculty retention as a major issue. Another issue came up concern having tools for disruptive tenured faculty in the department.

G. Long: What do you mean?

M. Rosenbaum: How do you handle disruptive tenured faculty in a department, what are the tools? When you have a lack of collegiality in a department. What exactly do you do when you have tenured faculty in a department who are not moving a department forward but who purposefully -- purposely try to slow down change? We really don't have tools for it. Also I represent College of Business, and to my -- two colleagues here represent College of Education. We're moving quickly into online education. And I will tell you that the standardization process is actually very confusing, because outreach wants to approve all online classes under -- oh, yeah -- under the guise of peer review. So essentially the process is that outreach will be now looking at your class and telling you what you're doing right and what you're doing wrong, under standards called QM? But -- but QM standards they literally give you a page, half of one page, and you got to have a checklist. But what is outreach's role in -- in approving our online classes? And if it's peer reviewed, I think peers would be in the College of Business, College of Education. I don't think my peerage is in the outreach office. This is a major priority now as we move for more students who are quickly moving to an online environment; but where is our certification standardization and quality control coming in from?

R. Moremen: I'd like to speak to this, if I could, please. Having just this last year developed an online course under the QM process, I did this in conjunction with Faculty Development and instructional design. And they were excellent in terms of assisting me with that process and explaining. I've had zero interaction with outreach even though I taught the course through external programming. The -- the source of that information and the guidance is through Faculty

Development. And they do an outstanding job in that regard. I want to give credit where credit is due as far as QM is concerned.

M. Rosenbaum: So is it Faculty Development that's going to improve the course, or outreach?

R. Moremen: An external body. But from what I understood from the consultant that I worked with, they are working with Faculty Development on this entire process. It's not in place at present. It is brand-new. It is something that they're trying to infuse into online courses so that they can be both -- as it was explained to me -- they could be institutionally approved for QM, and then potentially reviewed by an outside reviewer for QM. But all of this, I was led to believe, was going to happen under the auspices of Faculty Development.

G. Long: So why don't we do this. Because since we don't have the absolute information -- I too went to a quality -- QM workshop that Faculty Development sponsored. And I'm not certain as to what role outreach has or approval issues. So rather than having us go off and be upset with regard to outreach, why don't we make this a follow-up for next meeting, and we'll come in with some information in terms of how it's being looked at. Because in any sort of conversations and stuff that I've had, I've not gotten the impression that we're going through any mandated process. It's certainly worthwhile to look into and confirm. That would be a concern, if that's in fact the case. Thank you. Okay. How about we got ten minutes to hear a couple more statements. Let's see what we can.

C. Carlson: I'm from nursing; and we talk mostly about what the budget has meant to us already. Mechanical engineering, sent -- perhaps -- said that he -- they've lost their TAs -- or they have to share them, I should say, between sections. In nursing we lost them years ago. We've also in nursing, because of lack of resources, we've actually cut how many students we admit. We've cut it by 40 a year. We had limited enrollment. We cut it this year. And there have to be future cuts because we don't have the funds to support the students. We also brought up salaries for faculty because assistant faculty makes more than associate faculty does. And we can't keep qualified people because they can make so much more in the private sector in nursing. So those are all things that are affecting us financially.

G. Long: Good. Thank you. You are nominated second to -- as elected.

B. Jaffee: Barbara Jaffee from the School of Art and Design. I think it would be accurate to say that our group focussed on that very intriguing flow chart, thinking about what the position of Faculty Senate is in relation to University Council on the one hand, but also in relation to the larger body of the faculty that we serve on the other. And we speculated on the possibilities -- a possible role for this group to really think about how we're -- how we're shaping or influencing -- was a word that came up -- discussion at University Council that is a historic role of this group. That was external to University Council, entirely faculty and therefore able to -- to strategize a bit in how to interact with University Council. But on the other hand to think about how we disseminate information to the faculty and how we might help shape or the priorities in that sense as well.

Recruitment is something we're all very interested in at the moment. Is there an opportunity for us to create some kind of structure for the faculty that might ensure more engagement and recruitment.

That was an example we discussed. I will go out on a limb here and say that one among our group also was interested in the possibility of -- of maybe participating more actively in program prioritization. I recall that last session there was a lot of interest in this group in how and whether faculty would shape program prioritization. And the process has moved forward and will continue to move forward. And it's lovely to get all of the information and updates. And we have had opportunities to participate. But it seems to me or someone in this group -- there is an opportunity, given that we're a faculty body and we meet regularly, that we could also among ourselves think about what is the university that we want to see in the future? W; what would program prioritization look like if it came from a faculty body. I mean, we're not legislating anything obviously, but you know, I think we could have a role in that vision thing as a parallel process.

G. Long: Thank you. Thanks. We got the -- inside table here, I think. Yes? Richard?

R. Siegesmund: The -- earlier comment about issues of our student population being sucked off by online programs, being -- going out of state, changing the kind of student who comes to NIU was what we talked about. And that challenge that, as we are in a recruiting mode, who -- who is going to be here, how do we reach the kinds of students we want to reach. And that's what we talked about.

G. Long: Great. Thank you.

M. Irwin: Mitch Irwin from anthropology. One thing that Mike and I talked about -- maybe you can say what you talked about. This may be a little too out there and too beyond us, but I kind of feel like it's worth mentioning, probably should be thinking about. I'm concerned about program prioritization. Anthropology, we don't always come out on top in the real world. But I'm equally concerned that program prioritization this year will turn into a bit of a feeding frenzy where amongst ourselves as a faculty we're so preoccupied with preserving our share of a diminishing pie that we lose sight of asking ourselves why is that pie diminishing in the first place. Which makes me think about President Baker. I know Provost Freeman is pretty accurately the head, I believe, of the program prioritization process. But when I think of President Baker's role and why he's here, I think a bit more of an ambassador from our university to the outside. I don't know much about what he's doing. Maybe he's doing an excellent job. I do want to point out quickly that his first report to us after the governor's proposed budget was, in my opinion, really lame. He said it's going to be okay, we're already doing program prioritization, we're getting ready to cut; as opposed to what he could have said: I'm going to be your advocate with regards to why higher education in this state is a high priority and a good return on tax dollars. So I kind of -- I think that -- lost my train of thought. I think that if he's not doing that job. We should reevaluate that more the program prioritization is going to distract us from that role that he should be doing.

I remembered what I was going to say. I'd like to say -- or I'd like to believe that faculty members in the state of Illinois are some of the most clever and capable people in the state, which is why we got the jobs we do. Why are we the worst lobbyists in the world? Why in the political stage does our opinion matter less than everybody else's? Because we're in minority, or because we're doing a really crappy job of representing why we're in -- a good investment? That's enough for me. So I'll pass it on.

G. Long: Thanks. Mark.

M. Riley: Mark Riley from Accountancy. Our group didn't get past the budget word. And just listening to all of the comments here, it strikes me that there are a lot of comments being made that are somehow related to that issue; right? Related to the budget. The enrollment. Faculty retention. 16 years behind -- you know, behind the cost of living. And if nothing else, I think the word -- the transparency, the call for transparency is key right now. Because the -- the word "preoccupied" just came up. And none of us are doing our best work when we're preoccupied. And so I think to keep us from pre -- being preoccupied, give us information. So that's kind of a link I make, you know, between or among all these items that are being mentioned. They are a lot of related items that are keeping people from maybe doing their best work.

G. Long: Good point. I think Keith -- your table there is the...have I missed anyone? I was going to say -- this side.

R. Feurer: Rosemary Feurer, from history. By the time that the time is called, I realized I had hogged most of the discussion, so-called discussion. So I apologize.

G. Long: What did you have to say?

R. Feurer: I had a lot of nods in agreement. Just the same old same old. Since I've been in this -- this group, it's transparency, lack of information. I think it's all -- a lot of ditto. The -- you know, for as long as I have been on Faculty Senate, the idea of -- that we would have somehow acquired a transparency and real information that we can grapple with some of these issues has been asked for. And continually we come back the next year and say we need to get some of that sometime. The other is the issue of power. You know, do we really have power to do anything as a faculty, and how do we get that power.

G. Long: Thank you.

J. Manning: Jimmie Manning from Communication. We had a really nice talk. Of course we're anxious about program prioritization. Talked about some of the positives of that and come up with a lot. Talked about some of the concerns we had. Mostly anxieties, because a lot of people are really passionate about the work they do, and they know some of us end up on the bottom by the nature of the process, and what happens when we have something really good, it ends up in the bottom; and is there going to be a chance for people to plead their cases for situations.

The other thing we talked about is how we could work together in terms of our scholarly or academic pursuits. A lot of people are really interested in working with other people, going across those disciplinary silos, but we're not always sure where we can do that. And sometimes you go into situations that are set up that you can't have those conversations. Rather than focussing on the scholarship or the teaching, we're focussing on how are we going to make it through another day at the University, and how we're going to deal with these changes. Looking for opportunities to really focus on what scholars do would be nice.

G. Long: Excellent.

M. Riley: If I could make one more comment. It's when I said preoccupation keeps us from doing our best work, I'd like to tack on to that that every day here at this University I see a lot of people doing great work. So I -- that really makes me admire the ability of our faculty and staff to work through these types of -- these types of issues and this type of uncertainty. I think optimally we would be getting more information and things could be even better.

G. Long: And I second your opinion of -- of our work. I'm very proud to be up here representing you. I'm -- will go to bat for us at all levels to make sure that these issues are shared. Certainly the salary issue is one that I have made a comment during the Board of Trustees meeting, making comments during any sort of budgetary meeting has to be a discussion of salaries. Not just for faculty. Yes, I'm faculty. I have been here lots of years. I understand salary compression. But from the standpoint of our staff are terribly underpaid. Staff members barely make a living wage. And so when we talk about salary increase, I think we need to think collectively rather than just this is something that faculty need. George?

G. Slotsve: A quick update that I just wanted to pass on is with respect to HR's role in retirement policy -- SRS is not allowing HR to take any role in retirement counseling beyond saying here's a -- some of what's going on here when you're running into maybe some issues with planning your retirement, that is HR's hands are being tied by SRS. And they just can't respond. I just want to let everyone know, don't necessarily blame HR.

R. Moremen: Here's the complicating factor in all of that. There are absolutely not sufficient appointment times here on campus with SURS counselors to meet the needs of each individual if HR cannot do a kind of comprehensive situation. You literally have to sit on the phone and wait to get connected with the number to make an appointment. And if you don't -- if you're not -- if you're not -- it's literally the case -- if you're not on the phone dialing the number when the office opens on the first day for appointments, your chances of getting an appointment here on campus -- you can get a phone appointment or go down to Naperville and meet with somebody, but here on campus, if you're not on the spot ready to ask for an appointment when they first open up, the chances of getting that appointment are not great. So if they're controlling the whole system -- I made a recommendation to George that what we need is a retirement handbook, a comprehensive retirement handbook that puts all these pieces together and explains it in everyday language. And his -- and this is going to come down -- and I respect totally what HR is doing -- the fact now apparently is that we can't do that, that that is an SURS issue. If that's an SURS issue, then they need to make appointment -- counseling appointments available to a far greater degree than they currently are doing.

G. Long: Would it be reasonable as a start that we -- as a Faculty Senate I'll do it certainly on behalf of us -- that we at least send a letter to SRS saying this is something as a faculty we feel would be helpful to us? Just at a start. I don't know that it will make a difference, but that --

G. Slotsve: A couple of things here. One is: there are nine SURS retirement counselors for the state. That's the total number they have for the state, to give you an idea how many counsels they have. Secondly, I know University Benefits Committee has been discussing, and we've talked about

trying to get SRS out here more. We have been pushing for that. Some of the visits have I think arisen because we have been trying to push that we even got some of these visits. They really want you to go into Naperville. And then there was a question: Do people even get time off to go into Naperville, if you've got to take half the day to get in and get out to have this counsel meeting. On campus at least you would. Hopefully get the time off from work and get the -- there have been a lot of issues, and we tried to address some.

R. Moremen: Here's another complicating factor as well. You really can't make an appointment with them unless you are within, what, five, four -- four years of retirement. Well, how do you know if you're within four years retirement -- until you meet with an SURS counselor? It's a catch 22 in that circumstance. If anything, if they're not going to increase the number of individualized appointments, certainly somebody can come in and talk in a kind of open forum where people can -- a town meeting forum where people can actually ask questions of them to find out if they're within the four years to make the appointment. It's -- it's a very confusing process.

G. Long: All right. Let's do follow up on that because I think there are enough people in here, you know, both those of us who are older and those people who are newer, appointments. Things probably need to get greater clarification on that.

Our time -- I want to be wrapping up in a moment. I wanted to say thank you very much for participating in our new approach to handling these meetings. I think that you shared some really helpful ideas. We will summarize those and get them back out to you. Certainly prioritization, budget issues seem to be at the forefront. I would mention something to you, and we will follow this up with an email to you. During the meeting that we had with President Baker earlier today -- one of the points that he raised was there's not a lot of -- and this is according to -- from a representative, Bob Pritchard -- that there's not a lot of push on higher education from a lobbying and information standpoint and so forth. And so Student Association, Operating Staff, my -- SPS, work together to try and encourage either the councils collaboratively, individuals too, share your concerns. Now, one thing just as a reminder, as faculty members, do not use NIU letterhead or resources to lobby. Because that puts us at risk. But you can use your personal email, you know, if you're on lunch break or something. But don't have it on NIU letterhead. That's going to get us in trouble. But I did want to encourage you that we'll send out a template to you if it might be helpful. But what we're -- what we were told is that our legislators are not really hearing a lot from higher ed in terms of we need to get this set. And K-12 is set; right? Because we can't let the little kiddies not go to school. But how about the adults who want to go to school? From our standpoint, to me both issues tie together really clearly. K-12 is set. We're not on anybody's real radar at this point. So encouragement would be to please exercise your right, if anyone wants to work collaboratively and do that together, that's fine. Happy to help out on any of those things. Just recognize that as we do this, be sure to protect yourself and do it privately versus as a NIU employee. In your letter or email you can say privately -- and my email, I'm Greg Long, a professor at Northern Illinois University, and these are my concerns. But I'm not going to send it as Greg Long as Faculty Senate president.

R. Feurer: I really don't think that's correct. I mean -- is that what they're telling you, that you can't act as a Faculty Senate to represent us in lobbying for us? I don't think that's correct.

G. Long: Can I refer to Debbie back there?

D. Haliczzer: HR and SPS council president. Greg and I were meeting this morning with the president, and we were clarifying the ethics issues of -- we as share -- as shared governance groups with write and express for our members. We have a right to do that. It's part of what we get elected to do. You all can, we all can send emails not on our University email, send letters, not on letterhead, express our individual opinions. We're looking at what we can do collectively to advocate for our colleagues, our members. And then encourage all of our colleagues to advocate individually. So it is within the purview of the ethics law to speak for councils and senates, and let the benefits committee also be your second lobbying group. This is at what they do. Okay? So it's okay. We have the okay. So I mean, you as Faculty Senate president, we could pass a resolution and --

G. Long: And I could put that forward. Yes. And I actually -- yeah, I think -- I actually would like to check that out, whether there's really a bar on stationery. I think we should ask somebody. I know people who do that all the time who are part of -- let's say they're collectively part of the union, but they use their stationery from K-12, and they lobby, and they have never gotten in trouble. So I just don't know why there would be a distinction on our part. Okay. Well, I was -- it was suggested on these issues to check with Mike Mann, who is our IBHE and BOT rep. And I will follow up with him and draft a letter that gets out to you that lays it out, and I will consult with Deborah on this as well. It's important to do, but we don't want to overstep bounds. And if we're hearing different information, then we need to get on the same page.

On a related note, remember that I'm the Advisory Council to the Illinois board of higher ed rep. Any of these concerns that you do want to formalize coming from our institution, if you can forward those to me, I can at least funnel them through the Board of Higher Education. Great.

E. Arriola: Elvia Arriola from the College of Law. As I'm listening to this discussion, I'm -- I guess I'm thinking that we need to remind ourselves that aside from the institutional affiliation and the boundaries that are set in the ethics law and considerations, that we are also citizens and residents. And we have our own First Amendment right to write letters to editors and write editorials to major newspapers here in Illinois to express those views. So that maybe one of the things that we can -- might consider is for people to volunteer to come together representing various sort of ideas and place it on the agenda as something to think about where people can educate each other. It reminds me of an organization that I'm active in as a law professor, the Society of American Law Teachers. Some years ago we hired somebody that was in -- basically a PR person, to teach us how to do that very thing. When we felt the need to not use our institutional letterheads, but rather because of the viewpoints that we had in a particular issue, we really felt the need to get the message out into the media. And it stills remains a very powerful tool, especially in this day and age of chronic communication. I agree that we need to help each other; but we also need to help ourselves on how to get that message out. We are all here because we do good work for NIU. And we need to know how to get that message out. And that -- it's a skill. It obviously is a skill for how to get a good editorial message out on these important issues like the budgetary constraints that we're having to work with, and the fear that we have that we're going to lose something in the process. And that that should not happen. But if our voice isn't heard, you know, they will just simply ride over us.

G. Long: Right. Thank you. Thank you. Seems like we have some interest in sharing our voice. Let's just figure out the best way to do that, and we'll provide some guidance in terms of how to do that within the ethics we have to operate within.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- I. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- K. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- M. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- P. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- Q. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- R. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- S. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- T. [Meeting Schedule](#) – 2015-16 – Page 20
- U. [Annual Report](#), Athletic Board
- V. [Annual Report](#), Academic Planning Council
- W. [Annual Report](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- X. [Annual Report](#), Graduate Council
- Y. [Annual Report](#), University Assessment Panel
- Z. [Annual Report](#), University Council Personnel Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: Anything else? Are we ready to move to adjourn? Anyone want to move to adjourn? Janet? Thank you. Hathaway; and Mark Riley second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.