

4-25-2012

FS Minutes 2012-04-25

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "FS Minutes 2012-04-25" (2012). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 16.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate/16>

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

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Wednesday, April 25, 2012, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Faculty Senate / Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Arado, Bateni, Cappell, Chandler, Chen, Coles, Collins, Corwin, Cripe, Deng, Downing, Feurer, Finley, Gaillard, Goldblum, Kolb, Kostic, Kowalski, Lash, Lenczewski, Lin, Lopez, Martin, May, Middleton, Mirman, Nicolosi, Nissen, Novak, Onyuksel, Pitney, Rheineck, Rosenbaum, Russo, Sagarin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Tonks, Valentiner, VandeCreek, Wade, Willis, Zahay-Blatz

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Allori, Arnhart, Azad, Bisplinghoff, Blecksmith, Brandt, Calvo-Byrd, Daniel, Elish-Piper, Fang, Farrell, Frank, Greene, Gupta, Holt, Houze, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kapitan, Lee, Long, Mackie, Mogren, Mohabbat, Munroe, Poole, Rollman, Shortridge, Thu, Von Ende, Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Freedman, Griffin, Haliczzer, Hansen, Latham, Peritz, Sunderlin

OTHERS ABSENT: Prawitz, Small, Snow, Streb, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: We have a number of changes in the agenda. First of all, we have eight walk-in items. I would also like to move the elections to the first item under Item IX so they will precede the reports of our standing committees. The reason I would like to do this is because we are going to have a rather lengthy meeting, possibly the discussion around many of these items could be time consuming and I want to make sure that we are able to get to the elections when we have the largest number of members present. Therefore, I would like to move item IX, F up to item IX, A and move everything else down accordingly.

The second item: Under X, which is now Unfinished Business, I would like add an executive session. The executive session will be used to discuss the report of our faculty contingent to the Raise Equity Committee. I posted it yesterday as soon as I was able to. I had to wait until the president received the report and allowed us to release it. I know it did not give people a

tremendous amount of time but at least gave you a little bit of time so that you weren't walking in and listening to 46 pages of report cold.

I need a motion to adopt the agenda with the eight walk-in items and the two additional changes, as described.

D. Valentiner: So moved. **J. Novak:** was second.

The agenda was approved with the noted changes without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2012 FS MEETING (distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next I need a motion to approve the minutes of the April 4 meeting.

S. Willis: made the motion. **R. Lopez:** was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Rosenbaum: I need a motion to go into executive session.

D. Valentiner: So moved. **S. Willis:** was second.

The motion carried without dissent or abstention and the senate went into executive session in order to hear:

- A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council
- B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor

Following the reports, the senate terminated the executive session and the meeting continued.

V. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Recognition of Faculty Senate members who have completed their terms, who have been re-elected, or who are newly elected

A. Rosenbaum: I have just a few items under President's Announcements. The first one is really a pleasure and that is to recognize the contributions of faculty senators who are completing their terms and some who are leaving for the University Council and to also note the people who have been re-elected and also some of our newly elected members. When I call your name, please stand up and receive the applause of the senate.

First, senators completing their terms on the Faculty Senate: Gina Nicolosi in Finance. David Wade, who is also finishing his term, as you know, as Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. David did a great job. We are very appreciative of his work over the last three years and we'll be electing his successor a little bit later in the show. David, thanks very much for your great work. Abul Azad, Engineering Technology; Ayhan Lash from Nursing and Health Studies; Elizabeth Gaillard, Chemistry; Brian May from English; Richard Blecksmith, Mathematical Sciences; David Valentiner from Psychology; Wayne Finley from University Libraries, our recording secretary; and Kryssi Staikidis from Art. Thank you all.

Leaving for the University Council, so these are the folks are still on the senate, but by virtue of their taking on positions on the University Council: Michael Kolb from Anthropology; and Rosemary Feurer from History. Again both Michael and Rosemary have been chairs of senate committees and have done a lot of work this year and we thank them for their work as chairs as well.

Re-elected to the senate: Hamid Bateni, Allied Health and Communicative Disorders; David Goldblum from Geography; Steven Martin, Physics; our vice-president, George Slotsve from Economics; Steven Tonks from Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations; Debra Zahay-Blatz from Marketing. Almost all of these people are on the executive committee of the Faculty Senate and we thank them for their service there as well.

We have newly elected senators who will be joining us when we resume in August. Winifred Creamer from Anthropology; Eric Jones from History; Mary Elaine Koren from Nursing and Health Studies; Sarah McHone-Chase from University Libraries; Chris Parker from Psychology; Richard Siegesmund from the School of Art; and Gleb Sirotkin from Mathematics.

Just a couple of quick updates. One is that the ombudsman search is ongoing. We are hopeful of having someone in place hopefully by the beginning of the term. We don't know what the field of candidates will be like. We're trying to get the ad out as soon as possible. Our out-going ombudsman, Tim Griffin, has been helpful to the committee in giving us advice as to how we should advertise and what we should look for and we will continue to draw on his considerable wealth of knowledge regarding ombudsmanship. And while we are on the subject, I think we should give a nice round of applause to Tim Griffin for his many years of service to NIU. He really cares deeply about the university and I think one of the indications of that is how important it is to him that we find an ombudsman to carry on the tradition that he has started here and has been carrying on for the last 21 years. Tim, thanks very much, we appreciate your work and we know your successor will not be able to fill your shoes.

Another update, the academic misconduct appeal policy was passed out of the University Council and is now policy. That has now been added to the APPM and students now have the option of appealing what they feel is an excessive or inappropriate penalty as a result of a misconduct finding.

You've been, hopefully, following the president's messages to us regarding what's going on in the pension area. The governor has now sent out a proposal that was not particularly favorable to us in many ways. It has some features that the university feels are reasonable but it also has quite a number of things that could be quite detrimental – probably the most significant being the

possibility that the normal costs of the pension plan will be passed along to the employer, the employer being NIU. At this point, if the entire cost was passed to NIU, it would be somewhere in the vicinity of \$24 million. Needless to say, that's one-quarter of the state appropriation. We will have a great deal of difficulty absorbing that all at once. The president is hopeful that, if that becomes law, it will be phased in gradually over time. He also feels that, if it is phased in gradually, we will be able to manage it. That, of course, is dependent on what that schedule is. So if it's phased in over two years or three years, that may not be enough time and we will have a financial problem. The president and Steve Cunningham continue to lobby hard to try and protect us from the consequences of that type of an action. It will also affect us as citizens of Illinois because we all pay property taxes and, of course, the schools will have to also pick up their share of their pensions and that will mean tax increases. We will not only be hit as state employees of the university, we will also be hit as citizens of Illinois who are now going to face higher property taxes and perhaps more difficulty in selling houses.

I will keep posting things on Blackboard whenever something comes along that I feel is important for you to know immediately. We have had some success in the last couple of months in calling our representatives and in getting them to vote against things that we find particularly heinous. I was at the faculty and SPS recognition luncheon the other day, and the head of the Annuity Association spoke and made the point that NIU does better than any university in the state of getting people who are not at retirement age, younger faculty, to sign up for the Annuity Association. We have the best record of that of any university in the state. That is very important. The Annuity Association is an inexpensive item. It can be deducted from your check. You don't feel it. It's painless. The Annuity Association is really our best defense against some of the things that go on in Springfield and we really need them to be as powerful as possible. When you speak to your constituents in your department, please make it clear, especially to the younger faculty members, that you don't have to be in your forties and fifties to join the Annuity Association and they really should do it. It's not expensive and it will help and make the legislators aware of how powerful we are.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Rosenbaum: I was asked by Steve Cunningham to discuss the four-day work week with you. As you know, every summer for the last several years, the university goes into a four-day work week. It is closed on Fridays although we all can get into our offices. But if you want to use any of the services of the university, they are not available on Friday. There seems to be about 80 percent support among operating staff and SPS for this. This is a foregone conclusion for this year. They are willing to consider changing this in the future if there are strong feelings against it. I'll open the floor to comments and suggestions.

A. Lash: A faculty member wrote to me that students complain they pay the full tuition, but they don't have access to libraries and off-campus libraries in Naperville, so she was wondering how that works out that you pay a full tuition but you don't have access to the library.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I can't speak to Naperville, but the libraries on campus are open. Wayne, I think you have something to say about that?

W. Finley: Actually, the library faculty, we also have concerns about the same thing because the way that the summer schedule works is that the librarians are there every Monday through Thursday. We have to work the four-day work week like everyone else and then the library is open on Friday, it's closed on Saturday and then it's open on Sunday. We don't understand the logic in that. If anybody does, let me know. There are several problems with that. One of them being that, obviously most students can't come in on Friday and get assistance from faculty librarians. Another problem is that a lot of grad students in the Department of Ed who are taking graduate seminars on Saturdays don't have access to the libraries when they come to campus on those Saturdays. Also, it makes a difference actually having faculty gone on Fridays because things like inter-library loan, document delivery, book delivery are unavailable. All the other state libraries are running on a five-day system. If we are running on a four-day system, people aren't going to get their materials as quickly as they normally would. So the library faculty are concerned about it but it's kind of out of our hands so we wanted to just express some of our concerns to the Faculty Senate and maybe you guys could pass it on to the people in charge. The other thing is, from a faculty point of view, we are also concerned because since we are on a 12-month contract, we have to work 37-and-a-half hours a week, but we're not allowed to come in on Fridays even though the library is open. So the only way we are allowed to come in is if we are working the reference desk. Some of our faculty think that we should be allowed to have flex time so we can serve patrons better because, if you come to the library and nobody is there, we can't help you. Those are our concerns.

E. Gaillard: Yesterday I polled our faculty about this issue and we are overwhelmingly opposed to the four-day work week because we really feel as though it harms our research productivity. We get our chemical orders later, we don't have our support staff if an instrument fails.

M. Kostic: I guess most of the engineering faculties really don't mind having a four-day week. Some expressed concern and some said if it's a substantial savings then it's okay. But the savings, in my judgment, is minimal. So basically we are for four days in principle.

A. Rosenbaum: I asked Steve Cunningham exactly how much we save with the four-day work week and I didn't get a dollars-and-cents answer. What he said was, well it's really not all that much; that there are some minor savings in terms of electricity and air conditioning, but essentially the buildings are not shut down. The air conditioning is still on if not at full strength, so I didn't get the impression that there was really a strong press for the administration to have the four-day week. As Mili says, he did mention that one of the savings was that employees save on gas by not having to come to work. So I don't know if globally and ecologically there's any great savings there.

J. Kowalski: I imagine if I were a staff member and not a faculty member, I would enjoy having the option to work four days a week and give myself a semblance of something a bit closer to a little bit more vacation time during my summer.

W. Finley: I just wanted to respond to that. Some of our faculty actually do not like having the four-day work week because many of them end up taking vacation leave so they can have a regular seven-and-a-half/eight-hour day because they find it taxing as do some of the support staff so it's not an assumption that I think we can make.

M. Lenczewski: I haven't polled all of my faculty in the Geology Department, but I know over the summers, and I agree exactly with Beth, we have had orders that have been missed. On Fridays I've had things that have been shipped to me that had to be refrigerated that have sat on the dock and then been destroyed because they had to be kept refrigerated. I've had shipments that they saw that it was closed on Fridays but took that it was closed all summer and things weren't shipped. I know we are working on Fridays. Experiments don't stop, equipment doesn't get shut down and then when we are trying to do our work, a lot of times the support is not there for us to be doing a lot of our research and then I teach all summer long and we still need those supports on Friday. I do not agree with having the four-day work week.

A. Rosenbaum: I will pass these comments along to Steve Cunningham.

C. Cappell: This is related in the context of saving money. The thing that most concerns our department is that DuSable Hall is closed during the summer. There are two computer labs and a collaboratorium that are traditionally used very heavily during the academic year. So any course that's offered over the summer has to either find another lab configured to meet all of the expectations that we have for our classes, etc. I don't know if any other departments or colleges are similarly shut down in some buildings and classrooms, but I would like to know what the savings are on that because it's a disruptive factor and can affect the rigor in which courses are offered over the summer compared to the regular academic year.

S. Peritz (student, non-member): Going along off of what he just said, the inability for us to reach those kinds of labs makes it so printing becomes a difficulty and with a lot of classes there is a lot of printing involved since, a lot of the faculty can attest to this, they don't let you print out as much as you'd like to or as much as the students need to print out and that can cause a lot of problems for us when it comes to actually being able to study for the exams.

A. Rosenbaum: One more item for faculty consideration, Sue Willis is going to give us a very brief comment on the Library Advisory Committee issue.

S. Willis: Okay, yes, I have been attending Library Advisory Committee meetings as a Faculty Senate representative in the wake of the large de-accession of materials a couple of years ago and I have no detailed summary of meetings (actually half of them end up getting canceled for the lack of agenda items), but I would say that there has been a document written about when the library is supposed to de-accession materials and what kind of notices to be given that was agreed upon between the faculty and the library and the provost early in the year. That is the document the library intends to use in the future so I would suggest, if you are concerned about these things, look at that and familiarize yourself with it and I would also suggest keeping a sharp eye on your materials and stay in close communication with your library person.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you, Sue. Again, we will have to find a replacement for Sue as a liaison and we will do that when we resume in August. And again, Sue is retiring and she has been a long-time member of both the senate and the council and was executive secretary and has been on every committee that the university has, so we also want to say thanks to Sue for all of her work over the years for the senate and the council.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of candidates running unopposed to serve on the committees of the university

A. Rosenbaum: We are asking the senate to approve the candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university. Just a quick explanation of this: On the committees of the university, we have positions that are identified as being from specific colleges and we ask those colleges to send us representatives. These are all unopposed; no vote is required. A little bit later we are going to elect people to at-large positions and when we have more than one nominee we will have a vote. I move that we approve the consent agenda and this will approve all of the candidates coming from the different colleges to the committees of the university and again, they are unopposed and they will be serving on those committees. **J. Kowalski:** was second.

The consent agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – [report](#) – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: We have a report from Earl Hansen, I believe he's giving Sonya's report. Okay before you start: Earl is retiring. He is stepping down as the representative to the FAC to the IBHE. Earl has been serving in that capacity since 2008 and he was doing this when it was an unpaid position and a relatively thankless job. Earl has been driving all over the state acquiring all kinds of mileage on his car, more recently the university car, and we want to thank Earl for his service to the FAC, to the senate, to the university and we, of course, wish him well in retirement. Earl, thanks very much for everything that you have done for us over the years. And now, Earl's final report as the representative to the FAC to the IBHE.

E. Hansen: I didn't attend the meeting at Truman College on April the 10. Sonya Armstrong did and her report is quite brief and I am just going to hit the highlights of it.

Basically, when we have a joint meeting between the Faculty Advisory Council and the IBHE, the Faculty Advisory Council meets in the morning and the IBHE has an open, public session that we as Faculty Advisory Council members can sit in on and then they go into an executive session and we have to leave. She's got some bullet points on here of what was discussed and the one that I found on here to be quite interesting to me was the next-to-last bullet where it says a faculty fellowship opportunity that would allow faculty on sabbatical to apply and serve on focus projects with the IBHE. I think that is just wonderful because we've not had much luck in getting faculty input into the IBHE. Just getting that thing on an agenda is a major accomplishment. The IBHE meeting was held. They showed a PowerPoint and they adjourned and if you want to know what was going on in the IBHE meeting, the web site is listed in here and the IBHE is not real quick on sending out their minutes to us when they get through with these meetings. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you very much, Earl.

B. Student Association –Austin Quick, Speaker – [report](#) – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Next report, Student Association. Don't be too disappointed, Austin is not here today. No, I know, I'm heartbroken myself, but we have his colleague, Seth Peritz, who is going to briefly give us the Student Association report.

S. Peritz: Well, one of the major things that happened in the past couple of weeks is that we have a full executive staff now with a cabinet as well as staff. We have been working to increase the GPA requirements for S.A. officers to try and raise the bar for all of the students, but first of all we wanted to start with the S.A.

We've been working on the budget a lot lately. We were supposed to have it in last week so we could look it over but that got delayed and we will be having it, hopefully, out on Sunday for us to vote on and discuss.

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – [report](#) – walk-in

K. Freedman: The agenda for this committee didn't contain anything controversial, so pretty much the report is as it stands. The presentation on capstone projects was very interesting to the trustees, in fact, so interesting that Ray Alden said that there would be more discussion of those at a future date. The only other thing I would point out is that in the accreditation process, anyone in the university can volunteer to participate in this process by volunteering to participate in the committees of the self study. If anyone wants to do that, please step up.

D. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – [report](#) – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: It's Greg Waas' report but I will present it.

The main items, it was a pretty simple agenda, nothing too exciting. The main items were the approval of the internal operating budget for this fiscal year. The BOT, by law, is required to approve the operating budget, otherwise they cannot spend money after July 1. Now one of the problems is that, of course, we don't know what the state budget is. Because they don't know the state budget, they couldn't actually submit a budget, so they gave a blanket approval that sort of translates as "okay when you get the money you can start spending it." We're expecting that by the actual Board of Trustees meeting, or hoping that by the actual Board of Trustees meeting, they will have the actual budget. They approved the plan to extend WiFi access campus-wide. This is apparently a three-year project. This is a major project and they approved \$1,800,000 for the next phase of this project. Those were the main items.

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – [report](#) – walk-in

R. Lopez: Basically, there were several pieces of conversation going on. It was a very lively meeting I would say. Kathy Buettner reported on the higher education appropriations committee allocating approximately \$2 billion representing a 5.3 percent reduction in the funding that

higher education would receive or \$113 million. Dr. Peters testified on behalf of NIU with other NIU administration, trying to get this worked out. Lori Clark went on to present on Medicare and pension status and we'll be hearing continued updates on that.

They did talk about the MAP funding being a big issue if that is removed, and President Peters remarked that we have been paid approximately \$11million in MAP voucher reimbursements and so many students are very concerned about this being removed. Vice President Steve Cunningham and Vice President and General Counsel Jerry Blakemore presented an overview to the Board of Trustees on compliance and risk management oversight including legal, ethical and business case for compliance. This included eight well-laid-out elements of an effective ethics and compliance program which included written policies, ethics training, communication, standards, internal compliance monitoring, systems for detection of offenses and periodic risk assessments. All of this to sort of take away the "I was not aware" defense that often arises when these things happen and also to remove the potential of the multi-million dollar fines and losses that we would have otherwise.

The rest of the report goes on with Dr. Cunningham's presentation of the comprehensive institutional compliance program to the Board of Trustees.

A. Rosenbaum: I should also like to tell you that the UAC has been meeting with the president and most of his cabinet before each Board of Trustees meeting as is the policy in the constitution. That has been a positive change and, in fact, the president just mentioned the other day that he's actually calling a meeting of the UAC. Apparently, the Board of Trustees has some questions for us. I am very delighted that the UAC is starting to be used the way it was intended to be used in the constitution.

F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

A. Rosenbaum: We voted to move the Elections and Legislative Oversight report up to the first item, so I will turn the meeting over to Therese Arado to conduct the elections.

1. Election of the President of Faculty Senate 2012-13

T. Arado: Our first order of business is to elect our candidate for nomination for executive secretary of University Council and president of Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate bylaws Article 2.1.3 calls for this election to be held by secret ballot. We are going to accomplish that today by using our clickers. Alan Rosenbaum is the only nominee for the 2012-13 election. Therefore, when you use your clickers, pressing number 1 will be a yes vote for our nominee, Alan Rosenbaum; and pressing number 2 is a no vote.

T. Arado: The voting came in as 41 yes in favor of Alan Rosenbaum and 0 no. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum was elected by a vote of:

#1-YES – 41

#2 – NO – 0

2. Election of Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor

(1) [Letter](#) – Paul Stoddard – Page 10

(2) [Letter](#) – Debra Zahay-Blatz – Page 11

(3) [Letter](#) – Robert Fleisher – Pages 12-13

(4) [Letter](#) – Toni Tollerud – Pages 14-15

T. Arado: We will also be using our clickers for the second election here which will involve more than a 1 or a 2. Our next order of business is to elect a Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor to serve an initial two-year appointment.

A. Rosenbaum: I just wanted to make one comment before you do that. Because we have four candidates, if we get a majority for one of the candidates on the first ballot, then that will be the winner. If we don't get a majority for any of the candidates on the first ballot, we'll remove the lowest vote getter and vote again until we have someone with a majority. That's typically what we would do when you have this many candidates.

T. Arado: Thank you. The four candidates submitted letters of self nomination for the position and those letters were included in the April 4 agenda packets. They are also in the packet you received for today's meeting. We're going to use the clickers to vote for this position. On the agenda you got for today's meeting, each person's name has a number next to it, 1, 2, 3 or 4. On page two of the main packet, next to Paul Stoddard's name should be a number 1; Debra Zahay-Blatz should have a number 2; Robert Fleisher a number 3; and Toni Tollerud a number 4. Using the clickers could you please select a corresponding number; 1, 2, 3 or 4 for the candidate you wish to elect for this position. So please vote for either 1, 2, 3 or 4 at this time. Okay, has everybody had a chance to put in their vote on this? Okay that's closed then now.

#1 – Stoddard – 13

#2 – Zahay-Blatz – 5

#3 – Fleisher – 3

#4 – Tollerud – 17

A. Rosenbaum: So I don't think we have a majority.

T. Arado: No, we do not.

A. Rosenbaum: So the lowest vote getter is which? Number 3 is the lowest vote getter. We now only have choices 1, 2 and 4.

T. Arado: Okay so we will vote again. Number 1 is Paul Stoddard; number 2 Debra Zahay-Blatz; number 4 would be Toni Tollerud. Okay if everyone has had a chance to put in either 1, 2 or 4, we will close the voting on that.

#1 – Stoddard – 13
#2 – Zahay-Blatz – 4
#4 – Tollerud – 23

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have elected Toni Tollerud.

T. Arado: Toni Tollerud for the position of Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor.

3. Election of FAC to IBHE representative to fulfill the one year remaining on Earl Hansen's term.

[Letter](#) – Sonya Armstrong – Page 16

T. Arado: Okay we get to use our clickers one more time. Our next order of business is to elect a representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE to fulfill the remaining one year of Earl Hansen's term. We have one nominee for this position, Sonya Armstrong. As we did in the first round, using your clickers if you would like to vote yes for Sonya Armstrong to fill this position, please press 1. If you wish to vote no, please press 2. You can go ahead and either select 1 or 2 for this.

#1 – YES – 40
#2 – NO – 1

T. Arado: Okay a vote of 40 to 1, Sonya Armstrong will be our representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE.

4. Election of UCPC representatives for 2012-14 – Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; voting will be by college (only COB, CHHS, CLAS, and CVPA have vacancies to fill); votes will be counted the following week and new UCPC members will be notified – walk-in
5. Committees of the University 2012-13 – Candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate – Packets/ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting – walk-in

The elections in items 4 & 5 were conducted by closed ballot by college and the votes were tallied after the meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you, Therese, and I should say thank you for what I'll take to be a vote of confidence whether it is or isn't and I will do my best to represent you well in the year ahead so thank you for that.

B. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair

1. [Proposed revisions](#) to Bylaws Article 5.4, University Criteria for Tenure, and APPM Section II, Item 29, Tenure and Promotion – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Next order of business, we have the report of the joint committees of Faculty Rights & Responsibilities and Rules & Governance and Rosemary is giving the report.

R. Feurer: This was a hold-over from last year. Dean McCord had raised issues of wanting to change the constitution and bylaws regarding the joint appointment policies and it's something that's being addressed at various stages or various places at the university level. We had the thankless job of trying to work through it. I should say that this report comes from myself and Gretchen after having numerous meetings and asking for input. But it wasn't vetted by the entire committee in order to get something out this year, but it was discussed in executive session. That's the basis on which this report has been made.

You can see that what is being asked for here is to remove some language and add new language regarding joint appointments. From what we understand, there are four different kinds of templates for joint appointments between centers and departments and there are some thorny issues in regard to faculty rights especially regarding tenure and promotion. It is universal sentiment that there ought to be more criteria and clearer criteria for people on joint appointments. There is no disagreement about that.

Where we came into some kind of impasse was on the issue of eliminating units in this language. It became clear in discussions with Dean McCord that that was an impediment to further ironing out our position. The thing that he really wants is to eliminate language regarding units. There is some concern – it isn't a universal concern, but there is some concern – from people involved with that might erode the power of faculty to make tenure and promotion decisions in their faculty units and departments.

We have these three statements, they are not a resolution, but it's our final comment on the issue. I think, Alan, when you started out you had said that you didn't understand why the language of units needed to be taken out and I guess, in a nutshell, that's what we came to the conclusion; at least enough of us. Are there any questions, explanations needed?

A. Rosenbaum: So, Rosemary, there's not a proposal here? We're not voting on anything?

R. Feurer: Well, we have a statement. Since we didn't vet it with our committee, we felt it was better to make a statement and ask members of the Faculty Senate if they thought that statement was one that they wanted to move it forward.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, does anyone have any comments on this? Any thoughts about it? Since we don't have a motion, I think one of the things we can do with this is to hold it, think about it and bring it up at the beginning of our next session. Any action on this would have to be approved by the University Council anyway, so it's not going to be made policy until the University Council gets it, which would not be until the fall. In the fall if we want to form this into a resolution or a motion, we can do that, pass it along to University Council and that will still get done in time for appointments that will be made next spring which is probably the next time when joint appointments will be made. Does that seem reasonable?

Okay so what we would simply do is take this as advice at this point and we will bring it up again at the beginning of the fall term. If there is any opposition to that we can certainly continue. Seeing none, we'll move on to the next agenda item. Thank you, Rosemary.

C. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair

1. Plus/Minus Grading System – [report](#) – walk-in

C. Cappell: In the last page of the walk-in packet you will see a report submitted by Professor Martin and myself updating you on the grade change proposal that we initiated last term, last fall, and reporting that the APASC committee has adopted an undergraduate grade change that includes the basic recommendations that we had moving to a plus/minus system, but eliminating the A+ grade and the C- grade that was in our original senate proposal. This almost corresponds to the grade change proposal that the Graduate Council recommended which includes the C-. This was a compromise. We presented three alternatives advocating for our first preference the original proposal that was strongly approved by the senate and this was the best we could get at this time. And the schedule is that, if this moves forward and minutes are approved and accepted, that the new plus/minus grade system might be implemented in the fall of 2013 term. Do you have any questions about that walk-in report?

A. Rosenbaum: I have a comment on this one if nobody else does. I don't understand why we can't have a C- grade. I mean I understand the argument that has been raised is that there are certain areas where a C- impairs a student's ability to proceed in a program, for example, if you get a C- in a core education course you cannot be a teacher, is that correct?

D. Wade: Any teacher certification course.

A. Rosenbaum: But it's my opinion that faculty are well aware of that so, if a faculty gives a C- grade, are they not giving the opinion that this person should not be a teacher? What we are forcing people to do here is to say, "okay, you know if I don't want you to be a teacher I have to give you a D. But if you haven't earned the D, I can't do that." So it seems like we are taking this option away from faculty members and it doesn't seem to me that that's the sentiment that was expressed by the senate. I don't think it makes a lot of sense. But I may be in the minority on this. I know that APASC apparently is very concerned about this.

D. Zahay-Blatz: I just wanted to comment that this was an issue with a C grade and people being able to take certain courses and go on into their major. In our department too, it was an objection to the plus/minus grading system. I think it might just be the harsh reality that we have to accept the fact that there would be no C- grade to get the plus/minus grading. And I also want to commend Charles and the folks that worked with him in doing such a great job with all the research because, at one point, we thought this was dead and now it's come back and I think it might just be something that we have to accept.

A. Rosenbaum: I don't want to fight with the senate on this, but my question is: What compels a professor to give a C- if they don't want to give a C-? If you are concerned about giving a C- what is forcing you to give a C-?

C. Cappell: I'll just comment that the deliberations in APASC lasted about an hour and probably 40 minutes of that was devoted to the discussion of the C-. We made these same points and we forced the committee to revisit it. I think the sense was that it was these political impediments to be able to implement a C- without really complicating curriculum and advising and these issues that ruled the day. We did make a case and the vote was 8-1, so it is possible, we can see that there is an inconsistency between the undergraduate and the graduate grading systems, and the only difference is C-. Since APASC might be reconstituted in the next term, different committee members, if we can somehow overcome the administrative notion once a change has been implemented, we might be able to reconcile the grading system back to the one that the senate preferred.

A. Rosenbaum: Stephen, do you have any comments?

S. Martin: I basically agree with that. I think there is going to be some value going forward with having a system that's common with the graduate students and the undergraduates. Personally, I think I'm willing to accept this for now. I also would prefer the C-, but the opinion on APASC was very anti-C- but I think going forward we might want to revisit this in the future and try to see if we want to reconcile these grading systems.

A. Rosenbaum: As far as the undergraduate system is concerned, I don't think we can keep changing the system, so what we adopt is most likely going to be the one that stays. I also want to point out that the APASC is a subcommittee of the UCC. The UCC is the parent committee. By going to the UCC last spring, we were able to get them to not accept the minutes of APASC. We could go back to the UCC if the senate so desires and argue for the C- in that larger committee and I am willing to do that if the senate wants that to be done. I will put it to a vote : one choice would be for me to go and represent the senate at the UCC and ask them to not accept the minutes of APASC and adopt the grading system that was approved by the senate. That's one option. Option B will be to accept this grading system that has the grades that you see there.

D. Wade: As the chair of APASC and a person who has been on this, may I just remind you that it's called shared governance because there is a sharing process involved in it. The people on APASC, believe me, are not a bunch of idiots not knowing what they are doing and trying to press a personal agenda that's anti-Faculty Senate. They have concerns, they hear from constituencies other than faculty, they are voting members who are other than faculty who bring to the table other concerns, other than faculty concerns. That is the shared aspect of APASC that doesn't exist on the Faculty Senate. Choose to do as you wish but the system is in place to vet effectively proposals brought forward not as a method to stomp your feet and get your way. That part of sharing is that sometimes compromise is involved in it and that was precisely what was present here.

A. Rosenbaum: So was it the non-faculty members on APASC that were opposed?

D. Wade: It was all members but one including faculty. They all have concerns about the C-grade, very strong concerns about it. It counts as 1.67. There's a lot of C or better requirements at this thing, it's going to delay time to graduation and drive up the costs for students. None of those are outcomes that we as an institution believe that we should be taking at this juncture in

time. There's a lot of issues here on the table, not simply the will of the Faculty Senate, but choose to do as you wish, because it will be beyond my time here.

W. Pitney: I appreciate David's comments and along with that I would like for us to be mindful that in many instances a student can get, using the C- scheme, if they get a C- in a class, one class only, that requires a C or better, they are dead in the water. They cannot proceed in that program nor can they retake that class, because at the undergraduate level you can only retake with a D or lower. So I think that was issue as I recall that was a big sticking point amongst many of the constituents.

C. Cappell: We recommended that students be allowed to repeat a C- course. That would be part of the proposal. But you're right, it could delay a semester for a student to actually repeat that course and earn a grade that's higher. We made the argument regarding the C- that giving a C- option when a student is taking a required core course gives them a higher GPA than if you gave them a D. So if they had to repeat a course or balance that grade out with another grade, they only need to earn a C+ rather than a B and that might actually offset the matriculation rate because their grade point average would not be hurt as much if they did not meet the C standard.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I would also like to point out again for the record that we didn't invent this system. That this is in place in many universities and I don't know how many universities in the state have this system without a C-. I've not seen that and Charles you've done the research, is that a common configuration?

C. Cappell: My off-the-top-of-the-head response without digging out the report is that no it's not. Most all of the MAC schools have a full range of C- grades.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, what I'm saying is that those who have the system have a C- grade.

D. Wade: Correct.

A. Rosenbaum: Right but there are privates in Illinois as well and there are many schools that have a C- that are in Illinois and they are managing to get by without screwing up the lives of their students. So it's not like we're doing something that's unheard of and cutting edge, it's the standard type of a plus/minus system. I don't know of a plus/minus system that doesn't have the C- minus.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so I think we know the issues, so we can either vote to leave it as is and let this become policy or we can argue the point with the UCC. It's up to the senate. Again, with the clickers, if you want to leave it the way it is, so it will go in as the grading system that you see on page 12 without the C- press 1. If you would like me to take a crack at talking to the UCC about restoring the C- press 2 and we'll go with whatever the majority vote is.

#1 – Leave as is – 19

#2 – Go back to UCC – 14

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so we leave the grading system as is without the C-.

2. Online Student Evaluation of Instruction – [report](#) – Pages 4-7

C. Cappell: The next item is part of your agenda packet and it is the report of the Academic Affairs Committee on the online teaching evaluation procedures. We prepared a report that lists several findings, some recommendations and some additional advisories that we would like faculty to consider and take back to their departments and possibly have their departments discuss the issues with the deans. We will be putting a lot of the information that we have collected in the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs folder on the senate site so that you can access articles and some references and some minutes of some interviews that we conducted with Associate Dean Hecht, College of Education and Murali Krishnamurthi of Faculty Development.

Our sense of our deliberations is that we are not recommending that the senate take any strong recommendations to address the issue with the deans or provost, but that the senate should use our findings and our recommendations to take this back to the departments and see if the department wants to revisit this issue about using online evaluations.

Our general sense was that it is probably more efficient. There are many aspects that can benefit faculty: quick response, being able to tailor-make questions and make things speak to the concerns of an individual faculty member easier than the current systems does.

We're concerned with the results being verified, that when they come out in nice pristine form in computer web sites and PDFs and Word documents that they might be processed and treated a little bit differently. We are concerned with the overall lack of attention on the reliability and validity of any instrument that's used. We're concerned with response rates and all of these are continuing issues. There's not a magic bullet or a specific solution that can take care of them.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, one comment, it should be born in mind that there are colleges now that are requiring online evaluation of teacher effectiveness and that some of the faculty from those colleges have complained that the response rate is too low and that these are being used in tenure and promotion evaluations. So the senate has some options, we can think about it and hold it off until next year. We can pass some kind of a motion that either specifies the minimum percentage of respondents and participation rate before a online evaluation can be used in a tenure or promotion evaluation, or we can simply make the statement that we don't think, at this point, it should be mandatory or should be permitted to be mandatory.

R. Feurer: Yeah, I want to speak for the last one. I think that we should make a strong statement that we recommend that the implementation and usage of online surveys should be done only in consult and with the consent of faculty in their units and divisions.

A. Rosenbaum: Do you want to make that motion?

R. Feurer: I am making that as a motion based on what I read here and I think that we have to be clear that, at this point, the faculty should be on board and that it shouldn't be implemented from on high.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so again for the record, your motion is that it be permissible but that it not be required without the consent of the faculty in each department or unit.

R. Feurer: Right. Well, if you want to read exactly.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes.

R. Feurer: Recommend that they be implemented and used only with the consent and in consult with the faculty in the units and division, in every unit and division.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and we need a second.

A. Lash: Second.

W. Pitney: What does that mean then for the colleges who are currently using it and mandating its use?

A. Rosenbaum: If the UC approves the policy, they would then have to follow this policy that we're suggesting. So deans would no longer be able to require online evaluations of teaching effectiveness.

A. Lash: I really want to support the motion because the way it came in was really with no faculty input whatsoever. It just appeared with no advance warning. All of the sudden we have to do it so there was no input. But my concern is also about recommendation number 8 on page 6. When we say that the online evaluations amount to no more than ten percent, we are basically saying they are useless. So I think we either fix it or we use it because by doing this sort of thing online we are saying student input is really kind of useless. Ten percent is so small of an amount. So I think faculty input and discussion at each unit would possibly help rather than just saying we have to do it this way or we're just not doing it.

A. Rosenbaum: And, of course, this is not part of the resolution.

M. Kostic: I am confused about that individual; it is individual per department or individual per faculty member that must be consent, consult?

R. Feurer: Oh, I said faculties so I meant the department and division.

M. Kostic: Decides then it's online only, because we have online only we don't have any other one then we are not going to have evaluation.

A. Rosenbaum: No, you just have written instead of online.

M. Kostic: So written evaluations will be reinstated because now we don't have it.

A. Rosenbaum: It will simply say that a department can't be forced to do online evaluations but there is still a requirement that there be evaluation of teaching effectiveness so that would leave you with written evaluation. Okay any other comments? We'll put this to a vote. If you vote 1, you are supporting the resolution, does anyone want to hear it again? Okay read it once more please.

R. Feurer: Does anybody have it written down because I've said differently both times. We recommend that an online system be implemented and used only in consult and with the consent of faculties in units and divisions.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay we have the sentiment there and we will get the wording right.

S. Martin: Just to make this clear, so if a college and a department within a college disagree, the department wins, that's the sentiment.

R. Feurer: Yeah that's what I – so both department and division.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, and keep in mind we don't have policy-making power so this goes to the UC. The UC includes deans and other administrators so at the UC it can be modified in some way. We don't know what will happen, but we're just expressing our feelings about this that this not be done without the consent of the departments or units.

The motion passed by a vote of:

#1 – YES - 31

#2 – NO – 2

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, it passes 31 to 2. We'll pass this along to the University Council once we've got the wording exactly right.

D. Economic Status of the Profession – Michael Kolb, Chair – no report

E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

F. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum, Liaison/Spokesperson – [report](#)
– Page 8-9

D. Goldblum: There was a discussion from Provost Alden about the re-initiation of the strategic plans and they are now going to be holding those plans more accountable going forward. There was a discussion about retirement, upcoming retirements, and they are expecting a higher rate of retirement this spring into the semester. They said the inquiries are up to about two to three times from what they have been and they are anticipating maybe eight to ten percent of faculty and staff might choose to retire at the end of this year but the notification is only 30 days prior to the retirement so they said it might be difficult to make plans in departments as far as how people want to be replaced.

Discussion about the elimination of tuition waivers I guess I just saw that now as of two days ago passed into the senate for the house so that's moving forward. I'm sorry no, that hasn't, the second one below that, the limitation on hiring retirees has now passed to the senate which, according to President Peters, would have a huge impact on NIU with administrators and faculty who have been hired back. His take is that it's going to go forward and they are hoping they can

delay the initiation date a little bit on that but people who are on grants would be exempt from that but others wouldn't be.

There are also some positive comments on admissions for the fall semester. Higher standards, higher averages for GPAs and ACT for incoming students is one of the signs they are seeing so they are optimistic about fall start for new students.

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Rosenbaum: Before we go into executive session, I want to make a few comments because I know people will start to leave. I don't know if people are going to stay to hear the entire report, hopefully they will. I don't know how long that will run, but I want to thank you all for your service to the senate this past year. I want to thank all the chairs of committees for all of the work that they have done. I hope all of you have a safe summer and we'll see those of you who are returning to the senate back here in September. With that I'd like to make a motion that we go into executive session. I need a second.

S. Willis: Second.

The motion passed without dissent or abstention.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we will ask all non-voting members to please leave the senate. I would suggest you're welcome to wait outside until we come out of executive session but we don't know when that will be, it might be a while.

A. Report of the Faculty Subcommittee of the Raise Equity Committee

XI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XII. NEW BUSINESS

XIII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XIV. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- E. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- I. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- J. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council

- M. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- Q. [Meeting Schedule](#) – 2012-13 – Page 17

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.