I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I call the January 28 University Council to order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first item of business is the adoption of the agenda. At your seats you will find three walk-ins that we need to blend into the agenda. The first is the memorandum to Paul Stoddard from Earl Seaver. That goes under the Consent Agenda as V, D. That’s a walk-in on adjustments to the University calendar. The second piece of paper that you have; the second walk-in is a written report from Earl Hansen. It goes under VI, A as the written report and the third piece of paper you should have, a walk-in, is VI, H which is a bylaw change, first reading where it says “no report”, this will be a report. We have a brief report under VI, F, Academic Policy Committee; William Baker will have a brief report I’m told. I think that encompasses the additions, therefore is there a motion to adopt the agenda as amended? Is there a second? Got a second. All right, we have many seconds. Any discussion on the agenda? Removal of anything from the Consent agenda? Oh, we haven’t gotten there yet. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained? Okay, we have an agenda.

Stephen made the motion; Derscheid made the second. The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2008 MEETING (will be sent electronically on Tuesday, January 27)

President Peters: I assume everyone diligently read the electronic version of the minutes of December 3, 2008 meeting. I assume they were distributed? For those of you who did look at them, I’ll call for additions or corrections. Is there a motion to approve those? A second to adopt the December 3 minutes? Those in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay.
made the motion; Stephen was second. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: President’s announcements. Well, let me tell you what I’ve been doing since I’ve seen you last. It’s been interesting. I’ve been to the presidential inauguration last week. Was it last week? It was very interesting. I was standing in one of the many lines I stood in to get inedible food but you meet interesting people and I was in a line to get your picture made and I was talking to a woman behind me who said where are you from and I said I’m from DeKalb. She said oh, I know DeKalb and I said oh, good. She said I went to NIU. I said oh really, she said yeah and she asked who I was and I tried to avoid implicating myself but I finally indicated who I was and she said well I was a scholarship athlete in 1991 and I was a woman’s field hockey player. Were you the president who got rid of field hockey? What ran through my mind was even there in Washington, D.C. but I found that exhilarating. I just returned from Springfield from a meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education and I also visited on the way out, our state capitol yesterday to say that within one week I experienced two rather historic events. I’m just hooked on that kind of stuff. As I was driving back and really at the inaugural beginning – my thoughts went back to other inaugurals that I’ve been at and other sort of events but my thoughts went back to June of 2000 when I first arrived on campus as president and one of the first things I did was that I went to Springfield to meet as many of the members of the Illinois delegation as I could meet. If it was not the first it was among the first state senators I visited was a young man from the Chicago area that I think had 625 from his district currently at NIU at that time and about 3400 alums and I introduced myself and it happened to be this fascinating young man, Borac Obama and I thought to myself, since I’ve been doing this a long time, there’s somebody with some talent. It reminded me of Harold Ford who I knew from Memphis who was a very bright African-American representative that I thought could transcend the old-style politics. It wasn’t too long after that, either late June or July of 2000, I went to Washington to meet as many members of the Congressional delegation that I could meet. Of course at that time, you remember, that NIU was fortunate in that our local representative happened to be an alum and happened to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives which struck me as being good things for the future which they were. I also met many people, many representatives, including one young fellow from the Fifth Congressional District, that was the old Rostenkowski seat, which any political scientist not from Illinois, he knows Rostenkowski – and it was this young fellow from Illinois named Rod Blagojevich and I can’t remember what we talked about and I have no record of it. Then I remember being in Springfield in 2002 for the gubernatorial inauguration of the governor and I remember at the time thinking that here we had two people in Illinois who, at that point in time, were presidential timber judged by, you know, the various ways you judge this thing and then yesterday, my thoughts were how interesting, how historic last week was. The first African-American president of the United States was this young lad that I first met in 2000 and impressed by and how another young public servant let’s say, his inauguration was kind of a de-inauguration yesterday. So, anyway, I thought you might appreciate that perspective and you know, NIU, it’s not me, it’s NIU that’s come right in the middle of that. That’s sort of history and interesting. I did see some students there for the inaugural and I saw many NIU people. Anyway, I thought you might be interested in that. You know, those who know my work in political science, know I was a bit of a rational choice theorist who, you know, believes that politicians act rationally? I have now come to the
conclusion that I’m studying chaos theory because I cannot explain those paths in any rational – well, maybe I could – give me a minute.

Anyway, getting down to rationality, let me talk about things. Let me try to make sense out of the state budget and let me try to make sense out of the federal stimulus package, at least any sense that can be made at this time; it’s a changing situation. Let’s talk a little bit about the state budget and that is the state budget which we will operate under in FY10 and I’m going to give you some context. The context for this budget is the FY09 revenue forecast – that’s the budget we’re still in – revenue forecasts are off by about 550 million minimum for this year. In other words, even not taking into consideration next year’s revenue or rolling deficit, this budget as passed in revenue forecasts is in arrears approaching 600 million. That’s probably conservative and we’ve been asked of course to – the state agencies have been asked to hold back money. We’ve been asked to hold back 2.5% of last year’s budget which we have. All right, so that’s one thing. The other context here on the budget for next year is the state deficit which most people now is approaching 4 billion for next year and the backlog of bills that have not been paid. People are not getting paid. Medical people are not being paid. Transfer payments are slow. It’s not like California where I guess they were issuing vouchers so rather than a paycheck, you got a voucher – you’re getting vouchers in California. It’s not at that point yet but it’s not pretty either. Another element in this budget development, the context, is pension requirements and just let’s say SERS, which is our employees, there is a 250 million payment due for SERS and, you know, those weren’t accommodated in any of the state budget requests that I’m going to talk about that went from the IBHE. That’s still – that’s on top of that. The other context of this and I’m going to talk about it later, is the federal stimulus package. What interaction, what help if any, will the federal stimulus package have on our state budget situation and, of course, it’s the federal issue, the state issue and what’s in it for NIU. You know, it’s just like you do your home bank account. What’s in it for us? Then the other context here let’s say is the economy which, you know, I’m not an economist but, you know, people would say we’re in the thirteenth month of a recession and recessions usually last sixteen to eighteen months and then there’s the slow recovery. I know most people I talk to look forward to an eighteen month to twenty-four month recovery before, you know, things turn around. Then the other context here for the state budget is this Strategic Planning process that the IBHE has just gone through, the public agenda. Go on line, read it. Pretty good document and its focus is on affordability for students, access to university education, post-secondary education, educational attainment which is completing your degree and progressing and then economic growth. That’s the focus of the IBHE public agenda. That’s what they’re focusing on for the next several years. So that’s the way the budget was built. That’s the context.

So the IBHE yesterday, passed a bill or passed a – approved a budget, a request budget, that goes forward to the Governor and this is kind of interesting because for the past few years there hasn’t been such a thing. Last year there was but, you know, the governor and the Office of Management and Budget just did it and there wasn’t a budget building process.

All right, let me talk a little bit about it. It starts out with the – assumes the FY09 base, you know, the base that we just had which for us – remember, we got about a 2. some percent increase so our base budget from general funds, that’s state money, appropriated dollars, is about 107 million, 107.4. A few years ago, it was 118. It’s gone downhill. But here’s the thing, NIU
is almost a half a billion operating entity now because 126 million of our total budget is from local funds; tuition, fees, auxiliaries. You know, all of that good stuff and non-appropriated funds; grants, contracts, endowment income, grants from endowments. So our total budget is about 425 million. It’s moving up to that half a billion dollars. The percentages of those three portions that pour into our vessel used to be the state portion; the GR – twenty years ago – was 62-63%. Now it’s the smallest of the three portions. We’re only talking about that right now. The GR, the 107 million base in 09. So what the IBHE did was they presented a budget in a series of steps or investments if you will based upon the context I gave you and there are six steps that they put forward to the governor and you can argue for or against those steps and they’re walk-ups; they’re incremental. The first step assumes – remember the base, FY09 – minus the 2.5% holdback that was requested so the first step is a negative 2.5% budget for everybody. The percentages change depending on your base, but give or take it’s a rough 2.5%. For us, that’s a 2.3 million dollar negative; about 2.1% of our base, all right? So that’s at the lowest level of the request budget. All right? So a 2 million dollar reduction from last year’s 107 million. All right. Step 2 is a minus 1% which is about 700,000 dollars for us. All right? So then we’re moving up, we’re still not spending money, right? We’re still cutting. Step 3 is zero percent which includes the 2.5% that they took, held last year, so I guess that means we can spend some money but that’s zero percent. That’s the 3rd step. The 4th step is positive, 1.1%. That’s about 1.45 million and what the IBHE says it should go for at that level is salaries and they want a match from us. So they’re giving us about 1% but they want us to match it and add to which we’ve done that forever. All right, that’s step 4. Step 5 is about – is I think 2.5% something like that. I really don’t get serious when I get up here in a rarified atmosphere. Step 5 is about 2 to 3% and Step 6 is 5% and what they add on. What the add-ons are is more money in salaries and then they add deferred maintenance and then the final, at the highest level, they add all of that plus increase in utilities. So not a lot of programmatic in there. It’s just infrastructure; bread and butter. Salaries, maintenance, utilities. You know, I look at that and say they did a good thing. You know, that makes sense. You know they haven’t – there’s some programmatic money in there but basically it’s for those things. All right, so that’s where we start. A few things you should know, I presume that there will be a new governor soon. I don’t know that; I presume. If there is, I understand the new governor will ask for a month delay in submitting the budget so everything gets pushed back a month. All right. Who knows, this maybe – maybe we will get an increase but more likely than not the negative 2.5 is the starting point and then everything else goes south, you. I would consider it a good thing if our budget was flat – 0. I would consider that very good but, you know, now you know all I know. I did it in some detail because you know there’s a lot of – people don’t know, they read and – but that’s where it is right now and that was passed yesterday so that’s the IBHE budget that was passed.

Capital budget, separate, was passed and it’s as it’s been for eight years. Stephens #1, and so forth – I’ll take questions at the end because I’ve got to go through the federal stuff and it gets complicated but the capital bill has Stephens and outside the capital bill but in an add-on bill is Cole Hall. All right, so it’s blended in to an overall state capital bill. We have a capital bill. I don’t know, there is talk about, you know, they have to come up with a match to get the federal dollars from the last federal transportation bill so I understand there’s some talk of a marked increase in gasoline tax and so forth to help do that for transportation issues. For transportation and not what they vertical – I don’t know if there’s any vertical in there, you know, for building stuff – buildings.
Okay, now let me talk a little bit about the federal stimulus package because I think these things for the first time are not independent. I think they bounce against each other and will set state strategies and I don’t know but the House was apparently debating and acting today on the stimulus package. The Senate has already done some action. The federal stimulus package, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, has two components. One is a kind of a tax relief component and then the other is an old style stimulus package in infrastructure; roads, that kind of stuff, even some operating and that’s at about 550 billion dollars so you’re talking about an 825 billion dollar thing. I’m going to try and talk a little bit at some length about what’s in there for education. What’s in there for Illinois education and what’s in there for NIU? All right, so I’m going to bring it on home to the local level. Remember, this is all – this is good, they’re debating it but the final result is, I don’t know because, you know, the House has to vote, the Senate, then they have to go to Conference Committee, there’s some differences there so there’s a lot of politics left. They’d like to get this done by February 19. So that’s the context. The House stimulus package which is proposed for today, I just want to focus a little bit on the educational side. There’s some sections called the Post-Secondary Institutional Operating Support through the states. They’re talking about some operating money through the states and a critical component of this is 39 billion per year for two years beginning July 1 in 2009 for states to address funding shortfalls in critical education programs at all levels. Elementary, secondary and post-secondary, all right, so it’s a little bit of a competition. So it’s 39 billion for two years to the states for education and all education. Now here’s the scary part. The Legislation calls on governors to provide the amount of funds to public institutions in the state that is needed to restore state support for post-secondary education to the FY08 level and another 25 billion is proposed for states to address high priority needs which can include education. So there is money there and, you know, there was somebody who introduced an amendment to specifically ban our current governor from distributing this. Anyway, what’s Illinois’s share? Illinois can expect to receive approximately 2.7 billion over that two year period or about 1.35 billion per year for that section. And public ed could use those funds for general operating support. So Illinois gets 1.35, 2.7 billion – how much goes, we don’t know yet. But, I look upon that as an opportunity to make a case so we’ll be doing that. All right, so that’s one part of this stimulus package that is relevant to us. The other is construction and infrastructure improvement so bricks and mortar, vertical. The bill calls for 6 billion dollars for higher ed renovation and modernization including technology upgrades, energy efficiency, to be distributed to states in proportion to their share of full-time undergraduates. So it’s aid to, you know, that’s the way they’re going to allocate – the number of full-time undergraduates for infrastructure. So, that could include health and safety repairs, (Cole Hall), facilities modifications to provide access for disabled students and educational technology infrastructure upgrades. That’s good. As well as energy efficient projects, hibachis in dorm rooms – I don’t know what that means. Priority will be given to colleges that serve high numbers of minority students and institutions impacted by major disasters as well as institutions seeking to undertake energy efficiency. Okay, renovations can also include – there will be 300 million in grants for construction of science and research buildings at colleges and other research organizations. I don’t know how far 300 million goes, you know, across all the – but, there you go, Illinois’s share. I calculate about 256 million administered by IBHE. Funds must be obligated within six months or they’ll be swept. So you’ve got to be ready to get the hammers and the nails out and get the concrete. Public and
privates are both eligible. No new facilities can be constructed with these funds. Repair and renovation only.

Then I just want to talk a little bit and not belabor this, there are a whole number of initiatives focused on student success and affordability that goes directly to students through the various aid programs. That’s good. For instance, Pell Grants and a lot of our students are on Pell Grants. 15.6 billion to increase the maximum Pell Grant by $500, from $4,850 to $5,350 for 2009 and 2010. There are millions of students on Pell Grants and if you add $500 to each one of those, that’s a big number – without even adding more recipients – that’s a big number. Right now, the maximum Pell Grant is $4,731. The increased funding will aid up to 800,000 more students and it will eliminate the deficit that’s building. There’s a 1.4 billion dollar estimated short fall in 2010 and 2011 so they would address this. This is really good news for students. Another good news, you know, our Federal Work Study has been cut in the last few years. Well, part of this – there’s going to be 490 million in additional monies to support undergraduate and graduate students who work on campus while attending school. I think that’s very helpful because, you know, a lot of times these work studies adds to the curriculum and the academic component of our students. There’s a new tax credit, you know, beyond the current Hope tax credit for families. It’s about a $2,500 annual tax credit. There’s some argument about that. They’re proposing to raise the student loan limit. On the one hand, I’m not real happy about that. On the other hand, you know, I guess we have to do that. It increases the limit on how much undergraduates can borrow in unsubsidized Stafford Loans by $2,000 annually up to an aggregate of $8,000. So now our students, those who are Pell eligible, usually stack Pell with Stafford and some other things to pay for their education and there are some other things in there that I won’t go into but, you know, money for state white data systems and improving teacher quality and other things. I don’t know whether this is going to pass or not but when you think about it, it may have a short term impact to help the state not savage our budget. Probably most of you are faculty; some staff, probably have friends in other states where you’re hearing horror stories like Nevada. How much? 36% of your general revenue. How do you do that? Imagine if we took all the vacancies we have now, it might be 3, 4, 5% of our budget but, how do you do that? I know in Tennessee where I came from, they’re at 20%. Like right now. 20%! So, you know, it’s all relative so think about that for a moment. I can’t tell you this is going to be pleasant but I did want to give you all the facts as they are beginning to emerge and things are beginning to clarify now so I think pretty soon, within a few weeks, we’ll know more about the state budget and simultaneously we’ll know what the macro, the federal stimulus package looks like and we’re going to work real hard to get our share for NIU but there are a lot of people out there that need the money and, of course, K-12 will get the lion’s share of this.

Okay, I’ll stop there on the budget stuff before I move on. Buck, if you wanted to ask a question or did I answer it?

**J. Stephen:** No. I have three questions for you. One is not a question for you. It’s actually a statement to the student members here and although you’ve heard some disagreement over the contents of the stimulus package, you may not be aware that although the birth control, STD thing really makes the news, you may not be aware that there are some considerable distracters from the education point part of the view and that as the Student Association representatives, I think it’s important that your voice be heard on this. It should be your voice; not ours. There are
people who want to say that’s too much money for education. Let’s see. Second question is again my return to Cole Hall. Our loss of 600 lecture hour seats which is somewhere in the neighborhood of what 6,400 hour seats per day. Is it worth our effort to try to get them to stick to their – you know, try to put some pressure to get that separated out or do you feel that’s a lost cause? Because done right, we could have that building back in a year. If we’re waiting for the federal stimulus package, it could be 2011, 2012.

President Peters: Well, it’s also in the state package. We have been – well, first of all, I have to thank Ray and his people, the facilities people, who have made a very bad situation, made it work, although it’s not optimal.

J. Stephen: It’s inconvenient but it works.

President Peters: It’s inconvenient but it works and it’s needed. We went through an elaborate process to determine what it is we need within reasonable dollars and I believe that state should give that to us and I’m not going to give up on that.

J. Stephen: Good, I’m glad.

President Peters: I’m not giving up on that.

J. Stephen: I don’t know if you in particular can address this question but in today’s Northern Star they discussed the 25% decline in some of the Ivy League endowments and I think it was SIU showed a 26% decline. Well, last week we had some pretty positive news about our True North project and I’m wondering if our endowments are ---

President Peters: Our endowments, like all endowments in the last quarter, were down 19.1%. That has an impact on scholarships. Hopefully, this will come back. But, you know, we’re rather new to building endowments at NIU.

J. Stephen: On the other hand, that seems to have paid off if we only took a 19%.

President Peters: It is something that has been a very, very positive thing so we haven’t had to rely upon endowments the way a private would for a tremendous share of our operating. Even Harvard has had an issue. However, we have – remember, this is separate. The NIU Foundation is separate from NIU but I kind of sit on their Board and they have an investment committee composed that our School of Business trained and Accountancy and Financial who are whizzes and they have minimized through shrewd investments our losses to, you know, 19% is good, you know. It’s a good point. I do think maybe Ray knows a little bit more about it. I know there’s been a lot of communication with the deans about what funds will be available and not available. That’s where the rubber hits the road Buck. How many scholarship funds are available from our endowments for our students.

R. Alden: What I think the Foundation is trying to do is go back to donors and see if they can dip into the pool for one-time funding of scholarships while endowments are not producing any revenue streams. Now that’s entirely up to the donors wishes as to whether you essentially start
drawing down on the principal or not but I gather that’s at least one of the strategies to try and get us over this very bad period.

**President Peters:** Yeah, let me give you an example. Barb and I have a small endowment and the income from it produces a small stipend. Well, maybe I might be approached to say would you dig into the principal because the income isn’t there to keep it going. Of course, the back end of that is I’ve that back – but that’s the kind of strategies. You know, our donors have been wonderful and receptive to that.

**R. Alden:** I believe some of them are actually saying well rather than jeopardize the endowment; I’ll carry you for a year or part of the year.

**President Peters:** Make an expendable gift.

**J. Stephen:** You’ve put great work into this.

**President Peters:** I’ll tell you, our Foundation – it’s first rate. Is that all of your questions?

**J. Stephen:** I thought I had another one but it will come to me eventually.

**President Peters:** All right. Now I’m going to turn it over to Ray Alden who has three or four things to talk about.

**R. Alden:** Okay. John wanted me to talk about the Equity Study, the Strategic Plan and where we are with our dean searches.

First of all, I would like to acknowledge Joe Grush and a team of more than two dozen faculty and staff who worked on the university-wide salary equity study for the last six months or so as well as on the report. This was a faculty dominated committee but they represented all sorts of different constituency groups so I’d like to acknowledge them. I will say that the entire study is posted on the Academic Affairs web page as a link so if you want to see it all, you can look at that including the statistical tables and everything else that might be there if you’re inclined to do so. But I did want to summarize. This was a bit of a risk when we took it on. As you probably know, we’ve been doing equity studies at the college level for the last decade or so on a two or three year basis so I just wanted to make sure that there weren’t any systemic issues that would cut across the university that wouldn’t show up in those and we did a very intensive study. It involved a large number of analyses; I think over fifteen different models suggested by the various constituency groups. The main models were showing that the predicted salaries based on I think 700 faculty, tenured faculty, tenured track faculty, was predicted by such things as market value, and we got those from national sources such as KUPA, the rank of a full professor, the long-term merit ratings and years at NIU and that counted for somewhere between 86% to 92% of all the variants in salaries. Such as things as minority status and gender and age were not shown to be significant in any of the analyses both parametric and non-parametric statistics were used so we looked at it from all sorts of different directions. We also looked at another thing about whether merit scores were related to things such as gender or minority status or age and these likewise did not show a significant effect on merit scores rather you’re talking about raw
scores coming directly from the personnel committees of quintiles which tries to put everything on a more uniform basis when you compare across colleges. As with any statistical analyses, there are a certain number of individuals just because of the statistics that fall below where you’d predict them to be. In this case, we were fairly conservative in that we went one standard deviation below what would be predicted which is still not considered statistically significant with respect to the commonly accepted definition that most people use of statistical significance but we felt that it’s better to start recognizing there’s some individuals slipping below. There are about 26 individuals who met the criteria and we went through a vetting process with the colleges to make sure there wasn’t something in the personnel records that would explain why they’re below where they’d be predicted to be and we made salary adjustments for those 26 individuals. So I think this is something the university can be very proud of. We know that in the distance past there were some issues with equity issues and I think they’ve largely been addressed as far as we can tell on a large-scale basis. Now of course, this doesn’t get down to an individual basis or one department versus another and it certainly doesn’t address the issue of all of our faculty are underpaid. There’s just no question about that but that wasn’t the purpose of this. This was looking at the demographics and trying to predict salary and I think we all should be very proud of the institution for showing so well. Again, if you have any questions, the full report is on the web page and I’m sure the various committees would be very willing to consider any questions that may come up.

On the issue of Strategic Planning, we are at the President’s request, proceeding with our Strategic Planning efforts this year. Obviously, we scaled it back when we saw the funding and economy issues but we still are making progress. I would hope that in the next week or two we will have all of the executive summaries so that we can have a news release to the campus so everybody knows what we’re making progress on and we’re also asking every group to have a champion who puts together a template which answers specific questions so that if anybody ever asks well, you know, what is this particular initiative, whose involved, how is it being done and what’s going to be produced and how much is it taking in terms of resources. All that information will be available. We do have some things that have been out in the press already. We are undergoing a Baccalaureate Goal Review trying to determine after 25 years, adjust our goals for what our baccalaureate students should have as their knowledge base or competency skills, however you want to look at it, and that will be a prelude for looking at such things as general education and outreach engagement and so forth. We also are participating by invitation with the Foundations of Excellence Program which is a first year program trying to make sure from both the Academic Affairs and the Student Affairs perspective that we are serving the needs of our first year students in academic as well as environment issues to make sure they get the best possible experience and that they advance their education. So those two I can say are ongoing. We have a number of others in the works and, like I say, I would say by the end of February we’ll have a major news release to the campus on what other things are proceeding.

We have two dean searches going on. We have a Law School dean search where the last candidate comes in next week and we hope to be negotiating with the candidate of choice within the next week or so and they’re all excellent candidates. The first two have been on campus and I’ve gotten nothing but rave reviews. I think the third candidate is equally of the same caliber so I think it is going to be hopefully a successful search. Of course, we’re competing with other institutions for any excellent candidate we have. The Visual and Performing Arts dean’s search
– we’re going to have an airport interview in another week or two and we’re bringing in eight candidates and they’re also very strong candidates. We hope to narrow that down to three or four that would be invited on to campus for campus interviews within the next month or so. So that’s proceeding very well as well.

I think we’ve already made the announcement that the Vice President for Research Graduate Studies search is postponed for a bit because of budgetary issues but we’ve gotten the search firm that was contracted to agree to come in toward the end of the spring semester to work with the search committee so we can get a good solid start early in the fall semester to get it out and announced and hopefully beat some of the other institutions that may be looking for other similar positions. Jim Erman has agreed to stay on as interim for another year and I’d like to thank him for that as well. So, thank you.

**President Peters:** It’s very important, in my experience over the years, that in times of tough budgets that institutions don’t lose a sense of themselves or their progress or their vision and I don’t think we are. We’re moving ahead where we can. We’re prudent and I’m pretty much focused on one thing always and that’s delivering quality education to our students and meeting payroll. That’s getting down to basics; we’ve got to take care of students and we’ve got to meet payroll. I don’t know what the budget’s future is going to be. I like to hope that it’s a little brighter but I don’t know but we’re – the message is we’re in good shape but, you know, I don’t know whether we can sustain huge cuts without major issues but we’ll just have to wait and see and I want to thank everybody for all their hard work.

You know the last thing I want to mention, to shift gears completely, is that we have our day of remembrance coming up on February 14. One year ago we had our tragedy on campus and the eyes of the world were on us and I don’t care where I go or who I talk to, presidential inaugurations (went to other side of tape) a very fitting set of activities planned for that Saturday and Brian Hemphill co-chaired with Kathy Buettner with a case of thousands to put together what I consider to be a very appropriate set of activities to mark that tragic day. Go on the web site and there’s a nice pdf schedule you can print out and once again, the eyes of the world will be on NIU and I know that what they’re going to hear is how well we have recovered, the strength of the campus, the strength of our students dealing with this, the sacrifices people have made and the fact is that we are moving on but without forgetting and we’ve tried not to let this event define us and tried to work with it. Of course I urge all of you to participate in any of these many activities and many of you are. The three major public events that I point to is the 10:30 convocation – we’re calling it “NIU Remembers; A Legacy of Character” which features the character of our five fallen students. Then another public presentation will be at 3:00 which fits the timeframe of the shooting. There will be a presentation of memorial wreaths where I will lead the families and faculty, students to the site of where the permanent memorial will be where we will lay wreaths and unveil or there will be a picture board of our permanent memorial which is, I consider it to be moving and I hope you will too. That will be at 3:00. Of course there are activities throughout the day and many of you are presenting and putting – whether it’s artistic expressions, video presentations, all sorts of activities and then the other public event is the 6:00pm candlelight vigil and reception so we will have a vigil, a candlelight vigil, and that’s beginning at 5:30 and then following that which will be simple, dignified, silence, bells – there will be a reception in Duke Ellington Ballroom. This will be a very long day but I think an
appropriate day and once again, the eyes of the world will be upon us and I think they will come
away with the same impression that they had when this happened and that is it’s really a strong
institution and we’re stronger than we were in so many, many ways and so we’ll – I just want to
encourage all of you to participate in any way you feel appropriate. I know there are many
things I do on a daily basis but I’m pretty much focused on a daily basis on that event; on all of
us – all of our students, the victims, the parents and I know all of you are too. So, questions?

J. Stephen: At the memorial we had at the Convocation Center there was a need for a great
number of faculty volunteers and such. Who should somebody contact if they want to help?

President Peters: Brian, the question – did you hear the question?

B. Hemphill: Any requests for volunteers or if you’re interested in volunteering you can contact
Angela Dreessen in Student Involvement and Leadership. Angela Dreessen. She’s director of
that office.

J. Stephen: Thank you and President Peters I continue after a year from colleagues and friends
both in DeKalb and across the country about how impressed they were with the face that you in
particular put on NIU in this tragedy and additionally the tremendous presence of Chief Grady
and how impressed they were with you for representing us.

President Peters: He’s scarier than I am. I appreciate that but Chief Grady and I are
insignificant compared to the courage ---

J. Stephen: But you were the public face certainly.

R. Alden: Virginia Tech is sending a delegation here. They don’t want to be highlighted or
recognized. We went to their memorial with that sort of support but if you do see them, they’ve
been a tremendous help for us from day one, advising our counterparts here so if you happen to
run into somebody that you recognize as being from Virginia Tech, you may want to say thank
you.

President Peters: The other thing is and I don’t want to belabor this but as we move closer to
this, particularly those who were involved, if you’re having issues dealing with this, we have and
this is to be expected, it happened at Virginia Tech, you begin to relive those horrible moments.
We’ve got help right Brian and they could contact – there she is. Contact her. All right?

B. Hemphill: We encourage of course all faculty and staff to contact Deb Haliczer but then with
all students we’re working with them through Counseling and Student Development Center so
either of those two areas, faculty and staff or students within our Center.

J. Stephen: Is it anticipated that there will probably be an uptake in anxiety ---

B. Hemphill: We’re already seeing it. It’s playing out in multiple ways.
President Peters: Yeah so I guess one of the reasons for my announcement is to get everybody to refocus - not that I have to, but to be sensitive in classrooms, be observant, help each other like we did and as we have been and will continue but as we move closer to that date, we’ve been told to see, and we’ve been experiencing, some anxieties. So, you know, if you’re in the classrooms professors, got to keep your eye out for that or if you need some help dealing with this, we’ve got resources to do it.

B. Hemphill: Deb just reminded me to mention one thing. We will have somewhere in the neighborhood, visitors on campus in terms of clinicians as well as our staff and some of our faculty, that will be working with us – it’s actually a total number of 68 that will be with us on campus that day in terms of total clinicians and you will be able to identify them. We’re making sure they’re be able to be identified.

President Peters: In addition to our normal personnel?

B. Hemphill: Yes.

President Peters: Okay, all right, enough said. Good. Let’s do Council business.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda as we had added D, the walk-in on the calendar? All right, there’s a motion. Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay.

A. MyNIU attendance reporting requirement – refer to Academic Policy Committee


C. Clarifying college role in approving sabbatical leaves – refer to Rules and Governance

D. Adjustments to the Academic Calendar – memo from Earl Seaver – refer to University Affairs – walk-in

Stephen made the motion; Ridnour was second. The motion passed.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: Now let’s hear reports. Earl you have a report and there’s a written walk-in.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – walk-in

E. Hansen: Well, I spent a lovely day driving down to Olney, Illinois and then back the next day for a meeting at Olney Central College with the Illinois Board of Higher Education faculty
representative group. The basic issue there and I’m not going to go through this two-page memorandum with you. I’ll save you the dignity of being able to throw it away without looking at it or whatever you’re going to do with it but the reality of it is it’s still the budget issue and it just comes out and everybody listens to the same radio station, WIFM, and as John mentioned here earlier, what’s in it for me. That’s basically the group as a whole as they come in from community colleges, they come in from private institutions, they come in from small colleges and then they come in from the state universities and they have their issues and it’s no different than what’s probably happening at the Board of Higher Education and the budget that was presented yesterday. We did not have privy to the budget so as you read this thing you’ll see there’s a lot of questions as to what’s going on. They didn’t have an answer for it and I don’t want that to confuse you, it’s just that the FAC had no idea what was in the budget. I think things of interest are basically there’s a new Deputy Director of Academic Affairs and Student Success on the Board and that’s Dianne Bazell who came over from Kentucky. The other thing is basically the shortfall in the budget and how it’s going to effect everybody and everybody that’s there is wondering how it’s going to effect them. The other issue that we don’t seem to get into much is because we’re not a two-year institution is the issue among community colleges as it relates to being able to have academic credit offered. An example might be that a high school student takes a college credit course taught at their high school by the same instructor that would teach that at a local community college but the community college doesn’t accept it simply because the community college didn’t get tuition for it. I mean that’s my take on it. I’m not saying that that’s the way it goes but basically it’s a profit center mentality yet the kid has taken a course whether it be English, math or whatever and had he taken it at the community college, he could have gotten the college credit for it and that’s a basic issue that they’re trying to iron out. It’s something we don’t see because we don’t deal with it here at the institution but I found it interesting that that was a major, major topic among the community college people there.

Other than that, there’s not much on there. I gave you a web site on the second bullet on the second page that’s basically our web site for the Faculty Advisory Committee if you want to go on there and look at items. They’re still trying to download white papers and other items on there of things that have happened in the past and it’s an informational page for you if you want to spend your time going through it. That’s all I’ve got unless anybody has a specific question for anything, I’d be glad to take it or you want to e-mail me and I’ll get back to you with whatever response I can.

President Peters: Okay. Earl I hope you’re not mad at us for talking you into doing this.

E. Hansen: It was a weak moment. There are those in here who know what that means. We’ll go from there.

President Peters: We appreciate it. There are no questions. We move on down to Paul Stoddard.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report
C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report (Page 3)

P. Stoddard: The Board met on December 4. The only report they heard was from the Legislative Committee as the other two committees had not met. Most of that material has been gone over already by Jay last month. A couple of things of note, the Higher Education Act Reauthorization has come through and there are some things in there that may have some impact on faculty. It cover costs, accreditation, financial aid, disclosure and compliance issues, future development, and international education and so if you think you might be involved in anything that that touches on, I strongly recommend you take a look at an analysis of that Act as it pertains to those issues that’s available on the University Council and Faculty Senate web sites. Also of interest to faculty especially will be the text book cost containment requirements that are part of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. This is the legislation that is going to require, or not require, but strongly suggest to the extent practicable that the information about textbooks be available with the course schedules. That when students go to sign up for their courses for the upcoming semester, they can see what textbooks will be offered or required rather and get a sense of how much those books are going to cost them. Again, the details of how that is going to be enacted here at NIU haven’t been worked out yet, exactly what that’s going to entail and so forth.

The other issue I have a correction to the written report. True North on B under other items, True North has actually raised $138,000,000 towards its $150,000,000 goal, not just $130,000,000 so they’re actually doing okay especially considering the economic times we’re in. In tough times people don’t have the same amount of money to donate so they’re actually doing quite a good job. That’s all I have.

President Peters: Any questions for Paul on BOT?

P. Henry: Actually this is for something for Earl but I think the FAC would also be a good place to find out what is going on with this textbook pricing thing so we can sort of get some sense of across the state of what people are doing that might be useful.

President Peters: This textbook thing is not going to go away. It’s cropping up in federal legislation, state legislation, the new president is tracking on it.

G. Seaver: Just one clarification. It is required by federal law to the extent possible that the student, when they go in to register for classes, must see the textbook or the ISBN # for the class so it will be required and goes into effect for registration in fall 2010. It’s effective in July so it’s actually mandatory and we’re working through the process of how it will be done mechanically but also as to how it will relate to when faculty will let us know what textbooks are going to be used so that when the student starts, for instance, registering for summer and fall at the beginning
of April, you will have had to have entered the textbook into the scheduling system prior to that time. Those who remember filling out the textbook request, we don’t require them that soon now. So – Paul knows we’ve had one initial meeting. We know we have the technology to do it. What we’re really looking at now is how we’re doing to do it from the faculty perspective of asking faculty to make decisions much earlier as it relates to the scheduling of the classes but it a federal mandate, effective July 1, 2010. We have no choice.

P. Henry: Can there be some flexibility if something comes out and you need to add a new textbook or something?

G. Seaver: What’s the wording Paul?

P. Stoddard: To the extent practical.

P. Henry: So there’s a little wiggle room.

P. Stoddard: That’s why I said strongly suggested rather than absolutely mandated but I mean, yeah, it is a mandate in law but there is that wiggle room, a little bit.

President Peters: To those of us who make a living with words, those are – you can drive a truck through that.

J. Stephen: As a practical matter, we note that they ask us for information about previous editions and cost and all of that. You might note that the wording of the note puts the onus of providing that on the publisher, not on us so essentially if we can just give the ISB # is should be a direct link to all of this stuff at Prentice Hall or whoever. We don’t have to keep track of that junk at least.

President Peters: All right? Let’s see, Rules and Governance Committee, David? Academic Policy, I didn’t want to bypass William Baker who has a short report.

F. Academic Policy Committee – William Baker, Chair – report

W. Baker: The Academic Policy Committee has been asked to look into the question of student evaluations for on-line courses. I’d very much like to acknowledge the ongoing work of the committee. Secondly, a meeting was held on the 14th of November at which representatives from the university-wide constituencies worked to attend and that was very vigorous. There is now vigorous on-line debate and discussions and essentially the issue is to truncate. The committee in discussion is very concerned that the decisions to use evaluative tools be left to the discretion of departments. That’s where we are at the moment. We’ve still got some feedback to come and I think the Provost maybe has something to say about that and subsequently I hope not before too long, we will be giving you a detailed written report. Thank you.

President Peters: Okay, great. Questions?
R. Alden: Just to put this in a little bit of context, this came from – really there’s two different issues. One the on-line student evaluation of all courses and the other the student evaluation of on-line courses so it’s kind of two separate issues and both have kind of converged on the UCPC from different starting points. The issue of evaluation of on-line courses arose out of constant requests that the Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center was getting from faculty who were either offering hybrid or on-line courses that maybe the student evaluations weren’t really reflecting the full range of issues that an on-line course would entail and our assessment panel also recognized that as an issue that, you know, maybe there should be some sort of commonality just for a level playing field of some questions that are unique to on-line courses and so that was the charge to the committee was to see whether some set of unique questions that should be considered in student evaluations just so that faculty who are teaching that and the students who are taking that are having the full benefit of the formative aspects of the student evaluations. So that was one thing and those two groups got together and put together a set of draft issues as a starting point but definitely not an ending point. There was no attempt to try and say that that would take away the ability of any department from adding to it or changing it; it was just a starting point. I think the other issue is we are, I think most of the colleges, are acquiring software that will permit more on-line interactions including student evaluations being done on-line instead of taking up class time which would give a lot more opportunity for thoughtful student evaluations. So that was the second component. Our College of Education is actually doing pioneering work in that and the other colleges are kind of watching and seeing how that works out. Again, it wasn’t the content of the questions so much as just having the surveys available on-line and secure – these are highly secured surveys – so ??? is protected and yet students can’t access more than one time for a course so it has both concerns addressed as part of the software. I think the only other related question is if we’re going to start having on-line student evaluations, should there be a few common questions that we build in to the template so that if somebody comes up for tenure/promotion or merit appeals to the UCPC and it’s based on how well they teach, at least apples and oranges are not always there for every department but there is some commonality of some kind of big picture questions about the effectiveness of instruction. Again, there was no attempt to try and say that departments had to all do this or had no right to add to it. It was simply just trying to get a little bit of a level playing field when these kind of college level, university level comparisons are made. So I think there were two separate issues. Both had on-line in the title; both had student evaluations in the title but they were somewhat different.

W. Baker: May I ask then, what exactly do you wish the committee to actually discuss?

R. Alden: I believe the discussion should be are there some questions that should be on student evaluations for courses that are either mostly or entirely on line to supplement what is kind of standard questions that other courses have in the student evaluations, just so that every department doesn’t have to invent their own, not that they can’t modify it or adopt it for their own needs but are there certain issues that need to be addressed that maybe are not being addressed because that was the question that we’re getting up through the grapevine that I’m not sure anybody is focusing on so that that issue. The other issue is as colleges adopt, if they do adopt, on-line evaluations, student evaluations of all courses, should there be some commonality in a question or two so that in case the question of comparing records at the university level comes up we’ll at least have some commonality and don’t have to try and interpret different
numbers meaning different things for different colleges and different departments. So that was the only question and I’m not sure that links to the whole issue of going on-line. I think the on-line issue is for expediency to not occupy a course section or a class section and so I don’t thin those two questions about whether it should be on-line and whether there some common question about teaching effectiveness are intimately linked. It was just by convenience they got put together when it was discussed by various groups such as the Deans Council.

W. Baker: Thank you.

President Peters: Okay. We have a question over here or a comment.

B. Jaffee: I don’t know if it’s appropriate to ask questions and I’ve heard this charge before and I’m just listening to you now wondering if you could say something about under what kinds of circumstances this need to compare faculty across campus might come up.

R. Alden: When there’s an appeal to the UCPC level because there was let’s say a negative vote, either on merit, tenure, promotion issues and there’s a hearing that someone presents a case where they say that they were given an unfair evaluation of, let’s say, their teaching record and one of the things they are basing that on is that their teaching record to equivalent to other people in other units that were doing well in teaching and they didn’t get tenure, they didn’t get promoted whatever. Each unit kind of defines its own definition of scholarly activity but teaching has a little bit more in common but there’s no common set of questions so I just thought it would be useful for a discussion to have at least a few that could answer that question. Again, I’m not seeing this as a hill to die for it’s a way to give a level playing field to those people who come up for appeal. Again, it’s not trying to take away anything from the discipline adding whatever or having the majority based on what they consider to be effective teaching. That wasn’t the point of this.

Becky ???: I just had an announcement for after this discussion.

President Peters: Okay. We’re still on the charge to the committee. Have we exhausted that? Okay, so William you know what you’re going to do now.

W. Baker: Hopefully.

President Peters: Okay, now for the announcement. Let me just – you know, I haven’t been involved in this but further back in my career, I was fundamentally involved in this issue in the 70’s and the 80’s when most universities addressed it and my bottom line thought on at university’s I’ve been involved in and I did some consulting is that there is usually a common set of questions across all faculty. Maybe it’s by college but sometimes it’s universal, some things that can be agreed upon to do exactly this and the other observation is that evaluating one’s artistry or creative research is difficult but it is much easier than evaluating someone’s teaching portfolio or instructional repertoire because you can – the scientists calibrate it, the arts – I won’t talk about the arts – but, you know, you can calibrate journals, you can rate journals but what usually happens when a faculty member’s tenure rests on largely their instructional contribution, a key ingredient in that is peer and other evaluation of their teaching and usually the local
knowledge is strong – well, of course, everyone knows that Jane Doe is a great teacher but you need something more than that. You need to validate it both within and in some places outside the university and so William I’d throw that into the mix too but again, I haven’t involved in that here but usually – this has been debated at universities in the 80’s an awful lot. Okay? Good. My two cents. Now your note.

**Becky ???**: All right, it’s real quick. The Elections Committee has a meeting tomorrow at 11:00am to count ballots in 103 Altgeld so please come.


G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Linda Dersheid, Chair – no report

H. Rules and Governance Committee – David Wade, Chair – report – First Reading – walk-in

**D. Wade**: If you remember last semester, an item was referred to us via the consent agenda from the UCPC. After some discussion, it appears as though there was a concern. This was a really telling narrow application. It’s dealing with situations in which there’s multiple sabbatical requests from the same department, so keeping it in context. There was some concern that there should be an explicit consideration of resources in addition to the merit of each request when they’re ranking and approving them, specifically toward student services and the cutting of sections to accommodate the absence of multiple faculty members from the same department. They offered some language for us to consider which we did. We made some small changes, inserted it in the appropriate place. It stands before you as a recommended bylaw change for first reading.

**President Peters**: All right, so there it is and we’re open for questions.

**J. Stephen**: A comment on this David. Second line from the bottom when you talk about you added it it says “then cannot be funded and that cannot be reasonably funded”.

**D. Wagner**: Okay, where is – I’m sorry, where is it?

**J. Stephen**: Second line from the bottom leading word on the first bold-faced paragraph.

**D. Wagner**: Oh, don’t worry about the top one. It’s just the suggested language.

**J. Stephen**: Yeah, I know but you’re retentive about your language so ---

**D. Wagner**: That’s true, I am.

**President Peters**: ??? This is first reading so comments or directives to the committee are in order.

**D. Wagner**: Any you may have please forward to me or phone calls, whichever.
President Peters: All right, very good. Are we done? Oh, new business.

I. University Affairs Committee – Linda Sons, Chair – no report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Rebecca Butler, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Is there any unfinished business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: All right, new business, Paul?

A. Executive Secretary of University Council and President of Faculty Senate – Eligibility List (Page 4)

P. Stoddard: As the Star almost reported last week, I’m term limited so this is my last semester. I’m not actually resigning, my term is expiring. So I’m not going to be eligible to do this again next fall which means we need to find somebody else. That person needs to be a current member of the Council and a returning member of the Council. There are several people who are up for election at the moment. We’ll find out tomorrow at 11:00 perhaps – well, we might – if they don’t get elected in the first round. Anyway, but those people who are eligible who might be re-elected you still might want to consider whether or not they would make good Executive Secretary of the University Council. The list of people who are eligible are on page 4 of your packet. The ones with asterisks are the people who need to be re-elected before they are eligible. If you’re interested or if you have somebody who you think might be good at this, nominations will be taken in the Faculty Senate in their March meeting and then the Senate will forward one name as a result of their deliberations in the April meeting. That name will come here in the late April or early May meeting and this body will officially approve presumably that nomination. So anyway, if you have any questions about what the job entails, I’ll be happy to tell you about all the good points and like what they told me and I encourage you to consider it especially if you’re one of the people who tends to speak up in here a lot. So, that’s all I have to say.

President Peters: Okay. You don’t get to appoint your successor. Mixed opportunity. All right. Is there any other new business to come before the house?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Comments or questions from the floor? Yes?

L. Sons: I’m wondering what is happening with our applications for admission that will come up in the fall, particularly applications for scholarships and the like, like our major scholarship awards? We must know something about what those numbers are.
President Peters: We have the expert here.

G. Seaver: I don’t have the exact numbers but applications for freshman are up although nationally that’s a trend that running – nationally we are seeing that those numbers are not as predictable as they were in the fall. So we’re still in the process. Right now working very hard with the colleges as to how we will convert or admit to confirm or admit to enroll numbers. Those are numbers that we’re focusing on now. We are very close to having the number of applications that we would typically need to make the freshman class ???. We’re still early in the transfer process so it’s too early to talk about transfers for fall. As far as our scholarships, those are being awarded. We do have actually a new scholarship program that we’re using this semester that have put money in the hands of our admission counselors so that if they’re talking to a family or talking to a person who is trying to decide between one or two institutions that if another $500 or $100 or $1500 or $2000 will make the difference will work. We found out about a young person who was between us and a private and our counselor said if we can offer you this scholarship – a very good student, very good ACT, very high class rank, very desirable high school – the admission counselor said if we can give you X amount of dollars, how’s that work. She said done; I’m coming. So we’re translating and using their information that way. I don’t have the specific information of who ?? but the awarding is going well on those and there are some centennial scholarships that we’ve leveraged off of Pepsi money as well. So things are moving along just fine in terms of getting the number of applications. We have an open house on the 16th of February. That is the day which we are marketing towards students who have already been admitted. The colleges have added a significant number of activities for early in the afternoon afterwards where we are reaching out to the students admitted and saying please come to campus even though you’ve been here before because now you’ll be able to then go over to this college or that department to be able to talk about why you’re coming so everything right now is on what we call converting yield in terms of those students who have been admitted. We’d like to get as many of those students to get out here and to try to get them to be convinced that’s why they come to Northern so that’s the primary thing we’re working on. We’re focusing down towards the end of the admission cycle for applications for freshmen because they tend to fall off. Now the focus is the confirmation date of May 1 is to convert those field ?? to as high as we can possibly go and the colleges – we’ve met with the deans on three different occasions and we are meeting with the colleges – in fact we have a meeting Friday with the College of Business for two hours to work with them about additional things they could be doing to focus on yield.

Professor Sons has in her mathematical precise way has I think linked two things together. One is our enrollment and the other is the financial ability of students to come I think. That’s the key variable here, across the country.

G. Seaver: Yeah, a number of you heard about the Huskie Advantage which is a new program that we are using that addresses the issue of financial need. Any student, new freshman, who is Pell eligible – that’s about 29% of our incoming freshman class – the President mentioned that we have a large number of those. Any student who is Pell eligible as a freshman, we will guarantee that their tuition will be paid for their freshman year by making up a combination of their gift aid so that’s MAP, Pell, their federal aid – we will make up the difference with scholarship funds so that any student Pell eligible will be guaranteed to have their tuition covered
for their freshman year. The freshman year is the year where they receive the smallest amount of federal aid that they’re going to get. If they move on past 30 hours then the aid goes up. Same thing beyond 60. We’ve received a great deal of attention on that from the high school counselors. We’ve been marketing that a lot, some of you’ve seen it in the newspapers. It was one of the lead interviews in the Chronicle of Higher Ed about three weeks ago in terms of the kind of things we’re trying to do to reach out to particularly those students who we think are just saying they can’t afford to come to a four-year institution and either are not going on – about 11% of the students who we admit do not ever attend – did not last year attend any kind of institution. That’s up about 3% from the year before and then also the increasing number of students which is about 3 or 4% that decided to go to a two-year institution so there are about 3 to 4% more of them this last fall than the one pervious so – those are students who because of the financial aspects that we’re trying to help those students to get them here at Northern and start a four-year experience rather than do a two-year.

President Peters: Buck?

J. Stephen: It wouldn’t be a UC meeting without a complaint about MyNIU.

G. Seaver: It’s not MyNIU.

J. Stephen: Okay, when I use the faculty service interaction part I cannot attach files to basically an e-mail – what do you call it – interface. I think that’s kind of silly that what I do is e-mail myself with all those addresses and then I upload from a different account and mail them. Any particular reason why we cannot attach files on MyNIU.

G. Seaver: I can check into that. I really don’t know. I used it this last fall when I taught a class but I wasn’t sending attachments. I did it through Blackboard but I’ll check into it. I really – that’s a feature – now you’re getting ??? that much knowledge that I have of the technology of it.

President Peters: But one thing is true you know and I’m so appreciative of the deans and the faculty and the departments getting involved because the recruitment of undergraduates has dramatically changed very quickly and, you remember, it used to be the view book, where you’d send nice pictures of the bushes and scenes – it’s called social networking. I suppose we have to take a page out of President Obama’s book and I know we were doing some things along that line that are very exciting.

G. Seaver: Yes, we have a Facebook page. I hate to admit my daughter showed me a Facebook page over the holidays but we actually have a Facebook page that we’ve established as an institution for the incoming class of 2013 that we’re monitoring almost hourly and we’re watching how these students are interacting to each other and developing enthusiasm about coming to Northern. I was relating to Brian it’s been interesting to watch how their decisions – they’re starting to make connections about being roommates with some being fearful of not knowing who their roommate would be so we have a Facebook page that we started and we got a very good response to that. That’s something that we’re monitoring very, very closely so that we can turn it off if it ends up being a nightmare. On Facebook there are a lot of people who don’t
do anything but Facebook but there are a number of things – we meet regularly with the
President. These students want to communicate electronically. They don’t want to get lots of
letters although we do do postcards but we communicate a lot electronically with all prospects
and many of you provide us with content so that – if we can identify let’s say mathematics
majors that are interested we can communicate just to them what’s going on in the Department of
Mathematics. So these students want to communicate in a much different way than what we’re
used to in the very recent future.

President Peters: So My NIU better work.

G. Seaver: MyNIU does work.

President Peters: Okay.

J. Stephen: For you Gip, when Live Journal was more common, we had an NIU web page of
Live Journal and there would be threats and I would jump in there every once in a while when it
was appropriate because students misunderstood university regulation or they didn’t know how
to get advice and I think if we’re going to have an NIU page there, if it gets serious, you might
want to have somebody form the AAC look in occasionally to make sure that students aren’t
giving each other bad advice.

G. Seaver: I’m sorry, which network?

J. Stephen: The ACC take a look at the Facebook page to see if students are going off on the
wrong track.

G. Seaver: Our Facebook page that we established? I have somebody that monitors that all day
long.

J. Stephen: Okay, and they’re familiar with advising?

G. Seaver: They’re very familiar with university procedures. They’re also very familiar with
Facebook but we already have somebody who’s watching it off and on – it’s actually two people
who are watching it off and on all day so that we can watch the threads and we can take off
things people are posting if we don’t like it. We also can interject to get people to where they
need to be so we’re monitoring it very, very closely.

J. Stephen: Great.

President Peters: All right. Are we adjourned?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 P.M.