FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2009. 3:00 P.M.  
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I want to welcome you all to the final Faculty Senate meeting of 2009. Who said yeah? You don’t like coming?

The meeting was called to order at 3:08pm.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, our first order of business is adoption of the agenda. The agenda does not have any changes, however, there are four walk-in items that are noted as reports under the Reports from Advisory Committees so those are your walk-in items but does not require a change in the agenda so I’ll entertain a motion to accept the agenda. Earl? Thank you. Second? Good. Any discussion? All in favor say aye. Any opposition? The agenda is accepted as written.

Hansen made the motion; Novak was second. The agenda was adopted as written

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 28, 2009 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next, approval of the minutes. I’ll again entertain a motion to approve the minutes. So moved, okay. Second? Earl, okay. Any changes, corrections, comments on the minutes? There are some mistakes. I put them in there purposely to see if people are reading them so has anybody found them? No. No discussion. All in favor of approving the minutes? Good. Any opposition? Okay, the minutes are approved.
Thompson made the motion; Hansen was second. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: We have mostly reports on the Board of Trustees meeting today. We do have a couple of points. First, Deb Haliczer has asked me to thank you all regarding your conscientious response to Ethics Training. We all know how important Ethics Training is and we know what good role models we have in the state regarding following the ethics so thank you all for doing that on behalf of Deb. There are apparently still some scofflaws at the university so if you have a department meeting, you might want to remind them that it is state law; they have to do the Ethics Training. When’s the deadline for that? Is it passed?

D. Haliczer: 7:00 p.m. tonight.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so much for discussing that with your department. 7:00 p.m. tonight is the deadline.

The second item, Jam Rintala has asked for a moment to make an announcement regarding the performance of our student athletes and so Jan, if you would like to make your announcement.

J. Rintala: As part of the academic reform legislation that’s gone on with the NCAA in the last several years, each year we collect graduation rate data and they do all kinds of great data manipulation on it. The report was released just today, this afternoon, and when we look at the federal graduation rates of our student athletes and again, the federal graduation rate looks at students who entered the institution as freshmen and six years later did they successfully graduate from this institution. The 2002-03 entrance class NIU students – at large graduated at 51% rate. NIU student athletes in that entering class graduated at a 70% rate so 19% above the graduation rate of the NIU students as a whole. When they calculate a 4-year average to sort of take care of some anomalies, again, NIU students at a 51% and student athletes at 66% so still 15% above (student athletes as a whole). When we break down the comparisons by gender, again student athletes are graduating at a higher rate than their comparative groups; all males at 49%, male student athletes at 64% so they’re 15% up and for students it’s a 53% to a 76% so female athletes 23% above the student athletes as a whole.

When we compare them with national date, all Division I institutions, all student athletes graduate at 64% rate nationwide; ours are at 66% so 2% over the national average. The NCAA also calculates something called a graduation success rate. Now the federal rate as many people looking at graduate rate data note, transfer students are not accounted for reasonably in that. If a student starts with you and leaves to go somewhere else even though they’re in great academic standing, they count against your graduation rate. On the other hand, if someone transfers in and they successfully complete a degree here, they do not count as a success story for us so the federal rate is kind of interesting in that way. So the NCAA has developed a new matrix that they call the “Graduation Success Rate” which takes account for those that if student athletes leave you although they’re in good academic standing, they’re not counted in the Graduation Success Rate and if students come in to you and then you manage to help them get successfully through, then they count toward your success rate so it’s a matter of what are you doing with
those that you’re actually responsible for at that time. When we look at all student athletes at Division I level, the graduation success rate is 79% and at NIU it’s 82% so on that index as well we’re above the national average. The same thing happens with males and females as independent groups and as a notion to talk about a success story, our female athletes at NIU have a graduation success rate of 94%. So I think rather significant and our men are at 88% by the time we account for what happens with transfers. As we look at our student athletes over time, in our program overall, we see an increase in both the federal rate and the graduate success rate over time so we’re even doing a better job over the years with our student athletes so I think that’s some tremendous success stories and I wanted to share those with you. So thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Thanks very much. I think also you may have heard this announced as well that our student athletes have achieved a 3.0 GPA for eight straight semesters.


A. Rosenbaum: And that we have the best student athlete GPA in the MAC Conference and there’s more to that and faculty should be very proud of student athletes and the face that our Athletic Department does a good job of actually educating our student athletes and not just using them as entertainment for students. Kudos to them and I think we should give them a round of applause for that.

J. Rintala: And a round of applause to you.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you Jan.

If I may, as part of my announcements today, talk to you a little bit about a meeting I attended in Normal. There is a group called the “Council of Illinois University Senates” and this group meetings really only twice a year; it’s supposed to be twice a year. That may increase and I attended this meeting for the first time, I think it was last week. It was a very interesting meeting because it gives us a chance to see what’s going on at other universities and what kinds of issues they’re dealing with as compared to the kinds of issues we’re dealing with at NIU and one of the things that was apparent to me is that things are considerably worse at many other universities both regarding the relationship to the administration and regarding the financial situation that they’re dealing with. One of the main concerns that was raised at other universities was the concern about the possibility of furloughs and layoffs and so many of my colleagues at this meeting were talking about how their Senate is approaching this and how they’re trying to prepare for what their response will be should the university engage in some type of a furlough or layoff program that affects faculty. One of the things that I think was positive is that apparently if a university takes stimulus money, which we have, then that affects their ability to do furloughs because that amounts to a reduction in salary and apparently there’s something in the stimulus money bill that prevents that from happening so many of them felt that this was not an immediate problem but that going forward, this could be a problem upcoming beginning in the next fiscal year. At the University of Illinois, the representative mentioned to us that they have written the reappointment letters to permit furloughing of faculty members so this is something that was done because they realized that they could not do furloughs until they had rewritten those letters and that has now been done. This has not been done at NIU according to
Deb Haliczer who I was just speaking with and Deb also tells me that President Peters is resisting the idea of including that in reappointment letters so our President is trying to avoid furlough programs to the extent that he can and so we should be grateful for that and that is somewhat different from what’s going on at other universities around the state.

One of the things that happened at this meeting which I felt was very important was that the various representatives, the Faculty Senate Presidents and Chairs from the different universities were pretty much in accord that there is a crisis with the state’s funding of higher education and, for the first time, the group was talking about the idea that perhaps if we all spoke with one voice, that we could be a strong lobbying force for higher education. There was pretty much general concern that the IBHE is not doing the job for us; that they do not represent the interests of faculty at the state level and that, in fact, many of them are somewhat disparaging with regards to faculty roles. We have seen this in years past with respect to their emphasis on productivity and the need for our FAC for example to educate the IBHE regarding the amount of work faculty do that is outside of the classroom. So this has been an ongoing battle from my understanding for a long time. Given the concern that was expressed by my colleagues at this meeting regarding the role that the IBHE played, it was thought that perhaps the Council of Illinois University Senates could unite and serve as a lobbying agent in the way that IBHE perhaps has not and so what we did at this first meeting was to elect a chair and to develop a plan that will involve soliciting the attention of some of the legislators to see if we can get an idea of how we might be able to play a role in helping the state make decisions around funding of higher education, of public institutions. So anyone have a comment about this or a thought? Earl?

E. Hansen: I think it’s a wonderful idea that the ---

A. Rosenbaum: We need a mike Earl.

E. Hansen: I’m sorry. That’s the first time I’ve been told I don’t speak loud enough. I think it’s a very good idea from what I see in the IBHE/FAC meetings and we had a legislator talk to us and I’ll get into that later on with my report but there’s definitely a need for as many lobbying groups that are positive for higher education as possible with the state legislature.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thanks. Any other comments? Yes?

P. Henry: Who’s the chair?

A. Rosenbaum: The person that was elected chair is named Dan Holland he is at Illinois State University. Illinois State actually has done a really good job of keeping this group alive. Apparently, they are the ones that organize the meetings, contact everybody, try to keep abreast of who the current Faculty Senate President or Chair is at the various institutions, host the meetings and – so, they’ve kept the group alive and so he was a natural candidate for this position. It was very interesting that at this meeting, I thought I would be one of the few first year Senate presidents at the meeting. It turned out that all except one was a first year Senate president or chair and so we were all a bunch of novices and Dan was actually the only one who had been doing this for a period of time and so we sort of thought well, you’ve got more experience than the rest of us and you’ve done a lot of work in keeping this organize going and
so he was a natural choice for that position. But encouraging – what was encouraging about this is the idea that when you think about the number of people that are represented by the Faculty Senates, all of the public universities in Illinois, it’s a fairly large group and one of the sentiments expressed at the meeting was that legislators seem to respond well to very large groups. They don’t always respond as well to an individual who is not happy but when you get, you know, a bunch of individuals who are not happy, it gets their attention and so an organization as, I would say, as imposing as the Council of the Senate from the state of Illinois, from the public institutions in Illinois, I think might be able to get their ear in ways that individuals may not be able to. So we’ll find out if that’s the case. Yes, Bill?

**W. Baker:** Could you clarify for us which state universities in fact have been operating furloughs so far to date?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I don’t know which ones have actually been having – I don’t know if any have had furloughs. What I’m talking about is that the University of Illinois has put furlough language in the reappointment letters but they have not done anything to, you know, enact furloughs so I’m not aware of any universities – there were certainly none at this meeting – where they are actually furloughing faculty members or laying off faculty members.

**W. Baker:** Do you know the nature of the furlough language?

**A. Rosenbaum:** In those contracts? I do not.

**W. Baker:** Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Deb, do you know? Deb Haliczer says it’s posted on the U of I website. Okay. And again, so that we don’t get ahead of ourselves, people are not being furloughed. The discussion was concern that this might be something that may be forthcoming given the anticipated financial problems that the universities are having. One of the points, for example, in support of this was as you all know and many of you have learned the hard way, the state is not paying its bills. So they’re not paying your dental bills, they’re not paying your medical bills. Many of us are getting letters from doctors and dentists saying you need to pay up front because your insurance company isn’t doing the job. Well, that’s only the tip of the iceberg. Apparently, the state is not paying some of its payments to the universities so when the university gets support from the state; they actually have to send that money along. You have to do more than just approve it. You actually have to send the cash so a number of universities were complaining that the state is in arrears, seriously in arrears, in terms of sending the money to the state universities that they need in order to meet their payrolls and some universities are a lot closer to the bone than we are so our administrators have apparently done a very good job of keeping us in a situation where we’re not living from, you know, week-to-week in terms of money coming in from the state but some of the universities in the state are not as lucky as we are and in those situations, they’re wondering what’s going to happen if they don’t get the payments from the state in a reasonably timely fashion. So, we see this coming out in the newspapers, in, you know, various reports from different organizations. The state, as you know, is in a very poor financial situation right now so they are concerned about what this might lead to.
W. Baker: May I please beg your indulgence. One more brief question.

A. Rosenbaum: I’m sorry?

W. Baker: May I beg peoples’ indulgence and ask a follow-up question which is simply is this one of the reasons why none of us apparently have received reappointment letters to date?

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t know the answer to that but perhaps Deb – do you have an answer to that? You need a mike. Maybe you haven’t been reappointed Bill.

W. Baker: Thank you. I knew you’d say that! You’re a bit obvious.

D. Haliczer: I’ll look into that. I’m not sure why no one’s received reappointment letters but I don’t believe it has anything to do with the thought of furlough language but I’ll get back to you all.

W. Baker: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, Brigid?

B. Lusk: Brigid Lusk, Nursing/Health Studies. Just as a point of interest sort of thing, although we haven’t had any threat of furloughs, all the people who get vacation time are being mandated to take 3 days vacation over the Christmas break and for those of our colleagues who are in civil service and for some of those who have just started, this is a considerable financial hardship because they’re getting 3 days actually without pay because they don’t at this time have 3 days vacation so there are folk around who may be not very well paid to start with and are losing 3 days of pay over Christmas so I think we should be aware of that as faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, just to – you’re correct about the 3 day furlough but there are a couple of points that need to be sort of brought up with this. Number one, the administration checked with the presidents of all three councils before enacting this and that includes the Operating Staff and SPS Councils, all of whom feel that their constituencies are very happy about the 3 day furlough with some minor exceptions. Secondly, the concern that you expressed has been addressed in that I believe that anybody who does not have sufficient vacation time, will continue to get paid and the vacation will be taken out as they accrue it so they will not be without pay for those days but they will, in fact, be sort of advanced vacation time which will then come out of their subsequent earnings. It’s still possible that people would not be thrilled about that because it means you’re being forced to use vacation time when you might not want to use it and then you’re going to accrue 2 or 3 or however many days less the upcoming year but this was addressed by the administration and they did, in fact, check with us before enacting this and I believe, whether it’s true or not, they did say that if any of the councils were opposed to it, they would not go forward with it. So – and I’ve since checked with both Bobbie and Jay and I think they seem to feel – it doesn’t effect faculty to the same extent except for those faculty on 12-month contracts and there are some of those, but it certainly does effect operating staff and supportive professional staff and they’ve told me that the response is very positive, not negative. Is that fair enough? Okay, but we certainly are keeping an eye on those kinds of things and if
there was opposition to it, we certainly would have stood up for – okay. Any other questions about that or anything else? Okay.

The last item is that, you know, as I said earlier, you know this, this is our last meeting of 2009. Going forward in to the spring semester, I would like to ask each of you to meet with your departments, your constituency and discuss with them what they think the Senate should be doing and whether or not they have any issues that are of concern to them and I would appreciate it if folks would do this and then send along to me the concerns and issues that the various departments would like to have us deal with and if you could give that to me prior to January 7 so I can bring this with me to the first Executive Committee meeting of the year, it will help us begin to develop an agenda that is coming from within our constituency as opposed to the agenda that is coming to us completely from the administration. So we still are certainly willing to deal with whatever issues the administration asks our guidance on, but it certainly is reasonable for us to think about what we might want to bring to the administration and if there is unrest among our constituencies, I would like to know about that so we can think about what issues we want to either give to our committees or tackle head-on during the spring semester. So if you would please do that I’d appreciate it.

Okay. I think that’s it.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: The next items of business are the reports from the advisory committees.

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

A. Rosenbaum: The first advisory committee is the FAC to the IBHE and we have Earl’s report which is one of the walk-in items. Earl?

E. Hansen: Thank you. You have a page and a half or a two-page summarization of what went on in our meeting and to highlight it for you the first maybe 4 or 5 lines might interest you where the summary of a higher education “report card” issued by the Illinois Policy Institute – I don’t know who they are – had a recent seminar with some 40 participants, including the member of the legislature. Illinois was awarded a higher education grade of “F” in many, many categories and I don’t know if you have a copy of that report or not. If you want a copy of it I’ll be glad to get it for you. The Faculty Advisory Committee in its normal, reactionary phrase called it a “hack job” and a few other things but you have to look at it and see where they’re actually evaluating us. The Assistant Director of External Relations gave a report on recent Board activities and that’s Candace Mueller and there are 5 bullet points there half-way down the page. The state budget deficit of $10-12 billion; a Pew report placing Illinois in top tier of states with financial problems; a sense in Springfield that nothing will happen regarding new revenues until after the primary; a cash-flow crisis affecting higher ed and unpaid bills at some public
universities which you were discussing earlier, and ways to maintain the unity achieved during the fight to restore MAP funding – that was a topic of conversation. The IBHE Board’s current Public Agenda emphasis is Goa 3 which they call Affordability and that’s an issue and that was a – we had a representative from the committee, Mahomet – Chapin Rose, who’s on the Higher Education Appropriations Committee, spoke to the group and after assuring us that he is really on the side of higher education, the group at times looks at these people with a jaundiced eye, said that the state deficit budget is closer to $4 billion that the $11-12 billion and I notice you’re getting different numbers but these were the numbers that were thrown around there so I’m just giving you the numbers that they gave me. He explained that because federal stimulus funds have not arrived, public universities are out interest income, not actually funding. I don’t know whether that’s exactly true or not. You’d have to talk to people in budgetary here to get an answer on that one. It goes on talking about – we as a committee told him we’re really not interested in who to blame with this thing, we’d just like to fix the problem and try to address it. He came back with us saying that we in higher education needed to get out into the constituents, in other words those people who are sending their children to school, and tell them to significance of higher education. No one had an answer of how we’re going to do that. I didn’t visualize driving up to Winnetka and knocking on doors or something to that effect so that in essence is pretty much what happened.

On the 17th there was a P-20 summit at the National Governor’s Association college graduation all talking about issues on that. Earlier the ---

A. Rosenbaum: Could you tell us what ---

E. Hansen: I’m on the Athletic Board and the – I’m sorry.

A. Rosenbaum: Could you just tell us what P-20, what does that mean – P-20? It sounds that the ??? or something?

E. Hansen: Well, it’s the progress report of tracking students and graduation. I believe that’s correct on that. I’ll double-check on it. Go ahead.

A. Rosenbaum: With a mike.

P. Henry: I think it meaning pre-school until graduation from college.

E. Hansen: Right. That’s the tracking system where the discussion was earlier about the NC2A. We’re looking at the same issue in higher education and the example that we’re always hearing is the students starts University A, drops out, goes to community college, drops out, goes back to a third year institution or a third institution, gets free credit – no, through their junior and close to a fourth institution and graduates and that’s a success story but it’s a failure for the other schools because they didn’t graduate there. The question on tracking it is what the IBHE is concerned about doing because the legislature is basically putting the IBHE’s feet to the fire on graduation rates.

That pretty much sums it up.

J. Jeffrey: Do you happen to know why the IBHE is having its feet held to the fire about graduation rates? I mean who cares and why?

E. Hansen: It’s the legislature looking at what higher education – what they perceive some in higher education do and don’t do. You and I as faculty and whether you’ve taught at in other states, in other institutions are well aware that the research and the training and the education goes on in higher education institutions whether they be private or state institutions, are what influences the economy to grow within a certain area or within a certain state. They seem to miss that a little bit and the question that was raised and I don’t always put all the comments in these things but some are rather derogatory comments and at one previous meeting, it was basically said we don’t really want to hit the hornets’ nest with a stick before this MAP thing came out and we are an advisory committee. Last month I told you we were having two representatives that would be on the IBHE and both of those would have votes and everybody that is an IBHE representative on – a Faculty Advisory Committee meeting, FAC, is a bona fide representative from their institutions. Two if those people are retired faculty but are elected by the Faculty Senate/University Council to represent those particular institutions as alternates and they’re the ones going to meetings. The make up for the most part, I would say, the vast majority of people down there are in the trenches faculty members and they’ve got the same concerns that you and I have.

P. Henry: Just on the graduation rates I think it’s basically that it’s an easy thing to measure. The fact that it’s measured inaccurately is not so much a concern but it’s a number that they can sort of ??? and say this institution is more productive than that institution.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Joe?

J. Jeffrey: Just as a quick follow-up just to make sure I understand, it sounds like what Pat said. It sounds like and I’m hoping for your take on whether this is what it sounds like is what it really is, it sounds like basically an anti-university stance. You damn guys aren’t doing your jobs, that’s why our kids ain’t graduating.

E. Hansen: Well, that appears to be where some stand but I think a lot of that is that they really are clueless as to what faculty do. The idea with the gentleman that came in and talked to us said we needed to get to our constituents or to the parents who are sending kids to school. Well, his particular group is more concerned about turning out people out of community colleges that go into the trades where we’re more concerned about turning out people with a baccalaureate degree or a master’s degree or Ph.D. to go and do what they do so there’s a variance there in what the different constituencies of the representatives have.

A. Rosenbaum: How many times do we have to educate the IBHE regarding what faculty do? I’ve been hearing this since I joined the Senate about eight years ago. I mean, it’s always the same. We have to educate the IBHE – are they educatable?
E. Hansen: Well, that’s a good question at times. I don’t think the problem is the IBHE, it’s the state legislature that’s going after the IBHE and in turn going after institutions. It’s not the IBHE.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so they’re educated. We’ve educated them. They understand.

E. Hansen: They’re trained anyway. Okay?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Well, that’s a start. Thank you. Yes? Mike.

M. Morris: Earl, could you talk a little bit more about – I’m not really familiar with the Illinois Policy Institute?

E. Hansen: I don’t even know who they are.

M. Morris: I was just going to ask is this report card that they issue, is this available on the website somewhere or ---

E. Hansen: I believe it is and I’ll get it to you and I have a hard copy somewhere that we’ll get to you, one way or another if you want it. If you’ll just contact me I will – just e-mail me on campus here and I’ll get it to you.

M. Morris: I mean I have a suspicion I know where they lean but I’m not exactly sure and I’d like to look at it myself. Okay, thank you.

E. Hansen: That group wasn’t held in real high stead among some of my Liberal Arts colleagues who were at the meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: It didn’t sound like a love fest.

E. Hansen: Always.

A. Rosenbaum: Are there any other questions for Earl about the contents of this report? Otherwise, I have a general question for Earl but let’s see if there are – any other comments or questions for Earl? Could you just – I don’t know this, I’m wondering. How does the FAC advise the IBHE? I mean do you regularly meet with them? Do you send them the minutes of your meeting? I mean, how does the process work? I mean, how do you do this?

E. Hansen: Our chair who is always at their meetings would convey to them what’s going on. They also get a copy of our minutes. We also send correspondence to them on things that we our subcommittees would come up with in regards to where we think needs are. My question to you is just how much of the stuff that I have do you really want to see? I mean, I can inundate you with reams of paper and I’ve got enough to grade. I don’t want to be reading somebody else’s stuff. I try to summarize it for you but we have taken stances on different things. If you’re interested, I’ll be glad to share it with you and you can do what you want. I have no problem with that.
A. Rosenbaum: As much as I’d love to be inundated with material, I guess it would be fine for you to send along whatever you think is relevant for us to have and we can think of ways to make it available if the Senate members would like to be able to access that.

E. Hansen: Spoken like a true administrator. Be glad to.

A. Rosenbaum: Pat?

P. Henry: There used to be and I’d be glad to check on this myself, but the IBHE website often had links to various things, including the FAC reports. I don’t know if that’s been maintained?

E. Hansen: We have our ??? papers on that site and everything else.

P. Henry: That’s a fairly easy way to access it.

E. Hansen: I can access that for you to; anybody can access it.

A. Rosenbaum: Access by going through the IBHE website?

E. Hansen: Right.


E. Hansen: Sure.

A. Rosenbaum: Can you respond to them? Do they have a chat room or something?

E. Hansen: Give it a shot. I would think so and, if not, the chair’s name is on there and the Advisory Committee’s names and e-mails are on there. You can correspond with any of them.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other questions for Earl? Very good. Thank you Earl.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: The next report is from Ferald Bryan and it is on the BOT Committee on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel.

F. Bryan: Thank you Alan. Professor Buck Stevens also serves with me in this capacity and was unable to attend the meeting. My report is in front of you and it’s concise I hope and it doesn’t perhaps do justice to the full hour and thirty minutes that we were there on November 12.

I’ll begin by saying that the committee is chaired by John Butler, a former faculty member at this institution, in fact, a colleague of mine. I think his goal is to educate the trustees about programs and offices on campus because that’s really what we got in this meeting. It ran an hour and a
half and that’s a half hour earlier than we normally would meet and really they only dealt with
the one action item that you see there. They approved the appointments of the new Chair of
Biology and the new Director of the Center for Southeast Asian Studies. Those appointments
were approved and forwarded to the full Board for their meeting on December 3.

Under Information Items there were four reports that were scheduled. Because the first three
took so long, the fourth one, the update on Strategic Planning, was postponed and we were
grateful for that.

First, Vice-President Anne Kaplan made a power point presentation on this new honor for
Northern. We received a Carnegie Foundation classification on engagement and I understand we
received this honor several months ago but just finally got a chance to hear about it. This is a
new elective classification from the Carnegie Foundation and essentially we won it because of a
lot of the things we do in terms of community engagement. What I found interesting was the
historical context. I had not heard, for example, that the land grant philosophy that guided the
original NASULGC members that we’re now part of, no longer focus of course on agriculture so
now we’re trying to respond to national criticism like the kind we heard in the earlier report and
this aspect on community engagement is supposed to help improve our public image so Vice-
President Kaplan then outlined in great detail the engagement projects that we have been
involved in for the last several years. Most of these you probably know and have been reported
on and I won’t say this when I report to the University Council but it was a lot of fluff. Most of
this - you know that this happens, but whether or not it’s anything to improve our image, we can
judge on our own.

Next we heard David Stone, Director of the Office of Sponsored Projects who also gave an
extensive overview of his office’s structure, function and services to faculty and staff. Since
many of us take advantage of that office, most of us know what they do and, of course, realize
that they’re mostly very good at it but it may surprise many of you for example that Trustee Bob
Boey, who’s been on the Board of Trustees for many years, at the conclusion of David Stone’s
presentation, commented that he didn’t know such an office existed. So indeed, at least in this
presentation, the Trustees were education as to what that office did.

Finally, Vice-President for Research, James Erman, presented an oral summary of the Office of
Technology Transfer Office and this was educational for me as well because I didn’t know about
all the patents and inventions and licensing agreements that we have or that have been generated
since 1983. He pointed out that the sums seem modest in terms of royalty income that this is
actually average; that few universities unless you happen to have Gatorade or a few drugs that
have patents, aren’t going to make the millions implied there so it was very educational to hear
that.

The meeting did end on time at 10:05 and the next meeting will be in March. That concludes my
report but it was a full packed hour and thirty minutes. There’s a lot more I could say. I’d be
happy to answer any questions if you have any.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Ferald?
C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next report is my report on the Board of Trustees Committee on Finance, Facilities, and Operations and again, Finance, Facilities, and Operations basically has to do with the getting approval for expenditures and budget items at the university. If you look at it, there were 7 action items. The first 3 of them are what are called pass throughs. A pass through basically means that a faculty member or a group of faculty members had secured funding from an outside source. The money does not come out of university operating expenses or the university operating budget I should say but rather the Board of Trustees must approve the expenditure of this money even though it is not really money that belongs to NIU, hence the term pass through and so they approved those. They approved money for upgrading the software and hardware that is used to operate our grant office. They used that apparently for monitoring proposals and for submitting proposals.

The next thing they did was – there apparently is a state law that when a computer that is taken out of service at a state agency, the hard drive on that computer must be overwritten a minimum of 10 times. Every track must be overwritten a minimum of 10 times. Apparently NIU is already in compliance with this, however, the state requires the Board of Trustees to approve this policy and so this is not something that had any cost attached to it but the Board of Trustees did approve that.

The most interesting thing that happened at the meeting, I thought actually this was quite creative, is Item F and that is that the university has begun to develop relationships with contractors who provide mostly energy related improvements to the university and who get paid only from the cost savings that are attributable to the improvements that they’ve made and these are guaranteed in the contracts and so if they come in and install a new air conditioning system, we give them no up-front money. Some kind of an estimate is made regarding how much money we saved using this new system over what we would have saved using the old system and that’s money that’s used to pay them for their work. If the system does not save any money, they don’t get paid. So apparently the university in the contracts establishes what the benchmark amount is that they have to save over and then anything that they save over that is where the money comes from to pay them back and this is paid off over time and we are able to do a lot of improvements and apparently are able to use some of the savings to improve things that are not energy related. So this has turned out to be a very important resource for us in a time when we’re not really getting a lot of capital improvement money from the state of Illinois. So this was very creative and Bob Albanese is the one I think who has really pioneered this and apparently other universities are now coming to use, coming to him and saying how did you do that. So I went to him and said can I get one of these company’s to install a new oil burner or gas burner in my house and just pay them with the savings that I get. He didn’t think that would go. At any rate, this is very creative and we have quite a number of projects that are being done using this method.

That was essentially the excitement at this otherwise pretty routine meeting. Any questions on that? I guess one point that I should make also is that prior to the meeting, Dr. Williams said that the number of items on this is about a third of what we would normally expect at this time of
year and so that we reflects the fact that we really are not spending money at the same rate as we have in previous years so this does reflect somewhat the fact that we have gone into a sort of holding pattern with regard to expenditures. We’re not spending money at the same rate as in previous years as a result of the financial situation that we find ourselves in. Okay? Any other questions regarding the FFO report.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the last report we have is Jay Monteiro from the Board of Trustees Committee on Legislative, Audit and External Affairs. Jay?

J. Monteiro: Thanks Alan. First we’ll talk about the Veto Session Update and the 96th General Assembly. Ken Zehnder, Director of State and Local Relations announced that the Illinois State Senate made Manny Sanchez’s appointment to the NIU Board of Trustees official and from what I understand, that was three years in coming so that’s good. He reported that language for securing Spring MAP awards was finalized at $215 million which is $15 million less than in 2009; however, funding has not been secured for that yet so we’ll see what happens. Zehnder reported a number of bills that were overridden during the second week of the veto session and those are listed there. You can read them. He also said that President Peters has requested that the funds be released for the Stevens Building, Cole Hall and the money for researching the technology building and again bonds for that bill have not been issued yet.

During the Congressional Report, Lori Clark gave a very brief report. She stated that health care reform legislation which was recently passed by the House is the main subject now being discussed by the U.S. Senate for the rest of 2009 and then there was some other information there you can read.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was discussed by Dr. David Stone, Director of Sponsored Projects. The ARRA provides $21.5 billion dollars in additional funding for research and development and at the time this law was passed back in February, NIU had 48 research proposals with a value of $16.7 million dollars eligible for reconsideration by the National Science Foundation and to date, NIU has been awarded five of these awards totally $1 million dollars.

Then Dr. Paul Bauer, Director of the Department of Music, presented information TAPE TURNED OVER HERE and there were comments from all over the world from people who had looked at the Internet too.

Then Jeffrey Compher gave an Athletic Certification report. He did announce that the NCAA had found nine minor issues with our reaccreditation report but those things are being addressed. He talked about the intercollegiate mission and values. He did talk about a bracelet that all of the athletes are getting. You can read there where the bracelets say red on them – R represents NIU in all we do; E = expect success; D – demand integrity and their new motto is “We develop champions in the classroom, in competition, and in life and Jan had already reported on the GPA that NIU had had eight straight semesters of all athletes achieving a GPA of 3.0 or above.
And that’s pretty much the report.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, questions?

**J. Monteiro:** Here’s the bracelet.

**A. Rosenbaum:** That’s the bracelet?

**J. Monteiro:** And also the bracelet has a jump drive on it I believe too.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Where can we get those for the holidays? Yes, question in the back.

**M. Kostic:** Professor Kostic. I’m actually in Engineering, professor of energy at NIU here and about those – I’m going back to energy – contracts for energy savings. I’m a little confused about it. If we have bad equipment which consumes a lot of energy, then we keep paying the same old energy costs to the contractor who basically fund it into a new, you know, treatment so we didn’t do anything really. We keep spending money on energy – I’m confused – why is this a good deal for the university?

**A. Rosenbaum:** It’s a good deal for the university because although we’re spending money, we’re getting new equipment and at the point at which it’s paid off, we continue to realize those energy savings above and beyond what we’ve already done. So, what I mean is once we pay that off, if we have a system now that is using 50% or 30%, whatever, less energy, we will continue to pay lower energy bills on that and we haven’t spent any money in order to do that so this involves things like, you know, putting in new windows and doors, changing air conditioning systems so we get all of this stuff, we don’t lay out any capital for it and then once it’s paid off, we continue to realize those benefits. That’s the principle of it. Whether it words or not I can’t tell you, but that’s the logic.

**M. Kostic:** I think it should be reviewed because we are paying them for 10 years might be some excessive costs and the old equipment maintenance or our consumption of energy and it will be economical to do it the real way, the way contractions do. Borrow money or invest in better equipment and save altogether. Anyhow, that’s my comment.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, thank you. Any other questions for Jay? No questions. Okay.

**E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report**

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. **Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report**

B. **Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair – no report**

C. **Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair – no report**
D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: We have one more order of business and I think many of you know that Donna Jarman is stepping down and retiring I guess is the correct term, as Administrative Assistant and this is her last meeting of the Faculty Senate. She’ll be passing the torch to Robin Anderson who is sitting to her right and Robin will be taking over as soon as Donna leaves. She’ll actually be in the office beginning on December 1 so you can all stop by and say hello to Robin after December 1, not all at once. Donna has been an employee at Northern Illinois for 30 years. Those of you who look at her and say you don’t look old enough to retire. The reason is because she started working here when she was 5 – before child labor laws were in place. No, she started here when she was 17 years old and has worked here for the past 30 years so that’s an achievement and I would like to read a motion and ask the Senate to approve this or if you don’t want to approve it, you can sort of suggest some changes. Anyway, the motion is:

Whereas Donna Jarman has faithfully served Northern Illinois University for the past thirty years and whereas she has been Administration Assistant for the University Council and Faculty Senate for the past ten years during which time she has been an dispensable asset to four Senate presidents and whereas she has decided to take a well-earned retirement while still young enough to enjoy it, on this date, November 18, 2009 on the occasion of her last Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Senate of Northern Illinois University hereby recognizes her dedicated service, thanks her for her many contributions to the Senate and her tireless efforts on our behalf and wishes her a long and happy retirement.

I need a second. We have a number of seconds and discussion. Unless – and I’d like to add my own thanks to that because it’s almost impossible to do this job without sort of an owner’s manual and Donna is the owner’s manual so I don’t know what I would have done if she wasn’t here; if she had decided to retire in August so it has been really great to have her and it has certainly helped me a great deal. I’d also like, first of all, get a vote on the motion so we have to do that first. So, all in favor this motion, signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Very good. The motion carries. There will be a formal reception for Donna on Thursday, December 10 from 3:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon in Altgeld Hall, Room 315. You all receive an invitation I believe to this but in case it gets lost in the mail, just show up so that’s December 10, Thursday, 3:00-5:00 in the afternoon, Altgeld, 315.
**P. Henry:** I hate to follow that up with a bit of a downer but I’m wondering about in terms of unfinished business, I recall that we had something referred to the Economic Status of the Profession Committee and the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee about the nepotism issues and I just wondered where the stood.

**A. Rosenbaum:** The salary issue is with the Faculty Senate. The nepotism issue went to University Affairs at University Council. That committee has been meeting. We have been working very hard to try and get the data that we need. The university has promised us the data by early December. They had originally said the end of November but apparently they’re going to celebrate Thanksgiving before they give us the data. So we are expecting that that committee will have the data they need in the first week of December or they will at least know that they are not getting the data that they need in which case there are back-up plans to try to figure out what it is we need to know. So yes, thank you for reminding us but that is in progress and we will hopefully have reports on that early in the spring term as soon as they have gotten what they need so we’re on top of that.

Any other questions, comments or business? Hearing none, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Who moved it? Okay. Second? I need a second. All in favor? Opposed? Have a happy new year. We’ll see you in 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.