
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Allori, Azad, Bishop, Blecksmith, Bujarski, Calmeyer, Cummings, Elish-Piper, Feurer, Finley, Greene, Jaffee, Kostic, Chih-Chen, Lenczewski, Lin, Liu, Marchewka, Mogren, Mohabbat, Moraga, Morris, Prawitz, Shortridge, Snow, Stravers

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, if we can come to order. We have a number of items of business today so I want to get started so we’re not here until too late. I’d like to welcome you all to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year. The first order of business – can you hear me if I sit back like this? Is this still coming through here or do I have to – yeah? Good? Okay.

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. You should all have four walk-in items. The walk-in items include the Strategic Plan for Enrollment Management Task Force report from Kerry Freedman. That is under Item IV, A. You should have the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee report. That is Item VII, B. That’s a walk-in and that will also be given by Kerry Freedman and not by Ferald Bryan as it says in the agenda. We have the BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Subcommittee report. That one is from Greg Waas even though it says it’s from me and that is under VII, C. And then we have the walk-in of the BOT report and that’s the BOT from last May and also the June 23 meeting so I think it’s May 13 and also June 23 so that covers those two meetings. The other reports are on the subcommittee meetings that we just held last week and so that is the last walk-in item. We also are going to cross out two items so we’re removing from the agenda Item VIII, 4, excuse me, VIII, F-4 and VIII, F-6. So Roman VIII, Item F-4 and F-6. So those are crossed out. We’re not voting on those today. Okay? So I need a motion to accept the agenda. You have to say your name if you would. What? No, not you – sorry. Cecil Smith. Okay. And I need a second; we’ll take David Wade as a second. Okay. Any problems with the agenda? Any discussion? Okay, we’ll take a vote. All in favor of the agenda signify by saying aye. Any opposed? The agenda passes.

Cecil Smith made the motion to approve the agenda; David Wade made the second.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 21, 2010, FS MEETING
**A. Rosenbaum:** Next is the approval of the minutes of the April 21 Faculty Senate meeting and so we’ll first take a motion for the acceptance of the minutes. Anyone want to move that? Pat? Pat Henry, okay and I need a second. Okay? Sue Wills, yes? Okay. Do we have any discussion? Okay Pat, what’s wrong with the minutes?

**P. Henry:** There’s a little bit on page 12 where we’re talking about academic dishonesty policy, I happened to notice that the University Judicial Office is now changed to the Community Standards and Student Conduct so I think perhaps some blanket change needs to be made. This was something in the Bylaws, wasn’t it?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Right, but that was subsequent to the meeting so we didn’t have that at the meeting so the minutes represent what we did at that meeting so anything that’s happened since then we don’t reflect in the minutes. Well, but it won’t change in the minutes. It will change in other areas, okay. Any corrections, grammatical changes, deletions or additions? For the benefit of new members of the Senate, if you happen to be quoted in the minutes, it is advised that you at least look at what you were quoted as saying and so you can make sure that that is correct because this becomes part of the archives. The other thing – I don’t know if the disclaimer is on the top – is the disclaimer on the top? If it’s not, I want to make it clear that these minutes are an abridgement of the actual transcript. The full transcript of the Senate and the University Council meetings are available online so you can get the full transcript if you want to. What happens is we take these transcripts and condense them so what you really have here are the cliff notes of the meeting and in the course of that, I try and maintain the sense of the things that were said and the issues but not necessarily the exact letter of it unless I put something in quotes. So that is an approximation to the minutes. Okay? So any other items – any other questions or additions to the minutes? Okay? That means people aren’t reading the minutes because there are always mistakes in them so – okay, very good. Anyway, all in favor of accepting the minutes signify. Any opposition to the minutes? Very good. Minutes pass.

**IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, the first thing I want to do is introduce the Senate to our new Administrative Assistant who is Pat Erickson. Pat, want to stand up? Say hello to the Senate. We are delighted to have Pat as the new Administrative Assistant. She comes to us from Media Relations and she has already cleaned up our act so she is a great addition to the Council and Senate office. If you have questions and issues, Pat is a good person to start with and if you just want to stop by and say hello, she is the loneliest person at the University. She sits at the desk there and we’re a kind of two person office so there’s not much going on so if you want to drop in and say hello to Pat.

Okay, I have a couple of announcements and then we also will have a report from Kerry Freedman which I put into the President’s Announcements as well.

The first thing is I’ve been asked by Kathy Buettner to tell you that there is now a new emergency alert system for the University. Many of you know that we already have a system where messages can be texted to you I believe on your cell phone. If you are not enrolled in that system, you can do so. You can probably do that off the main web site but you can certainly do it off the emergency web site. This web site can be located off of the main web site. If you go all the way down to the bottom, there’s a small area where you can click on emergency information. And, if you click on that, it gives you the update on what’s going on on campus. The idea is that this is going to be used for things that do not reach the level of text messaging announcements. So, for example, anything that is a major source of danger to the students or faculty or staff will be texted, but things that are less urgent than that will be placed on this
web site. So, for example, if there are suspicious characters lurking around certain buildings, those kinds of things will be noted on this new emergency notification system. And so I want to call your attention to that. Kathy Buettner has asked that people go there and take a look at it and I believe register for text messaging. Correct? Am I right on that guys? Was there anything else that I left out about that that you can recall? They're e-mails? Okay, they're e-mails. They're not texted to your phone? Okay, so both. Okay. All right, so that's the new emergency notification system.

She also asked me to call your attention to the NIU Today which is our new sort of daily magazine that has all the news. I don't know if any of you have looked at that yet. That can be accessed again on the home page or by going to [www.today.niu.edu](http://www.today.niu.edu) and apparently we also have our own You Tube channel and you can go to that and you can watch various announcements, meetings, anything that NIU has officially posted on the You Tube channel. These are official postings; these are not things that are coming from the students so you won't see anything – well, I don't know what you'll see. Anyway, they are official.

Also, the President has asked me to point out to you that tomorrow is the State of the University Address. President Peters will deliver this at 3 p.m. in the Altgeld Auditorium. It will be streamed live on wherever we stream things. I would guess you would find it off the home page. The President tells me he will not dwell on the financial crisis of the past but will instead dwell on the financial crisis of the future. So no, he's not going to dwell on the financial crisis. Just kidding. But the President says that he has some important announcements to make about the future of NIU and so he’s encouraging faculty to either attend or to watch his State of the University Address.

Next item. Some of you may have noticed that we have gotten a Blackboard web site for the Faculty Senate. This is more appropriately called the Blackboard Community. The Office of Faculty Resources or whatever it is has agreed to give us this for nothing. There is normally a $250 a year charge. We explained that we have no budget and Murali Krishnamurthi generously has approved us for a free web site so we are apparently a charity case and we’ve been given web stamps or whatever it is that gets you a Blackboard listing. Okay? So I would encourage you to check it. Some of you may have done this already. I’ve sent out announcements here and there. I am posting things on that. Eventually we may post minutes and the agenda on that web site. There are things on there that you might be interested in reading. For example, a little bit later in the agenda we’re going to get to this item on the funding of Intercollegiate Athletics. I have posted a link to the Inside Higher Education article that talks about the issue and so from time to time I’m putting things on there. It is also my intention to eventually open a chat room so that people can develop some threads and can converse with each other. The only people who can get into this are people on the Faculty Senate that we have invited and so this is not something that the administration can get into or the students can get into so this is protected. The only way anyone gets into it is if you let them get into it and so it is our own site. So we’re going to sort of do this and see how it works. It’s kind of a work in progress and we’ll see if this turns out to be a good way for the Senate to communicate with each other and so any of you who have not been able to get into it or who have not received messages from me, please let Pat know because it’s a little tricky to find your IDs that we have to put in there in order to get you on the web site. I think I’ve gotten most of you but there may be a few of you who are not yet into it. So if you have not been able to get into the Blackboard web site, let Pat know. Okay? Any questions about the Blackboard web site? Yes?

S. Willis: Is it your intention to always send e-mail notices ???

A. Rosenbaum: No. It’s not. That’s going to be too difficult. So, no. I’m hoping people will go in and check it from time to time and uh - yes?

G. Bennardo: It’s easier to receive the e-mail.
A. Rosenbaum: Now for those – is it too much to ask you to check the Blackboard – it is, it is. Okay. Okay, I will look into that and I will try to send you an e-mail message whenever something new is posted. But keep in mind again – will that work also if we open a chat room and people make postings to the chat room? No it won’t. Okay. So if we do that, then you might want to check and see what the discussion is about and I’ll let you know when we do that; when we open up the chat room so I’ll at least inform you of that. Okay? Okay.

One more item. Please when you speak, and I should have said this before, start off by saying your name. The reason being that when we get minutes, if you haven’t said your name we have to sometimes guess who it is that said it. Pat will try to keep track of who says things and who seconds things and who makes motions but she doesn’t know everybody and so it would be maximally beneficial for us if you remember to just state your name at the time you start speaking about anything. We say this every year and I know it’s hard to remember so I’ll remind you from time to time but that would be most helpful.

Okay, a couple of updates before we get to the Strategic Management Enrollment Task Force. First of all we have an update on the library issue. Those of you who were on the Senate last year remember we had an issue about the disposal of a large number of journals without faculty being informed. The Senate passed a resolution and that resolution created a little bit of a stir. It was written up in the Northern Star. We did get some good action out of that though. The Provost has stepped in. He has charged the Library Committee with developing a policy for communication between the library and the faculty so that is going to be ongoing. We’re keeping an eye on this during the fall semester. I should also tell you that the Math Department actually succeeded in getting their journals back. Yes. And the way they did this, apparently the Dean of the Library did contact the place in California that we had sent those journals to. They agreed to send those back but they wanted their $5,000 that they had spent for shipping and so what happened was we had to get $5,000 to pay that group and we needed another $5,000 to ship them back and so apparently the Math Department raised the $5,000 and the library agreed to pay the other $5,000. So it seems like an amicable sort of settlement where the library and the department shared the expense and those journals. I don’t know if they’ve come back yet; do we have anyone from the Math Department – Math Department rep? Sure, we do all that work and then they stop coming to the meetings. Great! Actually, they probably can’t get out of their office; the journals are probably stacked up so high they can’t get out the door. So, anyway, I was very pleased to hear this. I just found this out today and so what we’re doing – I met with the Provost today and he says that he is again recharging the Library Committee to make sure they come up with a policy that is acceptable to the faculty in regards to disposal of library materials so that was a very positive action by us and again we’re continuing to pay attention to that.

Okay, another item. As you know, there are certain very important honors that are bestowed on faculty, certain faculty members. Among these are the Board of Trustees Professorships. In order to select the faculty members that are worthy of receiving the Board of Trustees Professorship, they have a committee and we are entitled to nominate somebody or to have somebody volunteer from the Senate to sit on that committee. So if you or anybody in your department is interested in being on the Board of Trustee Professorship nomination committee, please either let me know now if anyone is interested. Nobody’s interested? All right. Or maybe someone in your department is interested. Good. Okay. Well, you know what’s going to happen. If nobody’s interested, I’m going to have to sit on that committee. Yes, thank you. All right. Well, anyway, if anybody is interested in sitting on the committee or knows of somebody let us know. You can call Pat; you can call me. Pat?

P. Henry: What’s the time frame?

A.Rosenbaum: Well, they want it now so as soon as possible. So –
P. Henry: You mean I can let the word known – go forth in my department.

A. Rosenbaum: Yeah, we have a little bit of time. How long?

P. Erickson: They can take names now. They meet two to three times.

A. Rosenbaum: Right. The committee meets once in December and again in January or February so it’s not a heavy duty – has anyone been on this committee by the way? Anyone? Okay. So it sounds like there are maybe two or three meetings. Yeah? Name. Okay.

J. Bowers: ???

A. Rosenbaum: So you’re automatically on the committee?

J. Bowers: I’ll do it.

A. Rosenbaum: No you’re not? Oh, you’ll do it? Oh great. Okay, let’s write his name down before he changes it. Okay, thank you very much. Okay. Good.

A. Strategic Plan for Enrollment Management Task Force – Kerry Freedman – report

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next item that we’ll do is Kerry Freedman’s report on the important initiative. President Peters has emphasized many times that he sees enrollment and retention as two of the most important issues confronting NIU. There are concerns about changes in the constituency of students that attend NIU and he wants to keep us current in terms of getting to the students that are in this group that is applying to colleges. Again, demographics change all the time. We also have issues of retention and it’s very important. Many of you know about the crisis – financial crisis – from last year. It drove home the idea that NIU is very dependent on tuition dollars and fees to meet our payroll when the state goes into its delinquent phase. So you all know that we were very fortunate in that the state came up with the lion’s share of the money that they owed us. We did not have to go and borrow money which was a major concern of President Peter’s. The only reason we got through was because of tuition dollars and fees and so the President is very enthusiastic about the importance of this mission. In order to do this, he has established – they have established – the Enrollment Management and Retention Task Force. We were entitled to nominate one person to that committee. That person is Kerry Freedman. Kerry will now report on the history of what’s going on with that committee and bring us up to date on what that committee is doing. Kerry.

K. Freedman: Okay. The committee was charged to Brian Hemphill by Provost Alden. Hemphill was the one who had to put the committee together. He is primarily responsible for recruitment and Seaver is primarily responsible for retention. Okay? So this job is considered so important and so large now that the job has actually been split up a bit. The task force has a large number of people. I never was able to actually figure out how many people are on the task force but it’s big folks. There’s between 30 and 40 people on the task force but it’s primarily administrators and staff personnel. I’ll talk about that later. Right now, as of this moment, I’m the only faculty member on the committee. I’m stepping down from the committee this year because it’s a new year but we’ll talk about that at the end of my report. The primary goal of the committee or the task force is to set and reach the target of 25,400 students or 620,000 credit hours. Now, this is very important right now, not only for the reasons that Alan mentioned, but
also because – and not only because we have competition; we certainly do have competition in the Chicago area by other institutions, but because, in fact, the predicted rate of high school graduation is going down. So we’ve got several things dovetailing that might cause concern for us. One is the financial crisis in the state of Illinois. Two is increased competition from other institutions in the Chicago area and three is projected low enrollments among high school students. So this is why the task force was formed. The first semester of the first year of the task force was primarily building a foundation on which people could discuss and make decisions. Basically most of the meetings were spent with people coming to the task force and presenting. We heard presentations, for example, from Brad Bond. He gave a presentation about graduate school enrollment including admissions and retention activities that fell under the auspices of the Graduate School. We also had a presentation about undergraduate recruitment and enrollments and presentations having to do with, for example, classroom space and that sort of thing. One of the presentations that was particularly notable was – had to do with the reasons that parents and students chose NIU or chose a particular institution and the reason I think this was a very important presentation is because one of the key points made during the presentation was that students primarily chose an institution based on the quality of faculty and programs. So this is important as a faculty issue.

The second semester, the spring semester last year, the task force was split up into five sub-groups or subcommittees. The names of those are in my written report and we’ve been working within these sub-groups ever since, now only meeting occasionally as a full task force.

So most of this I’ve written in the written report but I do want to point out just a few issues that pertain to faculty in particular. The first one is that, as the Strategic Plan for Recruitment and Enrollment is developed, class size may become an issue. Certainly student credit hours have already become an issue in many departments and class size may be a part of that. I know in some departments already it’s been discussed, that discussion may continue and, in fact, may become a major issue in terms of keeping our student credit hours stable.

Second, although one of the great outcomes of the task force is improved recruitment, there’s been some money invested in recruitment that wasn’t invested in the past. There’s been some reorganization. The recruitment areas have been re-targeted so that we’re covering – we’re better covering the Chicago area and so on. So I think recruitment is definitely going to improve because of this task force but along with recruitment and retention we also have to consider educational standards and so there hasn’t been an indication that that is going to be a concern but I just think it’s important that faculty monitor the situation.

Now the third issue has to do with the fact that I was the only faculty member on this task situation. It’s just that we’re not actually having the input to these decisions as they’re being made. So I did talk to Brian Hemphill about that and Brian Hemphill met with Alan about that and, as of now, we have been given five faculty appointments to the task force which is great. So Brian Hemphill listened to us and what I’m recommending is that we have one person on each of the sub-groups, each of the faculty sub-groups and also Alan was invited to join the task force as well in his position as president of the Faculty Senate. So I’m very glad to say that action was taken to improve the situation about faculty representation and I hope that people will volunteer to be appointed to this task force. Thank you.

B. Nominations for five members to serve on Strategic Plan for Enrollment Management Task Force
A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Do we have questions for Kerry? Any questions? Okay. First of all I want to thank Kerry for her service on this committee. I really appreciate her putting in the time on this and I know she loved the committee and the only reason she’s stepping down is because she has other duties such as taking over as head of her program, Art Education, correct? Yes. And so she’s encouraging people to do this. Secondly, the other thing that Brian Hemphill has agreed to is the fact that once these subcommittee reports have been read out – we’ve already had the first two subcommittees, there are I think two or three more to go – what’s going to happen is they’re going to take feedback on those and issue the final report in February and so what he has agreed to do is to make the Faculty Senate one of the groups that vets that report. So he has agreed that that report will come back to us. We can send it to our committee and we can tell them whether we’re okay with this or not and, of course, they don’t have to listen to us but they are at least agreeing to hear what we have to say about it and I think they will take faculty input seriously on this one. So it struck me that Dr. Hemphill is very interested in doing this the right way. He did not think that he was doing it the wrong way and wants the faculty to be adequately represented and wants us to feel that we have a say in how this is done since enrollment and retention are issues of great import to us. And so again, I need five people who want to sit on this task force and attend the meetings. It’s going to be a one semester obligation. As we said the report will be done by the end of this semester. And we’re also in a situation now where those members are going to be part of the fine tuning of the report, not so much the development of the report because they’ve already done a lot of the leg work on this so we’re coming into this really in the home stretch rather than at the beginning of the process. So, do we have any volunteers to sit on the Enrollment Management and Retention Task Force?

P. Henry: How many times does it meet?

A. Rosenbaum: That is unclear. Do we know?

K. Freedman: You would be meeting in a sub-group. One of the sub-groups listed on my sheet here – I’ll read them to you. One is Marketing and Branding. The second one is Recruitment. The third one is Retention. Fourth one is Institutional Facilities and Capacity Management and the fifth one is Strategic Enrollment Target and Budget Forecasting. So on how much each of the committee is to meet.

Rosenbaum: Okay, and I’m guessing that, you know, during this semester there may not be as many meetings because now we’re in the final stage so it may not be as intense.

K. Freedman: Yeah, I know the Marketing and Branding Committee – that was the committee I sat on – will probably meet maybe three times during the semester at the most.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and I also want to remind you that we can’t complain if they offer us seats and we don’t take them so if they agree to include us and to hear our voice and we chose not to, that’s our problem. That’s not their problem so if this doesn’t come out the way we want it to, if we haven’t sent the people there to argue our position, we can’t complain about it. So I would hope that we could find people either on the Senate or elsewhere that are willing to do this. Yes?

L. Yamagata-Lynch: ??? not on mike

A. Rosenbaum: Names? We need names. You need a microphone.

L. Yamagata-Lynch: I’m interested in Marketing & Branding.
A. Rosenbaum: Yes, go ahead.

S. Willis: I would be interested. I would take Retention.

A. Rosenbaum: Retention, good. Okay. Jeff?

J. Kowalski: Yeah, I would be interested in the Marketing and Branding and taking Kerry’s place if – somebody already ask for that?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, Lisa did.

J. Kowalski: Oh, well, I would take another one if that’s already spoken for.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, we can – I guess the two of you could discuss this. We need one on each committee. Okay, that gives us three.

J. Kowalski: Recruitment or Retention.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other interest. Okay. I would ask you then if you want to go back to your departments and if you can get us – we need two additional names and so if anyone goes back to the departments and people are interested, please let Pat know. We don’t need them instantly but we’d like them rather quickly so we don’t miss any of the meetings.

L. Yamagata-Lynch: And then we’ll just hear when we’re supposed to be at a meeting?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, what we’re going to do – we’ll give your names to Brian Hemphill and assume that he’s going to add you to the e-mail list for the various committees. Okay? So we’ll leave – if you don’t hear something in the near future, then let Pat know and we’ll run it down. Okay?

K. Freedman: Everyone interested in Marketing and Branding, the announcement just came out a couple of days ago.

L. Yamagata-Lynch: Yeah.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay? All right. Again, if anyone comes up with names, let us know.

Okay, there are just two more issues and then we can move on. One is we have some hold-over issues from last year that I just want to mention to you that these haven’t been dropped. One of the issues is the issue of raise equity and so we have been pursuing the administration on this since last September. The latest word on that is that the administration has agreed to provide us with the data. Steve Cunningham tells me that we will have the data by the end of the first semester and so the committee that we put together remains together. Rosemary Feurer is still the chair of that committee and we will continue to update you on what we learn from that committee as we go along but we’re not dropping it; we’re continuing to pursue it. We have been fighting for this data now for over a year and we will continue to do so until the University provides what we need in order to answer the question. And again, for those of you who were not here last year, the question is whether raises are fairly distributed across the different groups within the University, those groups being faculty, operating staff and SPS; and also whether there is an equal distribution between the academic and the financial, facilities and operations side. Questions have been raised as to whether that is the case or not. And so that is an ongoing issue.
The second issue that is carried over from last year has to do with the idea of whether we want a +/- grading system. This has been a source of much debate. The faculty seems to be almost equally split. At the end of last year we agreed to give this to Academic Affairs. They will continue to look into this and report back to us when they have some recommendations. So there is no clear favorite on this. When you ask faculty members, some departments say leave it the way it is; other departments say change it and it seems to be fairly evenly split. We’ve done this before. The Senate has declined to take action on this. Whether we take action on it this year is anybody’s guess but that issue is still on the table.

Okay, so those are the ongoing issues.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Rosenbaum: Next item, we’re on V. Items for Faculty Senate Consideration.

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

A. Rosenbaum: This is the selection of Vice President and Secretary of the Faculty Senate. At this point I am only going to offer the nomination of Nancy Castle as Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Nancy has done this before and has been a great Secretary for the Faculty Senate and so I’m going to ask for us to – well, I’m going to nominate her. Do I need a second Ferald? I need a second. Okay, Bridget Lusk is the second. Any discussion? Do you want to hear a platform? Nancy, why don’t you tell us what the Secretary of the Senate does.

N. Castle: I have very good penmanship.

A. Rosenbaum: But you really only have one job right?

N. Castle: I only have one job. In the spring semester when we go to –

A. Rosenbaum: Executive.

N. Castle: Our closed section and everybody has to leave I have to take the notes because we don’t have a tape recorder going and that does not get entered into the record per se because we discuss personnel. So all you’re asking me to do is be here and take roll and take really good notes and hand them to Pat.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

N. Castle: And I think I can do that for you.

A. Rosenbaum: We’re confident.

N. Castle: I’m confident, yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and so first we’ll take a vote on this. All in favor of Nancy as Secretary of the Senate say aye. Opposed? Okay, it carries. Nancy’s our Secretary. I’m going to ask for a delay in appointing the Vice President of the Senate. I need to ask people before I can nominate
them and so we’ll do that at the next meeting. If I become incapacitated between now and the next meeting, I don’t really care – you’ll be on your own so.

N. Castle: I think that will be me, won’t it?

A. Rosenbaum: Maybe. So hopefully we’ll have a nominee for Vice President of the Senate at our October meeting. Okay, it’s at the end of September, yeah, it is – what, the 29th or something? Whatever. Okay, good.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: All right, the next item, the Consent Agenda. What we need to do is approve the membership on standing committees. The committee assignments were made by me. I used the sheets that some people submitted giving their preferences. I tried to give people their preferences. It was not always that easy. We did not have a lot of volunteers to chair the committees and so we’re going to put this on the Consent Agenda. What that means is if anyone has any problem with this, you have to speak up and it will take – it would take a vote of how many – five members? If five people object to this we’ll have to go through them item by item. Otherwise, we can approve them as a block. Anyone object to approving the committee memberships as a block? No objections. Okay. I’m asking for a motion to accept the committee memberships as they are with the exception of this – Gaylen Kapperman replaces Woody Johnson on Election and Legislative Oversight. That’s the only change and – what? Oh, why do you say they don’t know who you are? You say they don’t know who you are?

G. Kapperman: Yeah.

A. Rosenbaum: I’m sorry, you need a microphone. I can’t hear you.

G. Kapperman: I was just making sure that people know who I was. I’m from Teaching and Learning and I’m taking Woody Johnson’s place for the semester.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you. So we’ll adding Gaylen Kapperman in replacing Woody Johnson. Other than that I need a motion to accept the committees. John Novak. I need a second. Okay. All in favor. Opposed. The committees are approved.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: We now have our reports from Advisory Committees. Earl Hansen is going to report on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. We have three meetings there and your reports are noted on the pages in the agenda. Earl.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report
E. Hansen: The meetings --- deals with funding. I want to first thank Kerry for stepping up and taking a position on the committee because that’s one of the major issues that we see across the state, faculty members not being active, especially young faculty members. And it’s rampant throughout the four year institutions whether it’s private or state and maybe we ought to look at ourselves a little bit and wonder why they don’t do it. Maybe they don’t get enough points towards tenure or promotion or something to that effect. I think realistically if we’re going to move forward in higher education – I’m trying to lump the three meetings into one here for you – but we have to basically understand that if we are offered a seat on any committee as a faculty person or a faculty member at our institution, we’d better get on it because as you so candidly said, if you don’t accept this thing you don’t have a voice, you don’t have anyone to blame but yourself. We seem to be the first ones to – and this is across the board – point your finger at everybody but yourself sometimes.

We have higher education issues here – start with finance. We’ve been told that we have to improve our enrollment of our student population to about 9,000 new students a year to graduate from Illinois universities to turn around the economy in the state. We’re seeing all these types of presentations given to us at these meetings and the only way that I can see that this is going to get filtered back down to you here or at any other institution is to do what Alan’s done with the Blackboard and we can put the reports up there and you can read them and if you’ve got questions you just need to ask because we can expound on this stuff forever and ever.

The Faculty Advisory Committee is supposed to have two – well, faculty is supposed to have two seats on the IBHE by constitutional law for the legislation and we have never had anybody there as a faculty member on the IBHE. We have put forward two names from the Faculty Advisory Committee because that would seem to be the first place to start to have someone dealing with the IBHE. As of last week, I had not heard of anybody being moved forward or their accepting anyone so there are issues here. Yet we have to deal with the parents and the students and if we want to fund ourselves here, we have to get the parents and the students on board with us and higher education from a funding perspective in the sense that we don’t represent Northern Illinois University, we represent the state of Illinois – we represent ourselves as citizens and what we need to do to turn the economy around in the state of Illinois. It’s going to be in higher education; it’s going to be in research. In essence, that’s run rampant. Now you and I attended a meeting, a joint meeting, down in Champaign – do you want to expound on anything from that meeting?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, the meeting he’s referring to is we have a group called the Council of University Senates and that group is trying to sort of get together and act as a body because we feel if something comes, for example, from the Northern Illinois University Senate, well that’s fine. But if it comes from the senates of all of the public universities, that’s quite a different matter and we think that the politicos in the state will have more trouble ignoring something that comes as, you know, a joint resolution from the senates of the public universities in the state of Illinois. So we have been meeting to try and create a body that will have a little bit more political clout and so that was the meeting we had in July and that’s an ongoing project and I’ve reported to you before on meetings that I’ve attended. We in general meet twice a year. There’s a fall meeting and a spring meeting. This summer’s meeting was the first time we actually tried to get together and we are in the process of putting together a document that lists the common interests
of the public universities and when we have that, I’ll be bringing that to the Senate as a body and, hopefully, we will approve that along with other senates in the state and that will be sent to the representatives, the Governor and anybody we can think of that might be an appropriate person to send that to, Mike Madigan, for example. So that’s an ongoing issue and we’re continuing to work on that. Yeah, Kerry?

**K. Freedman:** Yeah, I just wanted to say that it’s important for us to participate in the membership of these committees not only from the faculty’s standpoint, but because students are not represented on these committees either and we’re the closest thing to student representation on these committees. So I think it’s really important for us to represent both ourselves and also the students.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, comments or questions? Questions for Earl? Yes, Jeff?

**J. Kowalski:** I don’t want to take this too long but I was intrigued in the report of the meeting of June 21 at the end of the section on the second page, it says ---

**E. Hansen:** I’m not hearing you so well. I apologize.

**J. Kowalski:** Okay, on the report of June 21 ---

**E. Hansen:** Let me get to it. Okay.

**J. Kowalski:** June 21 report you’ve got on the second page a list of three items and at the end it says there was a question from John Minogue as to whether the current professorial education model was sufficient to reach the goal. Can you tell us anything about what that rather vague statement implies or was about?

**E. Hansen:** I wish I could because I sat there dumbfounded when I heard it myself. The reality of it is – and I don’t know the gentleman at all – but what we’re saying is that the public agenda is for education to move forward in the state of Illinois and everybody be prepared to go out and do things in life successfully and in essence what we’re hearing is that that’s in jeopardy by just everything that’s going on in education, K-12 as well as higher education and the frustration level runs through the gauntlet of the people who sit on these committees are even coming in to deal with it. But I can’t answer that but I will try to get an answer for you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes, Sue?

**S. Willis:** I have kind of a related question in that there is a – this is all referencing a big goal and goal appears in capital letters in a number of places in this report – and I’m – it’s not clear to me, whose goal is this? Where did this goal come from?

**E. Hansen:** This big goal to increase the proportion of Americans with high quality degrees and college credentials to 60% by 2025 evidently has evolved from a formulation of higher education groups across the country. It was just dropped on us as a big goal and higher education needs to prepare these people. Now who authored that, I have absolutely no idea and when you ask that question sometimes the person who’s presenting it doesn’t have any idea where it came from either. I’m regurgitating to you the minutes and things that go it. It doesn’t mean that I comprehend what the hell’s going on sometimes. It’s like quizzing us in here on what’s going on in ???.
S. Willis: And I’m not necessarily opposed to it. It piqued my curiosity.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I hope there are no other questions. Unfortunately, there are.

G. Bennardo: Giovanni Bennardo, Anthropology. It’s not a question; it’s just going back to the previous point about the question by John Minogue. I think the only thing they are referring to here is to make higher education more electronic bound.

TAPE TURNED OVER HERE

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other – Okay, next item.

We just approved the committee memberships and so one of the things that we’ve had a problem with in the past is committee members not showing up for meetings, chairs not staying on top of things and scheduling meetings. You know, we talk a lot about asserting our role, you know, in shared governance. This is the way we do it. We do business through the committees. The committees vet these things, they come back to us. If we’re not meeting, if we’re not, you know, vetting the issues, if we’re not coming up with resolutions, we’re not saying anything; we don’t have anything to say. So, you know, one of my objectives for the Senate is for us to take our rightful place in the shared governance process and that means we need people to come to the meetings, speak up and do the work of the Senate. So I really encourage you to be active. We’re trying to sort of make this a meaningful thing; not a waste of time. In the past people have thought the Senate is sort of a toothless body and not worth going to. It’s my impression that the Senate can be a very powerful body. In the year that I’ve been president I’ve seen that the administration pays attention when the faculty is upset about an issue and so I think that we should not be reluctant to speak up. I think if we don’t share our voice in shared governance then we have nothing to complain about. So I’m really asking you to try and be an active Senate – to attend the committees – chairs please keep your committees together, meet and let’s, you know, do the work that we’re supposed to be doing. So I hope you’ll, you know, do that this year.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Ferald Bryan, Kerry Freedman -report

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next item is the Board of Trustees subcommittee on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel and Kerry Freedman, who has not yet been approved by the University Council in this position but has volunteered to take it (and I’m sure they will approve her). And so she attended the meeting and will give us a report.

K. Freedman: Okay, you’re calling that volunteering? That conversation we had. That’s not what I would call it but anyway.

A. Rosenbaum: I’m giving you credit.

K. Freedman: Okay, so the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee met on August 26. Much of the work was not, you know, just formal work but fortunately they did recognize the Faculty and Staff Professional Excellence awardees so that was really exciting. They got to stand up and we got to clap and so on.

Vice Provost Cassidy discussed the visit from the Higher Learning Commission. This is a visit that they’re making to off-campus sites so there’s not a lot of information there, just that they are going to be coming.
The main point I think that pertains to us has to do with the fact that Dean Dawson of the University Library gave quite an extended presentation. I, in my couple of minutes when I was allowed to speak, I did ask a question having to do with improving communication between the library and the faculty as charged by the Provost and asked if anything had been done on that yet and the answer from the Provost and the Dean was no, nothing had been done on it yet. However – and I’m not sure – I mean I reported this meeting date of September 17 Alan, although that information I actually got from the Dean after the meeting so I just included it in the report. I don’t know if that’s okay to do but after the meeting, because I hadn’t really gotten a lot of information during the meeting, I did ask him if there is a scheduled time when this was going to be addressed and he said yes there was, September 17 there will be a meeting to address the charge by the Provost.

A. Rosenbaum: And again, the Provost today assured me that he’s going to recharge the committee, that’s he’s determined that this will be done and that we will have a satisfactory communication system between the library and the faculty. So they haven’t dropped the issue and we certainly haven’t dropped the issue.

K. Freedman: Okay, and then the final issue was a presentation about grants received by the University. The good news is our grants have increased substantially and most of that gain was through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, questions for Kerry? Yes?

F. Bryan: I want to thank Kerry for being called into service. Normally I would have provided this report but I now have a class that meets at like 9:30 which only gives us a short period of time. This is a last minute change. I will certainly still be attending as much of these meetings as I can at least through – the next meeting will be what, in November – and I appreciate you doing this. Thank you.

K. Freedman: Yup. You’re welcome.

A. Rosenbaum: Well remember also that we have two members of the UAC that attend that so Kerry is going to remain a member even when you’re able to attend those. Okay. And again we get the same people all the time that are volunteering to do these things for us so we’re really trying to enlarge the pool of people that participate.

K. Freedman: And really, Alan is just very convincing. He ???

A. Rosenbaum: Desperate is the word I would use. Okay.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum, Greg Waas - report

A. Rosenbaum: The next report is the one on Finance, Facilities, and Operations. This report was provided by Greg Waas. Greg is not here. I’m not going to bore you by re-presenting that report so you can read it yourselves. I don’t really think it’s terribly exciting but be my guest and if you have any questions about that report. Does anyone have any questions about that report? I might be able to answer them; I was not at the meeting. Okay.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – report (page 29-30)
A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the report on the Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham. Jay is the President of the Operating Staff Council and Todd is the President of the SPS Council so those are the two other councils besides the Faculty Senate and between the three groups we represent all the employees of the University. So I don’t know which, Jay or Todd is presenting – Jay?

J. Monteiro: I’m going to try my hand at it. I’m actually giving the notes for the April 29 meeting. We will have the notes for the August 26 meeting at next month’s Senate meeting. I’m going to try to keep this brief because some of this information is old. If you look at A4, SB642, the borrowing bill was passed and, as we know, that allowed us to borrow into our future tuition monies that were coming in. Luckily, the state has brought us up to date so we’ve not had to do that for this year – for the past fiscal year actually.

If you move down to D, the FY09 University Financial Audit and we were happy to see that there were zero financial audit findings. GR appropriations decreased by $1 million, but NIU saw an increase in net assets of $6 million. So we were able to protect operations and programs in light of the state not funding us and this also shows that our increase in tuitions, the model we were using, was appropriate to cover those costs.

If you move down to E, there was an amendment to the Board of Trustee regulations regarding the Freedom of Information Act for FOIA laws. Previously, all the FOIA requests had gone through Legal Counsel and now they’ve turned that over to the Public Information Office. Legal Counsel will still be available for questions if need be but this way this department has a little more time and they’ll be able to get the FOIA requests done in a five day turnaround.

At the end of the meeting, Dr. Steve Cunningham gave an information presentation on a new organizational structure for the procurement process in the state of Illinois and you can read through that. It’s going to be producing 26 new positions.

That’s pretty much the highlights.


E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report

A. Rosenbaum: As you might have noticed, there are a number of different meetings that are being spoken of here so we have some reports from May 13 Board of Trustees meeting. There was a special Board of Trustees meeting on June 23 and there were the most recent subcommittee meetings on August 26. So, most of these reports are on the August 26 subcommittees. Jay’s report was not. That was on the earlier May 13 meeting and the last one is the Board of Trustees meeting from – report from May 13 and also June 23. So I’ve given you reports on May 13 and June 23. We have not had the Board of Trustees meeting that follows those subcommittees that you’ve been hearing about. So I’m not going to say too much about these because – yes, Abhijit?

A. Gupta: --- on May 13, Item 2(c), it says “approval of a minor in sustainable engineering in EEG.” I’m not sure what EEG stands for. EEG, Item 2(c). What does EEG stand for; I’m not sure.
A. Rosenbaum: Well, I think they mean Engineering and Engineering Technology. I think they mean EET. So I think that’s what that is. We’ll make the correction on that. Okay? EEG is what we should be doing for ??? reports. Okay.

Anyway, the Board of Trustees meetings generally are just a rehash of the subcommittee meetings and so some of the stuff you’ve already heard about. The meeting on May 13 was the standard end-of-the-year meeting. They elect the BOT officers for the coming year and you can see those listed in my report. They’re essentially the same as they are this year. The True North Champaign – they mentioned that the final total was somewhere between $160 and $165 million. The report by President Peters had to do with both the state of the finances at that point which were not really too good because we hadn’t received the money and also honoring Jim Erman and Harold Kafer for their service to the University.

Of import to the faculty, the Board approved the 54 recommendations for promotion and tenure and tenure with promotions. They approved a number of additional programs which you can read for yourself. They appointed La Vonne Neal as Dean of the College of Education effective July 1. They approved the tuition rates for the coming year which includes a 9.5% increase in tuition for the incoming class. As many of you know, they can only change tuition for the incoming class. The law protects that tuition for I think five years for incoming students. So we are not allowed to raise the tuition for incoming tuition which is a source of some concern to the University but by state law.

There was approval of the interim budget and a bond resolution for existing residence hall improvements.

You can read the rest of it. The last item is that the Board honored John Peters for his first ten years as President of NIU and that was a very nice retrospective of his accomplishments and a very warm thank you from the Board to President Peters.

The next item was the special Board of Trustees meeting which was held on June 23. The main interest here is the approval of the first year residence hall ground lease. What’s happening here is the University has determined that one of our biggest problems is our housing supply. They feel that our housing stock is outdated and unattractive to students. The newest at the University is 40 years old. I understand the conditions in the dormitories are not particularly pleasant. The University is trying to remedy that. They are building a freshman facility that will have rooms for 1,000 students. They are doing this not using University money but rather they are leasing the land on the University to this group that is called Collegiate Housing Foundation. They are going to manage the project and they’re going to contract the building of the dormitories. No money will come out of the NIU budget and we will not be floating a bond issue on this one. So this is a special arrangement they’ve made and it’s kind of clever financing and we’re expecting that we’ll have a beautiful new freshman dorm complex and so the Board of Trustees approved that and that’s the main item of business from the June 23 Board of Trustees meeting. Any questions about any of that? No, okay, seeing no questions we will move on.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – report
A. Rosenbaum: We only have one report from the standing committees and Charles we – Charles Cappell will give us a brief, a very brief, report on Academic Affairs. Charles? Microphone.

C. Cappell: I’m speaking into it. Charles Cappell, Sociology, Academic Affairs. We have formed a subcommittee to assess the grading system issue. Professor Steve Martin from Physics is going to chair that subcommittee and we have three volunteers. Still waiting to hear from a couple of other committee members. If you have a particular interest in this and you have information that would be pertinent to this operation, you can forward it to me or Professor Martin and we’ll see that it’s brought into our deliberations.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions? Yes? Name and speak into a mike. Mark, okay. Are we related?

M. Rosenbaum: Maybe like great grandparents. But is the grading council for the + or – this year? Oh, do you need volunteers for that?

C. Cappell: Not on mike. There is a subcommittee --- if you have information about that, please forward it to us.

M. Rosenbaum: Okay, perfect.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other questions?

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

C. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report

D. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jozef Bujarski, Chair – no report

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

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair

A. Rosenbaum: There are no other reports from subcommittees. The next order of business is I will turn the mike over to David Wade who is the chair of Elections and Legislative Oversight. We have a number of elections to go through so David, take it over.

D. Wade: Thank you Alan.

1. Hearing Panel election – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting.

D. Wade: First one is the Hearing Panel election which is the ballot that was before you when you walked in the room. Pick 20 of 34; leave at your station when you’re done.

2. By-lot election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee.

D. Wade: We have to do the Faculty Grievance Committee which requires a selection from our box of names of 15. I’m going to ask Tim Griffin to pick the names. We’ll
read them out. We’ll send an e-mail to the people – the lucky ducks who were selected; 15 total.

Rebecca Houze, Art; Jeff Kowalski, Art; Carl Von Ende, Biological Sciences; Eric Mogren, History; Larry Arnhart, Political Science; Brian May, English; Steven Martin, Physics; Abhijit Gupta, Mechanical Engineering; Brad Sagarin, Psychology; Teresa Fischer, Counseling Adult and Higher Education; Rick Poole, Theatre and Dance; Jana Brubaker, University Libraries; Lisa Yamagata-Lynch, Educational Technology, Research and Assessment; Kryssi Staikidis, Art; and, last but not least, Karen Brandt, Nursing and Health Studies. Congratulations to all the winners.

A. Rosenbaum: We already have cases pending so you can expect to draw sometime in the very near future.

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

D. Wade: The next one is election of University Council alternates. This is done by colleges so as I call your college, if you could raise your hand I’ll give you a ballot.

A. Rosenbaum: Dave you’ve got one on the other side.

A. Rosenbaum: Behind you.

4. Election of two members to serve one-year terms on the University Judicial Advisory Board (removed from agenda).

5. Nomination of two faculty members to serve as at-large members on the Unity in Diversity Steering Committee – nominations from the floor.

D. Wade: That brings us to the next page which is the nomination of two faculty members to serve as at-large members on the Unity in Diversity Steering Committee. My understanding is that J.D. Bowers and David Valentiner might be willing to continue their service.

J.D. Bowers: I have to step down.

D. Wade: Okay. David isn’t here so we can’t – can we dragoon ---

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I can’t guarantee that. He was willing a couple of months ago. I don’t know if he’s changed his mind. Brad, do you have any idea? Brad will dragoon him into it.

D. Wade: Well, we need to pick two members.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so we need at least one other nominee. Is there anyone who’s interested in serving. Why don’t we try that? Sue?

D. Wade: The meeting meets approximately monthly based on committee members’ availability so it’s fairly flexible in time.
A. Rosenbaum: You’re interested? Good. Anyone else. Okay. Good. Now I don’t think we have to vote on this; this is just nominees. So we just need the names. So Sue that’s great and we’ll see if we can get David to do it.

6. Nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee (removed from agenda)

D. Wade: That completes our business.

A. Rosenbaum: You can just leave the ballots on the table. We’ll pick them up later.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Rosenbaum: Next item. We have no unfinished business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Ohio University resolution on the Sustainability of Intercollegiate Athletics – (p. 31-33)

A. Rosenbaum: We do have one item of new business which is an interesting item. You have all got in your packets a letter that was sent to us by the Ohio University Senate. This has to do with the feasibility of funding intercollegiate athletics in times of financial hardship. I really did not have any idea as to how our athletic program is financed. I always assumed the money did not come out of our general revenue and that the University did not subsidize athletics out of our budget. That may not be correct. It appears at least from the material that is published in USA Today poll that NIU subsidizes the athletic program to the tune of $3.2 million or so out of the general revenue fund. There’s also about $7 million that comes out of I think student fees. I also have to tell you that I am not certain that the figures that are posted by the USA Today are accurate. They didn’t come to us from the University. They came from USA Today. I’m not sure about them. They’re also from 2008 so they’re not the most recent figures.

So the question here is the University, excuse me, Ohio University Senate a resolution questioning whether or not this is a reasonable way to spend money. I think – I’ve heard many faculty talk about the idea that coaches on athletic teams are often the highest paid employees of the University. Many faculty feel that that’s inappropriate. There are faculty who enjoy athletics and think it’s an important part of the educational process. There are also faculty who believe that the University shouldn’t be in the business of big time athletics and so I don’t know where this faculty stands.

The Ohio University Senate asked that this be distributed to the other senates at least in the MAC and so I have put that on our docket for Senate discussion. We can decide that we’re fine the way things are. We can decide to give it to a committee and have them really take a close look at this and find out how much money is being spent on athletics and whether that money is coming out of funds that could be used for other things. For example, educational purposes, faculty raises, travel – I don’t know. So I think this is a legitimate question. If we are interested in pursuing this, then we will and we can either give it to committee, we can discuss it, we can do anything you’d like so you have the letter from Ohio University. You have the resolution and the Blackboard web site I posted the Inside Higher Education, as I said before, link. I’ve been told that it doesn’t quite work for some people. So, I don’t know but if you look at that footnote, #2, on that Ohio
University resolution, you can just Google *Inside Higher Education* and the name of that article and it will come up and then you can – there’s a link within that article to the *USA Today* database and you can put in Northern Illinois University and the most recent year which they have which is 2008 and you can see the figures that *USA Today* is posting. So I would recommend that you do that and we can decide either today or we can think about this and decide at our next meeting whether we want to give this to a committee, whether we want to talk about it or whether we’re happy with the way things are. So, I’ll open the floor if anyone has any questions or comments about this. Pat?

**P. Henry:** I think one of the things that occurred to me also was that the amount of fees that are charge to students are a continuing hardship I think as far as the financial feasibility of going to school here, so I think that’s an important issue that needs to be considered as well.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes and, in fact, I got a kick out of the sign that’s on Lucinda that says that student tickets to athletic events are free. So it’s – it’s free but, you’re right, student athletic fees are paying for that. Okay? Any other questions about this or comments? Brigid?

**B. Lusk:** I totally agree with you in sports. I’m not interested in it myself personally but I think a huge component is the amount of alumni dollars that it brings back to the University and so I think any review of this matter should also look at why do we do it and I think it’s a huge financial benefit to the University and also it’s a huge benefit in getting students here. If we have a good team or whatever, students come to NIU so I think a report should also reflect that benefit of it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Comments? I see some in the back there.

**G. Kapperman:** This is Gaylen Kapperman. I am not quite certain what students actually pay for athletic fees. Does anyone here know?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I don’t. Anyone know? We can get that information certainly. All of the information that we want is available to us; we can get it. Okay? Question in the back, go ahead. Need a mike. It won’t work. It won’t get on the tape; we need the tape.

**M. Fischer:** Mark Fischer substituting for Jay Stravers and I guess my comment is just that I wonder, particularly based on your comment, that you’re not sure how accurate those figures are, whether or not it would be worthwhile to give the administration an opportunity to give us some information. It would help us if they’d make some task force to do all this stuff but I think it might be useful just to say find out, what are the fees, what does the University see as the funding model before we start making decisions or all kinds of discussion regarding an article that was published in *USA Today* and a couple of other places.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well it’s actually a data base so again, that’s a perfectly legitimate comment. The other possibility that we have here is we could ask Jeff Compher to come to the Senate and give us the actual information. He’s the Director of Athletics so we could ask Jeff to tell us exactly what this is costing and where the money comes from and how it’s spent. So if the Senate is of a mind to invite Jeff, I’ll be happy to do that but we can certainly get the information. Mark. Give Mark a mike. You need a mike.

**M. Rosenbaum:** I think the question we should ask is just what is our return on investment. I think that’s the key question because I think athletics and housing and student retention, they’re connected; there’s a correlation there so, I mean, do I think their coaches are overpaid – I’m not going to even answer that. But, make as much as you want – really what is your return on investment and what can we – is there a tangible return on investment and also intangible. Its
component is how much student retention is necessary because we have the homecoming events because we have a sense of community. Um – the dorms – I hear students complaining about the dorms all the time. You look at the retention rate – your parents are here on a student visit, you look at the state of the dorms, you look at the athletic department, you look at the student rec – well actually, that’s beautiful now – but --- the question I would love to ask is return on investment.

A. Rosenbaum: Um-huh and I certainly think that’s a good question and if we send it to committee they would look into that. The only data that I’ve been able to get from the University or the only information in regards to that is they will tell you that alumni giving goes up when you have a winning team. It does not say what happens when you have a losing team or when your team is not the champion. So, for those years that you happen to win, it brings out the donations. But if you’re a team that loses more often than you win, I don’t know if that helps you very much in that regard. So, again, if we decide we want more information, one way to do this is to give it to a committee and let that committee look into it and determine whether or not they think – they can find data to address some of these questions. They’re good questions. Yes?

S. Willis: Yes, Sue Willis, and just in terms of full disclosure here, I’m partly wearing my hat as the mother of an NIU freshman and so I’m paying some of these fees; but in any case, information about the detailed breakdown of where the student fees go you can find on the NIU web site if you go and look under tuition and fees it tells you what those are. I would be curious – I spent six years at the University of Oklahoma before I came here many years ago and football, in particular, but also other sports are a much bigger business at Oklahoma even than they are here and I heard there all these statements about alumni and giving and all this kind of stuff too but I would be curious to know, if we do look into this, is how targeted that giving is because if a winning football team or a sports team induces alumni to give money that’s targeted towards athletics, I’m not sure how much, you know, that’s nice but I’m not sure how much good it does the rest of the University so I think we need to be a little purposeful in how we look at all this. I would like us to look at it in more detail.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments? Is there a sentiment then that we want to give this to a committee? Well, I guess we should just – do we have to take a vote on that?

F. Bryan: It should be a vote to refer to committee.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, well one question is which committee we give it to. We actually don’t have a committee on sort of University affairs so the one that seems to come the closest is Resource, Space and Budget I would guess. Anyone have any thoughts – yes, Pat?

P. Henry: I don’t know if it would fit under Economic Status of the Profession? That would be my second guess.

A. Rosenbaum: Yeah, I don’t know – does it affect our economic status – I don’t know. Jeff, do you have a thought? Where do you want it to go? Go ahead.

J. Kowaski: Yeah, I would move that we refer this issue to Resources, Space and Budget.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, do we have a second? Okay, we have two seconds. Okay. All in favor – oh wait, we have the seconds. Any discussion? Okay. Call the question. All in favor of referring this issue to Resources, Space and Budget for further examination signify by saying aye. Any opposition? All right, the motion passes. We will send it to Resources, Space and Budget. Joseph, you have another item on your table. Okay. That completes our new business.
XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Do we have any comments or questions from the floor? Okay. Yes, Jan?

J. Rintala: I sit on the Senate ex-officio as the faculty athletic representative and I would just request if it’s okay with the Resources, Space and Budgets that I sit on that ex-officio because I think I’ve got some insight that may help.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we can leave that up to Resources, Space and Budgets to decide if they would like you to do that. Okay.

J. Rintala: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: One more thing, I’ll take a show of hands. Does anyone want me to invite Jeff Compher to come and give us some information or do you want to leave that to Resources, Space and Budgets first? Anyone who wants to have him come in and speak next week – next meeting if he can come – show of hands. Otherwise – all right, show of hands – who wants him to come to the next meeting. We got a count? What have we got? I didn’t have my hand up no. 16? All opposed? If you say opposed we’ll leave it with Resources, Space and Budgets to discuss it with Jeff. Opposed? Okay. So 16/15. All right, I will talk to Jeff about coming in and answering some questions for us. It can’t hurt. All right, if there’s no other comments or questions – Pat?

P. Henry: Items that we want to bring forward, do you want us to just e-mail you with these?

A. Rosenbaum: You can do that.

P. Henry: Okay.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. 2010-2011 meeting schedule (p. 34)
B. Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, April 26, 2010
C. Athletic Board meeting minutes, April 21, 2010
D. Operating Staff Council meeting minutes, May 6, 2010
E. Operating Staff Council meeting minutes, June 3, 2010
F. Operating Staff Council meeting minutes, July 1, 2010
G. Operating Staff Council meeting minutes, August 23, 2010
H. Undergraduate Coordinate Council meeting minutes, April 1, 2010
I. Annual Report – Academic Planning Council
J. Annual Report – Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
K. Annual Report – Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
L. Annual Report – Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor
M. Annual Report – Graduate Council
N. Annual Report – University Assessment Panel
O. Annual Report – University Council Personnel Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.