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I. CALL TO ORDER

A. ROSENBAUM: Why don't we come to order so that we can try and get through the meeting in a reasonable amount of time.

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

One announcement before I introduce Jeff Compfer. We are trying a different form of transcribing. We actually have someone who is a court reporter and will be transcribing our minutes for us. So it's especially important since this is a new person for you to please state your name when you speak so we'll have it both on the digital disk and so she will also have it in her notes. So I know I warn you about this every time, but we still tend to forget. So please try to remember to state your name.

Next small item, and that is some of you are aware that we have a Blackboard Community for the Senate. Many of you have not visited it. I would like to encourage you to do that. We would like ultimately to put the minutes, the agenda and any item of business that we'd like for you to consider in advance on that Blackboard web site, and we'll save some trees and hopefully it will be a better way to communicate. So we did post some stuff, we sent out announcements, we took the recommendation that was made last time, so whenever we post something on Blackboard, we do send out an email.

Some of you may just be reading the email and not going to the Blackboard site. I also opened a discussion board, and so far nobody has discussed anything. So there is a discussion board there, and you can either start a thread if you want to or you can say anything you like. And we have been following the policy of only having Faculty Senate access to it, so nobody who is not on the
Faculty Senate can get into that web site. We have not given any access. So you have, I guess, not complete privacy because we have no way of knowing whether someone on the Senate will share something that you said, but at least you know it was someone on the Senate that shared something that you said and not somebody else getting into the Senate community. So somebody start a thread or say something or give us some feedback.

To encourage you, I have posted a survey. It's under information. The survey will inquire as to whether you prefer the individually-wrapped cookies that we have been having for the past two meetings or the loose cookies baked by Food Service that we have had for the past couple of years. We originally made the transition because Food Service raised their prices, and in protest we switched to packaged cookies, but we have had some feedback that the packaged cookies are inferior and especially that we don't have those nice chocolate ones with the white chips. So majority will rule on this, and for the next meeting we will either continue with the individually-wrapped cookies or we'll go back to the Food Service cookies. So, please, go to Blackboard and vote, and while you're there, look around and maybe make a comment on the discussion board. Okay. Enough said.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. ROSENBAUM: The first item that we have is, of course, the adoption of the agenda. We have a couple of added items. One is Earl's report on the FAC to the IBHE. This is a walk-in item. We also have a walk-in item which is the report on the Board of Trustees meeting from September 16th, and that will be given by Todd Latham. Todd, you may recall, is the President of the SPS Council. We also have an updated report from Resources, Space and Budget, and Todd will also, I believe, be addressing the updated report from Resources, Space and Budget. So you have a report from Resources, Space and Budget in your packets, but you don't have the updated report from Resources, Space and Budget, and so that was the walk-in.

I need a motion to accept the agenda.

A. LASH: So moved.

A. ROSENBAUM: Who moved it?

A. LASH: Ayhan Lash.


III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 FS MEETING

A. ROSENBAUM: Next, approval of the minutes from the September 1st Faculty Senate meeting. These were sent to you electronically. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

J. NOVAK: So moved.
A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Second? Okay, Sue Willis. Any corrections, changes, omissions, something you would like to see omitted? Grammatical mistakes? That's it, read it now. Don't read it like when we send them electronically. Take your time, we have all day. No comments? All right. All in favor of accepting the minutes as written, aye. Any opposed? Minutes are accepted.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Intercollegiate Athletics – Jeff Compher – presentation

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Consistent with the request that the Senate made at the last meeting, we have invited the Associate Vice President and Director of Athletics, Jeff Compher, to inform us about the funding of intercollegiate athletics at Northern Illinois University. He's going to give us a brief presentation, and then we'll open the floor for questions. So, Jeff, it's your floor. Do you need a microphone?

J. COMPHER: I guess.

A. ROSENBAUM: You're welcome to come up here and stand in the middle.

J. COMPHER: First of all, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here, Dr. Rosenbaum. This is the first time I have been able to come before this group, and I appreciate the opportunity. There's some people here that I want to introduce, some of whom you are very familiar with, some of whom you may not be. First of all is Janaan Mickey who works with me in my office, and she is my assistant. Debra Boughton to my left here is my Associate AD for Business Affairs. Christian Spears in the back is my Senior Associate AD for administration. Jan Rintala, who is our faculty athletic representative and a member of this group. Terry Bishop, who is our Chair of the Athletic Board, and Paul Bower, who is the Chair of the Budget Subcommittee on the Athletic Board. It's good to know that you have representation on our athletic board. I just wanted to point out who those members are that work with you each and every day.

Okay. If you will, since many of you may not know a lot about our department, I would like to ask your indulgence on a few kind of background slides to let you know kind of who we are. First of all, we are an intercollegiate athletics program made up of 17 sports, seven men, seven women. There are 12 institutions in the Mid-American Conference. We have 130 staff members in our department, and there are 407 student athletes.

Many organizations have a mission statement. Our mission statement is to develop champions in the classroom, in competition and in life. And I would like to kind of let you know how we're doing in those areas. First of all, as far as our academic success, you can see for ten straight semesters our teams have had a 3.0 GPA or better. 188 of our student athletes have earned a GPA of 3.0 or higher, and actually ten of them have a 4.0. All 17 of our sports programs have exceeded the academic standards set by the NCAA as measured by a relatively new measurement that has come out, and that's our academic progress rate, APR. In particular, one sport has done very, very well, and that's our football program, and how they have done, as you see, we rank in the top ten in the country as far as APR ranking goes. When you look at the company that we're in, of those
twelve schools, I believe seven are private schools, and the other schools are very highly ranked public institutions in our country. It's good company to be in, and I think as we continue to make progress in this area, we could even move up in these rankings I'm very proud to say.

Then as far as graduation goes, this past year 89 student athletes graduated. And this is something that I really like, 93 percent of the student athletes who complete their eligibility, that means they played four years out of a five-year period, they will graduate from NIU. percent. That's an excellent rate. And the NCAA also has a relatively new measurement called GSR, graduation success rate, and we rose that up from 81 to 82 percent, and we exceed the national average, which is 79 percent.

So I think we're doing quite well academically. In competition we're doing very well. We have several student athletes that were recognized either through NCAA individual competitions that they participated in or received national and regional publications recognition, and those student athletes are noted there. And then many of our teams did well. This is last year, so you'll see right here it was – in football, this was actually at Purdue. We could actually put another slide up there that talks about our latest victory over Minnesota where we actually had three Big 10 victories, too, in the last two years, which is also a really good thing to have for us in our program. We're very proud of that. Our men's soccer team continues to do well. Our volleyball team has only lost two matches over the course of the year, and they are doing great. If you haven't been to a match, I really encourage you to come out. Softball continues to do well and make progress, and our gymnastics team does that as well.

Then in life, what we try and do is get our student athletes involved as much as possible, and you can see here over 8,000 hours of service, an increase of 3,000 hours from the year before, and we actually participated in 50 different community service projects over the course of the year, many of which are brought to us from the teams and student athletes themselves.

So now we can get into some of the information that you were looking for, and one of the questions that Alan asked me as we began this was, you know, are the figures that were put out in a recent article -- and I think you all received a letter from the Faculty Senate, from the Ohio University Faculty Senate -- are those figures correct? And to our knowledge they are correct. I'd like to point out that we don't know what went into all of those figures, but from what we know from our end, our numbers are correct, and what I thought I would do to start off originally is to kind of tell you what -- you know, how do we compare to the rest of the university budget. As you can see, we have a total university budget revenue-wise of $490 million. Of that, roughly $20 million is with athletics, which really comes out to a percentage of about four percent of the total university revenue.

And as you think about that, I will note that we have excluded foundation funding. We'll come back to that in a second because I want to -- I want to just relate that at this point, but when you're comparing apples to apples, it's important to note that the dollars that we're showing here does not include that kind of funding. So, okay, then when you look at our athletics budget, you'll see here, some of you are quick mathematicians, and you'll see that these two numbers add up to more than what we showed you on the previous slide. The reason is that because we actually spend some of our foundation dollars directly in athletics. We've put those figures in there so you can actually see
what that is, but when you think about direct institutional support dollars, those dollars that come directly from the university and those dollars normally come in either salary dollars from the State or with tuition waivers that we get for our student athletes, it's 17 percent of our total budget.

Now when you look at what Ohio has, and this is what we're going to get to in the next slide, Ohio's number is 64 percent direct institutional funding. And if I'm on their Faculty Senate, I'm probably asking questions, too. What is it about their system that's different than ours, and how are their numbers different than our numbers? So as we look at that, I can tell you that the biggest difference is our fee structure that we have for all of our students at our university, and I wanted to kind of explain how that fee structure works with you and how that process begins each and every year. So, Janaan, if you would, please.

It begins in September. It's -- there is a fee committee made up of students and staff. Then those committees review all the student fees, including the athletic fee. They make recommendations to the President, either to increase or decrease fees, and then following a full review with the student leadership and also the President, then those fees are recommended back to the Board of Trustees for final approval. That's the process that we use. What we found out a little bit and some of it is a little anecdotal, at Ohio, what they do is they have a fee from the university, but the students don't vote on how that money -- they don't have a say in how that money is distributed. Here at NIU, our students do have a say on how that money is distributed, so we do derive student fees. That is not part of that direct institutional support though that I pointed out earlier.

And then finally, as we talked about, one of the other questions that Dr. Rosenbaum talked about was, what are some of the values that athletics may bring through maybe Alumni giving or support or those kinds of things. Well, this is a very -- Kathy Buettner and her group just did a survey. Almost 800 people were surveyed this past year over the last six months, and in that survey of current faculty, staff, current students, prospective students, parents, alumni and guidance counselors in the area, all six groups consistently ranked Division I athletics as a positive and important component of student life here on our campus at NIU. I think we do bring a lot to the table. When you start trying to compare dollars and funding models, sometimes it's difficult to kind of peel back the layers of the onion and really feel like how one university does it isn't the same as another university, and we're not unlike many institutions that I've worked at, at previous places, but I think Ohio's model is a little bit different than most.

So, Alan, that's my quick overview, and I'll be happy to ask or entertain any questions you may have.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Let's begin. Remember to say your name into the thing as we go.

G. BENNARDO: Giovanni Bennardo, Anthropology. Now my question is not from your presentation, but thank you for coming here to share everything with us. Second, I didn't understand, maybe I just missed it, but the student fee for athletics is part of those $4 million that you mentioned or not?
J. COMPHER: No, it is not part of that amount. In fact, Janaan, will you go back and pull that back up for me? Yeah, of that 70 percent, the student fee is not included in that. It's -- our student fee is a little bit -- let's see, exactly $7.7 million from student fees.

G. BENNARDO: Thank you.

A. ROSENBAUM: What does that work out per student roughly?

J. COMPHER: Well, I can tell you that -- what's the rate per credit hour?

J. MICKEY: Right now $18.88.

J. COMPHER: Eighteen eighty-eight per credit hour currently.

A. ROSENBAUM: Everything requires math. Give us a figure.

J. COMPHER: Of all of the student fees, we are at roughly 24 percent of all of the fees collected for students.

A. ROSENBAUM: Other questions? Sue?

S. WILLIS: Sue Willis from Physics. First just to clarify, so the $7 million from student fees is part of the $17 million that appears there?

J. COMPHER: No.

S. WILLIS: So it's extra on top of all of this.

J. COMPHER: It's part of the 17, not the --

S. WILLIS: It is part of the 17.

J. COMPHER: $17 million, not 17 percent.

S. WILLIS: Right, it's part of the $17 million.

J. COMPHER: Sorry, it's kind of confusing with those two figures there.

S. WILLIS: Okay. Then the other question I had was that you quoted a couple of different graduation rates, one for students who had completed their eligibility and one called the graduation success rate. We have this graduation rate that is mandated by some federal agency or other where we look at incoming freshmen and we see how many of them are graduated after four, five, six years.

J. COMPHER: Right.
S. WILLIS: Do you have that figure for us?

J. COMPHER: That's the federal graduation rate, and that's computed over a six-year period. I don't have that. I don't know, Jan, do you remember what that is?

J. RINTALA: Jan Rintala. We are consistently higher for student athletes, above the student population who are not student athletes, and I can bring out a history of that, but we are consistently higher by several percentage points on the federal graduation rate. What the graduation success rate takes into effect, as you know, Sue, the federal rate doesn't account for transfer students, either those who leave in good academic standing or those who come in to our institution. The GSR the NCAA puts together does take those students into account, so it looks at those students for whom you are actually responsible, and that's where we get those 82, 84 percent graduation rates.

S. WILLIS: I would be happier if we used the GSR for the rest of the university as well.

J. COMPHER: I know. It's a much fairer rate because students leave in good academic standing, go on to other institutions and graduate. Those students aren't even counted in the federal rate.

S. WILLIS: I know that.

J. COMPHER: So it's difficult.

S. WILLIS: It's just that it would be nice to be comparing the same number even if it's a flawed number.

J. RINTALA: I will bring the data on the federal rates to the next meeting, Sue.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Brigid.

B. LUSK: Brigid Lusk. You probably don't have these figures, but is there any way that you can tell us how important athletics are to bringing in alumni dollars to the university?

J. COMPHER: Yeah, we've talked about that a lot. I think there's a couple different measures you can use for that. First of all, anecdotally, if you go back and you listen to Bob Burk, who was the former Director of Admissions here, he talked about our best years of applications were when we had good football seasons, and he spoke about that quite often and used that a lot in making presentations about how important that is for us. So that's one thing. But I think if you look at a game day for us, if you look at away games for us and other trips, many of the colleges buy tickets for our events, our football games and our basketball games, and host people during those events. They are using athletics as a way to entertain former students and alumni and others, and they use it quite well, and we're very proud of that. We want there to be that kind of synergy between the academic and athletic community. Whether I can point to a particular figure and say, well, we've won a championship and therefore our alumni dollars have gone up, you know, there are example of that other places, but, you know, here at NIU, I would like to speak more about that, I don't have that as a real number. But I can only suspect that it certainly would help us, but I can't give you a number on that.
A. ROSENBAUM: Pat.

P. HENRY: Pat Henry, Foreign Languages. I think some of us have concern about the size of the fee and that that impacts the students pretty directly. And I appreciate knowing that they do have some input into this, but to what extent has this been rising over the years? Do you have some sense of that in terms of the percentage or the dollar amount that students pay?

J. COMPHER: First of all, I like to say that I'm a junior this year, so I'm in my third year, so I don't have a long history here to give you, but I can say that that rate did go up last year, but one of the things to kind of keep in perspective on that is every time tuition rises, every time other fees rises, our costs go up because of our scholarships that are associated within our budget. So as the university costs go up, our budget has to keep pace with that. And so there are some kind of unintended consequences of raising tuition and other things that actually come back to affect athletics. So what we've tried to do is match whatever those increases are with the dollars that we can use from student fees in order to offset those increases.

B. CRIPE: Brad Cripe, Accountancy. How much of your budget here represents scholarships for students? How much of this money do you use to provide scholarships to student athletes?

J. COMPHER: It's roughly 24 percent. I can give you an exact.

B. CRIPE: That's fine. Thank you.

A. ROSENBAUM: Accountancy, I thought we were going to go right after this. Okay. I just have a question. The $3.5 million or so that comes as direct institutional support, you had sort of indicated that most of that was salary and scholarship?

J. COMPHER: Right.

A. ROSENBAUM: Is all of it salary and scholarship, or what exactly is in that amount?

J. COMPHER: Well, most of it is -- let's see here. Of that amount, of the $3.5 million in direct institutional support, over half of this amount is for student tuition waivers. So, half of it is for tuition. The other half is for positions in our department. Our compliance office in operation, for instance, isn't funded through athletics. It's funded by the university. So we do have salary dollars in that mix as well.

A. ROSENBAUM: Is anything else in that mix? I mean, does it pay for anything else?

J. COMPHER: Is there any other 02 dollars in there? That's the majority of it as I understand it, Alan.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Charles.
C. CAPPELL: Charles Cappell, Sociology. Are there any sports that are revenue neutral, revenue possible -- or positive that could sustain themselves without any infusion, such as football or basketball? And, secondly, part of it is a revenue question that might concern the academic faculty, but it's also the academic culture at NIU, and I wonder if you could comment on how the Athletic Department tries to foster an academic intellectual culture here.

J. COMPHER: Right. Let me answer your second question first, if you will. Hopefully, with the success that we have enjoyed either through graduation or from our academic performance, what we're trying to do is all three of our mission statements, and that's really create an environment where academics is as important as athletics, and participation in life lessons and life experiences is as important. Those are the three things we concentrate on. And I really believe that from our coaches, from the student athletes we recruit, to the support that we provide student athletes, to the expectations that we have of them and the kinds of monitoring that we do with our student athletes, we try and build that kind of academic culture and create a responsibility around our student athletes. The fact that our teams have had a 3.0 for now ten straight semesters is something that they feel pretty proud about, and they want to continue that. And when you think of the company that we're keeping with our APR nationally in football and what that means from a recruiting perspective, as well as a university community, that means a lot to us. So I believe that they go hand in hand for us. You know, I'm one of these guys that believes you can have it all, that you don't have to sacrifice academically for athletic success, and I believe our coaches and our administration feels that as well. So that's what we're shooting for is an appropriate balance, something that says this is possible to do it the right way and succeed in both.

And your first question really talked about whether or not any of our programs are revenue neutral or would they sustain themselves without other support. No, I don't think they would.

A. ROSENBAUM: Jeff.

J. KOWALSKI: Jeff Kowalski. It occurred to me that perhaps possibly related to questions of academic environment might be sort of the size, scope and sort of outcomes for individual athletes in an athletic program, and in that light could you give us some idea, you know, what percentage of NIU athletes, for example, go on to play sort of professional sports after leaving NIU, because I think that bears on that question to some degree.

J. COMPHER: It does to a certain extent. You know, nationally that rate is between one and two percent anywhere you go. So of our 400 student athletes, very few will go on to play professionally. If you're familiar with that NCAA commercial that's out there, you know, they all go on to be professionals, just not in their sport. And that's really what it's about for us as well. I mean, what we want to do is position them so that they have opportunities for careers in other areas, but, you know, last year we had -- two years ago Larry English was, you know, one of our football players, a premier player in our conference, was the highest draft pick we have ever had out of NIU, and so he is now playing with San Diego. But we do have those. We have some actually in baseball, we have some in soccer, and we have some in football.

A. ROSENBAUM: Jim. You need a mic. Someone pass it over.
J. CORWIN:  Jim Corwin from Psychology.  One of the questions that I had is over the course of time has the percentage of support that goes directly to students been roughly the same?  I guess what I'm trying to get at here is the amount of this money that's used, for example, for administration as opposed to dollars that are going directly to student benefits, scholarships, etc. Has the level of administrative costs remained fairly consistent over the years, or has it grown in percentage to student support?

J. COMPHER:  I think it's been pretty consistent over the years.  I don't have a longitudinal look at that.  We could certainly put that together.  But we haven't had many operational increases, whether administratively or in our individual sports, for quite some time.  So most of our increases come from scholarships or when there is mandated salary increases and other things that we have.

A. ROSENBAUM:  So the staffing has stayed pretty constant, there haven't been addition of assistant coaches and assistant vice presidents and all of that?

J. COMPHER:  No, I don't think there's been any additional assistant vice presidents in our area, but we have had -- we're fully staffed as far as, you know, many of our assistant coaches are actually graduate students. They are not full-time staff. So we do have that, but those numbers have remained fairly constant over the last few years.

A. ROSENBAUM:  Okay.  Nancy.

N. CASTLE:  Nancy Castle, Allied Health & Communicative Disorders.  Could you talk a little bit about where we stand in terms of Title IX, I notice we have more women's sports than men's, and how that affects us in terms of expenses?

J. COMPHER:  Yes.  In fact, some of those tuition waivers are a direct result of Title IX legislation in the state that enables us to provide waivers for gender equity purposes, so that helps from our perspective.  We do have more women's sports than we do have men's. When you have football with roughly 105 student athletes, that creates kind of a tough balance to try and capture. So we -- and you may remember a few years ago the university got rid of swimming, and since that time we have added women's soccer and also women's track, field and cross country back, so we're trying to build back our women's sports programs and opportunities.  We are still in the process of reviewing Title IX requirements, and this year, in fact, we'll be doing a survey of current students here on our campus and potentially incoming students to assess whether or not our Athletics Department at NIU meets their interests and abilities and whether or not we should look at adding another women's sport.  So we're constantly looking at that, you have to, and that's something that we should be doing anyway.  So I'm excited to get the results of that survey that we'll be doing this year.

A. ROSENBAUM:  One more question.  Jim?

J. CORWIN:  I think it's great that students are doing so well in terms of graduation rate, etc. I'm just curious, what does it cost for a student – I mean, obviously these students work very hard as a part of the athletic program, a lot of community type things that they have to do, but what does it
cost to get a 3.0 out of an athlete, for example, as opposed to a 3.0 for a student who is paying tuition, and how much more attention are they getting as far as tutoring, etc., etc.?

J. COMPHER: I don't know that I have ever done a cost analysis on that, what those expenses are, but we do have academic support services for student athletes that does monitor students, especially those that are at risk, and many of those are coming in as freshmen. As you know, most freshman are at risk in one way or another, and so we actually monitor those pretty carefully at first. Those who have a certain GPA or below we continue to monitor throughout their time and work with to ensure that they have tutors and other services, and so there is a cost associated with that, but I haven't looked at that as kind of a cost/benefit analysis to see what it cost versus -- a 3.0 for a student athlete versus a 3.0 for a regular student on our campus. But, I will say that many of the tutorial services and other academic services that we utilize are provided for all students, and it's run out of our Provost office, so I feel good about that in that I believe that we're accessing those at maybe a greater percentage rate than other students are because we do have a bit of a carrot there to say that, you know, we need you to do well, and it helps with things like academic progress rate and other rates to have that.

T. BISHOP: Terry Bishop. I would like to piggyback on that, and as chair of the Athletic Board, I oversaw a subcommittee. We went through NCAA recertification in the last couple of years, and I was subcommittee chair overseeing the evaluation of those student support services. And I want to reinforce the point that most of the services that student athletes use are available to all students. Rather than reinvent the wheel and have -- you know, that's not where the expertise lies in counseling and student tutorial services and so forth. So we do have staff in the Athletic Department that helps identify those resources, work with the student athletes. I also want to point out that the spectrum of student athletes is reflective of the students that we have throughout the rest of the institution. We have a lot of self-service students, if you will, that are student athletes that, you know, really don't use those resources a whole lot. They are capable of balancing their activities, managing their curriculum and their degree program pursuit. We have some that utilize those services and, as Jeff mentioned, are, quote, unquote, at risk, and more intensive services are provided to them, or at least attention, and they are steered to those resources on campus, you know. And, again, the focus hasn't always been just maintaining their eligibility. I have been proud of my association with athletics that the focus is on them completing their degrees ultimately and successfully graduating and doing well academically. It's not a rush to get them eligible and then, you know, cast them aside when they go on through their eligibility cycle and they are no longer useful to us. So I have been proud of the balance and focus on them as students first and athletes as a complimentary activity.

A. ROSENBAUM: Sounds like we should apply the Athletic Department model to the rest of the student body.

J. COMPHER: You know, we are able to do things more individualistic that I think helps someone get from freshman year to graduation, and we monitor that probably more closely than most students have that opportunity.

A. ROSENBAUM: Right. I said that was the last question, but all right, Charles, one question, short.
C. CAPPELL: Quick comment and a question. Charles Cappell again. I appreciated your comparison with Ohio University, their revenue structure.

J. COMPHER: Right.

C. CAPPELL: I suggest it would also be very informative to extend that to all the MAC schools, and if you are going to submit a brief report to the Senate, that would be very helpful.

J. COMPHER: Sure, we could do that. (NCAA Revenue Analysis-MAC provided following meeting.)

C. CAPPELL: And the second question is, while according to your data only maybe $10 million of direct institutional support plus student fees is kind of going from money that could be allocated to academic purpose, if it wasn't going to the athletic department seems a pretty small percentage comparatively, it's still $10 million, and I'm wondering if you have any models or any thoughts on how that level of support can be reduced over the years with an alternative revenue generating source that makes you more self-sufficient.

J. COMPHER: Well, we really have two ways to generate more dollars. It comes down to selling more tickets and raising more money. That's it from our perspective. Therefore, it's -- would we like to either hold the current student fee where it is or reduce that fee over time? Sure, we would. But at the same time we're trying do what we can to raise additional dollars and to sell more tickets and do more things so that we can drive revenue ourselves, and it's very important for us. We don't want to be an anchor to the academic community. That's not what we're about. What we're about is hopefully enhancing the academic community in some way and allowing athletics to be a viable part of the institutional and educational experience, and hopefully it's a value-added part of our students' experience as well. So, yeah, would we like to raise more dollars and reduce that fee? We would, and we're going to try and continue to do that.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. I want to thank you very much for coming on behalf of the Senate, and we also have our Committee on Resources, Space and Budget that is looking into this as well, and so hopefully if they have additional questions, that you will be as forthcoming with them.

J. COMPHER: Sure.

A. ROSENBAUM: So thank you very much.

J. COMPHER: Thank you.

A. ROSENBAUM: I just met with President Peters earlier today, and he wanted me to tell you that he is working almost exclusively on the Vision 2020 Plan that he talked about in his State of the University address and then reiterated at University Council. He also wants you to know that he is going to be coming to the Senate. He is going to be coming to the Senate because his plan is to really listen to all of the different groups in the university regarding their thoughts on the benchmarks that we should be setting for the university, and so although he did not give me a
specific date, he wants me to tell you that he is coming for a visit, and he voted for the loose cookies when he comes. If Northern Star is here, please -- no, don't mention it.

**B. Graduate School Dean Search** – Alan Rosenbaum – Pages 3-5

The next item we have is item B on the President's Announcements, and that is the Graduate School Dean search. Just to give you a little background on this, the Graduate Dean is a relatively new position here at NIU. It used to be combined with the Vice President for Research. When Dr. Bose left, the position was split. Jim Erman took the Vice President of Research position, and Bradley Bond became the Interim Dean of the Graduate School. When Lisa Freeman was hired as the Vice President for Research, she was given the option of recombining those two positions as they were before Dr. Bose left, and she decided that she would prefer to keep the position split, and so she will retain the Vice President for Research position and is looking to initiate a search for a new Graduate Dean. You have seen the proposal. It is -- I think it was in your packet. We posted it on Blackboard, but we weren't comfortable that everyone would look at Blackboard, so we also put it in your packets. Hopefully, you have taken a look at this. The Senate must approve the search plan, so that is our charge. She would like to begin this search quickly, and so what I have suggested is that we will try to handle this on the floor rather than send it to a committee, which is why I wanted you to all have copies of this so you could read it and decide if you had any problems with it.

There are two issues here. I think one of them has to do with the fact that they are doing an internal search as opposed to an external search. As far as deans searches go, we typically do external searches, so if we look at the last several deans searches which we have, they have almost exclusively been external searches; however, the administration argues that for a graduate dean, Dean of the Graduate School, those are typically internal searches. And I don't have any data to either support or refute that; however, that is the contention of the Provost and the President.

One of the arguments that they made for an internal search is that it is much less expensive. The second argument that they made, and these arguments are in the piece that you should have read, is that they feel an internal candidate would be more familiar with the way our departments operate and would, therefore, be able to hit the ground running and not spend an enormous amount of time reinventing the wheel. So those are really the two major parts of this.

The one concern that I had when I spoke to Lisa Freeman was to make sure that faculty were adequately represented on the search committee. It appears from the search plan, at least to me, that faculty are adequately represented. So with that as the background, I'll take a motion to accept the search. We'll second, and then we can have discussion, and if we decide we don't want to approve this, we can certainly do that. We can send it to a committee or we can suggest changes in this.

So I need a motion to accept the search as written. Do we have a motion? Brigid Lusk? Okay. Pat, you'll second? Pat Henry second. Okay, discussion. Any concerns, questions, problems with the search plan as proposed? Everyone likes it the way it is. We are all satisfied with it. Okay. Okay, Sue.
S. WILLIS: Sue Willis, Physics. I just had one question. I noticed that it says that the committee will be structured to include at least three Faculty Senate members. Do we know if there are three Faculty Senate members on the Graduate Council, and if not, how will those people be included onto the search committee?

A. ROSENBAUM: My assumption is if she doesn't have them coming from other sources, that she will come to us and we will ask for volunteers, the way we usually do. So we will either fill it that way or she may have Faculty Senate members already in mind. If we want, we can specify that those have to be elected by the Faculty Senate. Do you have any desire to do that?

S. WILLIS: (Shakes head.)

A. ROSENBAUM: No, okay. George?

G. SLOTSVE: George Slotsve, Economics. I was just curious with the increased cost associated with an external search, what costs are those? Are those the actual search costs or are they talking salary costs? I mean, which one is it that's increasing here? That if we hire internally, we don't pay the market wage, or –

A. ROSENBAUM: Well, I think what happens is sometimes for a Graduate Dean they hire a search firm, which is fairly expensive. I don't know if they would have to do that. They certainly have to bring people in and pay their travel expense and entertainment expenses while they are here. For some of the deans' positions I know they do airport interviews, and then they bring people on campus. So I think those are essentially the major expenses in an external search. Anyone else have any thoughts on what might contribute to the expense of an external search?

A. LASH: Advertising in journals.

A. ROSENBAUM: Right, they'd either have to do that or give it to a search firm or -- right, so there would be some of that. Okay? It's generally reasonably expensive. You've got to fly people in and put them up in nice hotels if you can find one and, you know, take them to a nice restaurant also. Give them cookies. Okay. Any other problems with the search plan?

Okay. All in favor of approving the search plan as written, say aye. Any opposition? Any abstention? Okay. We approve the search plan. Thank you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERTION

A. Selection of a Vice President of Faculty Senate

The next item is the selection of the Vice President of the Faculty Senate. For those of you who don't know what a Vice President of the Senate does, pretty much the same thing as the Vice President of the United States does, which is not -- well, let me not go there. Vice President of the Senate, essentially the main role is to replace the President of the Senate should the President become incapacitated. It also means that his primary role is to watch the President's back and make sure that no one does anything to injure the President, so he essentially becomes the Secret Service.
I would like to nominate George Slotsve to be Vice President of the Senate, and I need a second.

P. HENRY: I'll second.

A. ROSENBAUM: Who was it that said that? Pat Henry. Okay. Any discussion? Everyone know who George is? He is sitting at the back. George has been on the Senate for quite a while. George is from the Department of Economics. Right, George?

G. SLOTSVE: Yes.

A. ROSENBAUM: So he certainly will have a better sense of the economics of the operation than I do. No questions? Okay. No discussion? All in favor of George as Vice President, signify by saying aye. Any opposition? Congratulations, George. Keep an eye on me.

B. Faculty Workload Policy

The next item, this is a -- sort of an item that actually may not need to be here. The source of this item was David Wade, and before -- well, David, there's been a development that may preclude this, so let me explain it. David is our faculty and SPS personnel advisor, as you know. He has recently seen a lot of concerns about the way different colleges are evaluating workload. So apparently every college in the university is now looking into faculty workload, and part of this is connected to budgetary issues and financial issues. There are also concerns about equity, and so David had made the suggestion that the Senate might want to consider taking this up and offering some suggestions regarding policies, setting policies as to how colleges establish workload.

When I informed the Provost about this today -- I meet with the President and the Provost once a month to discuss what's going on in Senate, what the agenda is for University Council. They tell me what they want the Senate to hear. At any rate, at our meeting today when I mentioned this as an agenda item, Provost Alden said that he has already established a Blue Ribbon Workload Committee, and he thought that the committee was already doing or would do what we were hoping to do. The way he established his committee is he asked each of the colleges to nominate faculty or representatives to this Blue Ribbon Committee. He has something like 14 or 15 nominees. It is not equal across colleges. It is sort of more in proportion to the number of faculty in each college, sort of the way the representation on the Senate is, although not exactly.

So this is a primarily faculty driven committee. The Provost is willing, if the Faculty Senate so desires, to add people to that committee. I didn't know if we had anyone else that even wanted to be on another committee. We seem to have trouble getting people to do it. What I will do is briefly read the Provost's letter, this is the charge to that committee more or less, and we can listen to this and see if we feel that this adequately addresses the issues that we have. So I'll read it, and then we can have a brief discussion about it.

"As you probably know, higher education is currently in a very dynamic period of change that includes greater demands for accountability and productivity for universities. Many states, including our own, are either considering or have already implemented evaluation systems to hold institutions accountable for productivity. In addition to demands for institutional measures of
student success and attainment, politicians and the public are asking about systems that ensure faculty productivity. These words sort of strike fear into our hearts, I think, as they are always misused. In many states the question frequently asked of university administrators is what do your faculty do with all of their time. This has been followed with restricted workload policies and tracking assessment systems from centralized boards and/or legislatures. It is clearly more desirable for universities to develop their own policies and systems for demonstrating the productivity of their faculty members in accomplishing their distinctive institutional missions.

At NIU we are aware of the dedication and productivity of our faculty in accomplishing our mission areas of education, research, creative activities and service. However, we do not have a comprehensive university workload policy that addresses and documents the diversity of activities that our faculty members undertake to accomplish these mission areas. We want to be proactive in addressing this important area so that we can demonstrate that we are responsive to the increasing demands for accountability and productivity.

While the focus of most political and public attention has been on classroom teaching, we need a university workload policy that clearly acknowledges and documents the full variety of professional activities that are required of the faculty at a student-centered, engaged public research university. It is recognized that each program may have different missions, demands and expectations and that within programs individual faculty members may serve different but equally important roles. Thus, the NIU workload policy should represent a set of guiding principles, a big picture road map, that may be focused/adapted to meet the needs of individual disciplines by more detailed specific college and/or departmental level policies. The goal is to have equitable and defensible but not necessarily identical workloads for faculty members across our campus. The workload system created by this policy should document the full richness, productivity and significance of the efforts of all of our faculty.

I hope that you will accept the invitation," blah, blah, blah.

So that is essentially the mission of this committee. So I'll ask David to comment on whether he feels that addresses completely what he thinks needs to be done, and then we'll take comments from the floor.

D. WADE:  David Wade. Yes.

A. ROSENBAUM:  Okay. David is happy.

D. WADE:  I mean, assuming the composition of that body is reasonable, it sounds to me like the charge is reasonable.

A. ROSENBAUM:  Okay. Kerry?

K. FREEDMAN:  Kerry Freedman. What I would recommend, Alan, is for you to check to make sure that faculty are adequately represented, because as we have seen in previous task forces where the Provost or Vice President has requested Deans to appoint people, often those appointees are administrators, like Associate Deans or Assistant Deans, so I would just recommend that you
actually check to find out how many of those people that get appointed are actually faculty. And if we don't feel that there are enough faculty, then I think we request that some faculty from the Senate be appointed.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Kerry, in answer to your question, he did show me the list and I looked over it, and there were some chairs on it, but there were faculty on it. And he offered to give me the list, so I will be happy to get that list from him and post it on Blackboard, and then you can all look over the list, and if we have concerns, he seemed very amenable to us adding members or making suggestions.

I also asked if the report when it's final can come back to the Senate for our approval, and he said that he would do that. So whenever they get this, it will come back to the Senate, and we will be able to put our opinions in on this. But I will get that list and post it on Blackboard and post an announcement, so after you vote for the cookies, you can read the list.

Okay. Sue, did that address your question?

S. WILLIS: (Nods.)

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Nancy?

N. CASTLE: Nancy Castle, Allied Health & Communicative Disorders. So could we ask the Provost – if David Wade is getting comments from various colleges, that colleges are doing it, it seems a little backwards for colleges to be engaged in the activity if the Provost is putting together a Blue Ribbon panel to come up with the university's guidelines. Could we recommend that it be recommended that colleges hold off until we see the university's guidelines and parameters as described in what you read so that instead of us as, you know, departments and so on in our various colleges having to go back and rework something that we're working on, could we wait to see what the university guidelines are and then, you know, attack it from that angle?

A. ROSENBAUM: I guess in going – by the way he handled this, by going to the Deans and telling them or asking them to nominate – or I think he went to the college councils actually. Is there any college council member here that would know that? I think he mentioned it would come from the college councils, that they are aware that this is coming up. So you would – you're not satisfied with that? Okay. Ayhan?

A. LASH: I very much agree with Nancy because – can you hear me? Ayhan Lash. Because, as you know, some of you know, our school began to initiate something like that as early as last year. April I think it was. So I learned that our school was one of the earliest that implemented such a workload distribution allocation without any advance warning to the faculty or anything. So I think it's very much needed, number one. And, number two, I think it would be very fair if it could wait, all the schools could wait until this Blue Ribbon job is done, because Deans and Chairs are doing all kinds of things.

A. ROSENBAUM: The thing I don't know, I mean clearly colleges have to fill their courses and have already done so, so I don't know what they would do in the meantime. In other words, they
are assigning, they are doing this. So I would guess that once this policy comes about that they will have to reconfigure things for the next set of assignments.

A. LASH: Now, I mean, maybe -- I don't know how long it takes for the Blue Ribbon Committee to get the job done, so that for fall, for instance, that we --

A. ROSENBAUM: I think the Provost intends for this to be completed this academic year, and so for next fall when those assignments are made, hopefully there will be something in place. Would that be satisfactory?

A. LASH: Sounds good.

A. ROSENBAUM: Jeff?

J. KOWALSKI: While I understand the idea of postponing it, certain colleges are involved in discussing workload sorts of guidelines and/or sorts of criteria. By the same token, presumably if some colleges are involved in this, there's going to be a good deal more across-the-board faculty discussion of the sorts of guidelines that are being considered, the criteria that would be used to sort of assess and evaluate workload performance than there might be by simply having a small committee of a select number of college council members coming through the Provost's office. So perhaps we might be having some -- how should I put this? It's sort of a federalism issue, you know, that the colleges might be generating some good models and good ideas; if some of them then have to modify them slightly as a result of the final outcome of the work that the Provost's office is doing, then they could do so, but I don't know that it's necessarily a bad thing that they are proceeding on this on their own.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. David?

D. WADE: David Wade. Just one last comment. Most of the comments I've gotten -- and, you know, the horse is out of the barn on this issue. I mean, people are making course overload assignments, you know, under their new policies created however they want to be created. The concerns that have been expressed to me is there is no body to whom they could make their complaint. Dissent within their department or college may be visited by putting themselves in harm's way. Short of filing a formal grievance, there is really no other place to go after you've talked to your Chair and/or your Dean and identified yourself. So my suggestion was to refer this to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities simply not necessarily to establish policies, procedures, standards, alternatives, but to serve as a clearinghouse for these people to express their concerns. A Blue Ribbon panel may indeed provide that clearinghouse for information, and it may not.

Blue Ribbon always concerns me at a number of levels: What does that mean? And, two, selecting from college council does exclude non-tenured faculty is my understanding, and they also share in this issue at a pretty substantive level and need to be represented I think as well at some level on this Blue Ribbon Committee, and I don't know if I can establish my Blue Ribbon credentials in a short period of time here at NIU. So if this Blue Ribbon panel provides non-identical standards, what they are basically going to say is you've got to figure out and justify what you are doing based on what your college or various disciplines choose to do. At the end of the day, though, the
college and the department is -- it's their own good faith whether they, in fact, follow those general guidelines or procedures or implement them in any way. Who is going to police the policy once the policy is made even assuming that the policy is a good one?

A. ROSENBAUM: Well, the grievance procedure would seem to be the way that would happen.

D. WADE: Unfortunately, that puts us back to where we are now, and that is the individual voice screaming from the wilderness and drawing a target on their chest. And I'll tell you, there is not a lot people willing to do that. And, therefore, this body is the body that represents faculty concerns. So I'm not trying to disparage the Blue Ribbon Committee, but I'm not sure that necessarily answers our fundamental concern, and that is that faculty's rights and responsibilities are respected and considered in this process regardless of their representation on this Blue Ribbon panel. I'm not sure that that divorces us, that perhaps we might want to refer this to Rights and Responsibilities to at least police the Blue Ribbon panel in the faculty's interest.

A. ROSENBAUM: Kerry?

K. FREEDMAN: Kerry Freedman. So were you suggesting earlier that Alden would be perfectly happy giving the policy statements to us to approve?

A. ROSENBAUM: I can't swear to you that he said approve. I said that it would be -- I would like to be able to tell the Senate that you will send this to the Senate for their comments. I don't remember my exact words. I don't think we have right of veto power, but we certainly could assert ourselves.

K. FREEDMAN: I would like to make that request, that you guarantee that he does allow those policies to come to us at least for review and comment, if not approval, because the point I think Mike is making I think is a really good one. We have had a lot of problems in my particular department in the past because of workload issues, and we had to wait until we had a new chair to resolve those. That's ten years of problems that we had no one to go to about it. I think part of the policy -- and these are comments that we would make, if the policy doesn't provide for a place to go is, you know, part of the policy should include perhaps something like -- you know, I don't want to say a workload tribunal, but, you know, some way to take some kind of action or at least make concerns heard.


C. CAPPELL: Charles Cappell, Sociology. I kind of would echo David's concern that some of this information that the faculty might want to provide might not get in the door soon enough if all we're seeing is a report at the end of the process. To my mind, the one key issue that may not have been as prominent in the Provost's rhetorical charge as I would have liked to have seen is a link of workload to quality, and it seems like the faculty that are delivering the academic goods are the ones that have the most knowledge and the greatest sense of how quality is intimately linked to workload and that that should be something that's on the table at the very beginning. So perhaps if David wanted to make a motion that this be sent to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities with some
initial input to forward to this Provost committee, that might be a good strategy to get some information in the door.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Now, the motion is that what be forwarded to -- that the final report or that –

C. CAPPELL: No, any information that the faculty wants to bring to this Blue Ribbon panel that may not be evident in the charge or through some of the concerns that David is aware of and others so that we can say, you know, fine, go ahead with your Blue Ribbon panel, but here are some issues that we would like to see discussed and considered.

A. ROSENBAUM: Would this work, if we asked for representatives from the Senate on this committee? Would that satisfy this concern? Would you like Faculty Senate representation on this committee? Do we want David Wade to be the faculty -- you're nominating David Wade?

K. FREEDMAN: I nominate David.

A. LASH: I second.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay, wait a minute. So, Kerry, you are nominating David Wade as the Faculty Senate representative to this Blue Ribbon Committee, which I am going to ask Provost Alden to accept. Second? Ayhan Lash. Okay. Dave, do you accept this by the way?

D. WADE: Yes.

A. ROSENBAUM: He does. Okay. Any discussion of this nomination? All in favor? Opposed? Unanimous. Okay. I will go to the Provost and recommend that – or tell him that the Senate has asked that David Wade be added to the Blue Ribbon Committee. Anything else on this?

J. NOVAK: What is a Blue Ribbon?

A. ROSENBAUM: Oh, God. I don't know. It's like best ribs in the state. You know, world famous chili.

J. NOVAK: Okay. All right. Thank you.

A. ROSENBAUM: I guess. I don't know. I'm not being facetious. I honestly don't know what that is. So, sorry. Okay. We need to move along because people are starting to migrate.

T. FISHER: Teresa Fisher from Counseling. I just wanted to check, do we have to vote on the fact that someone suggested that the recommendations come to the Senate for review, or is that automatic, or what?

A. ROSENBAUM: You know, again, at this point I think I would prefer to clarify that with the Provost rather than send him a resolution. He seems to react badly to resolutions, so I think he would be happier if I just asked him, and he would probably say yes to that. And I will clarify that.
We have some time. This is not going to finish up for a while, so if it's okay with the Senate, I will ask the Provost exactly how much veto power we'll have or whether it's just going to be input, and I'll bring that back to the next meeting, and if we're satisfied with that, then we'll leave it as is. Is that okay?

T. FISHER: Okay.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. All right. Next item, we are up to the Reports of the Advisory Committees. We have two reports. The first one is a brief report by Earl Hansen on the FAC and IBHE. Earl?

E. HANSEN: Okay. We met at IIT. It was a one-day trip. It took me almost four hours to get home. I left at 3:00 in the afternoon. Be that as it may, Don Sevener is the new interim executive director for the IBHE, and he spoke about higher education the IBHE faces, and it all comes back down to the normal money things again. You'll see the dollars there in the report. The main thing that I think that came out of the meeting, there were basically two things, the first of which was a presentation that was given to us by a professor of economics from the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. It's brought to you on the fourth paragraph down basically, or fifth paragraph down on page two.

Walter McMahon was introduced. His topic was "A Strategy for Cooperating in the Funding of Higher Education." Personal income in Illinois has been declining since 1960 relative to the US average. More low income students are priced out of college relative to the U.S. average. He noted that the four goals of public education each require more funding to achieve. Community college graduates usually stay in their local areas, four-year college graduates tend to stay in their region, while master and doctoral graduates tend to go coast to coast. And he has a book out that he published, and I have information on that. I haven't read the book yet, but it's by John Hopkins. It just came out, and he did a study in the U.K. comparing higher education graduates within the community and the dollar value that they bring back to both those as opposed to those that didn't have higher education degrees.

The other thing that came out of this was on page three where you see a list of what the council came up with. We were asked to come up with four major points. We really came up with six before we counted, as listed there as, one: Articulation, college readiness, remedial systems, retention. Two: Advocacy, marketing, communications, public relations. Three is collaborations, partnerships and alliances. Four is economics of higher education: Funding, justifications, human capital.

And then we also talked about faculty needs and concerns, and internal responsibilities of our Faculty Advisory Committee. Now, each one of us on the Faculty Advisory Council is a member of one of those four committees, and we're supposed to get a little bit of direction from ourselves as
Faculty Advisory and come back to you as faculty at each institution and ask for your input, so you will be getting that kind of questions asked back to you.

A. ROSENBAUM: We can post that on Blackboard.

E. HANSEN: Yeah, you've got this. She can post it on there. I think that would probably be the best thing to do with all these reports that come back out of the Faculty Advisory Committee. And if you've got questions, by all means email me, call me or whatever you want to do. I was impressed with the data that the gentleman had. I haven't read the work, but maybe people in higher education economics would bite on that and jump on it and give us their input on it.


B. LUSK: Brigid Lusk. I just want to know, do you know why Judy Irwin left the board?

E. HANSEN: I'm sorry, what?

B. LUSK: Do you know why Judy Irwin, the former chair, left the board?

E. HANSEN: We asked that question as a council, and the response we got was that she was looking for something else, which tells me that the choppy waters down there were maybe a little more shark-infested than we think they are.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Any other questions for Earl? All right. Thank you, Earl.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – no report

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report (walk-in report presented by Todd Latham)

A. ROSENBAUM: Next up, we have the report on the Board of Trustees meeting, and Todd Latham will give us that report. Todd.

T. LATHAM: The Board of Trustees met on September 16. It started with Chairman Strauss' comments welcoming students as they returned to the university for the academic year. He also wanted to express his gratitude to the faculty and staff for their work supporting our core mission as a student-centered research institution. He further then went on to identify NIU as being ranked in the top 50 percent nationally as an institution in the areas of social mobility, recruitment and research. When you look at Illinois only, he pointed out that NIU was second in the list that identifies graduate potential earning in the range of $43,000 to $80,000.
Under the reports of the Board of Trustees, I'm just going to highlight two areas. One, that President Peters announced that the IBHE had accepted NIU's proposal for a ground lease to permit NIU to enter into a public/private partnership in its attempt to develop the 1,000-bed freshman dormitory.

As we all know, the True North Campaign has finally concluded. It was pointed out that it had raised $163 million from 59,000 alumni and friends.

Some of the main points of the meeting that I really want us to pay attention to today is the President's report as he addressed the Board of Trustees with his Vision 2020. He recognized that NIU has stood out as a university that was friendly to military veterans and nontraditional adult learners. In the area of competition, he noted that NIU continues to receive competition from public and private universities within the state; however, he cautioned us about out-of-state universities, online providers and for-profit universities that would be cutting into NIU's attempt to attract and retain students.

In the area of changing landscapes, he identified how the Great Journeys Strategic Plan, the Baccalaureate Review and the Strategic Management Enrollment Plan helped him in his formulation of the Vision 2020 initiative. To that end, he charged Provost Alden and Executive Vice President Williams to create a commission for a task force that would investigate a report on the strategic salary plan.

He then went on to an area identified as benchmarks where he noted that student recruitment and fiscal sustainability is going to be crucial. The benchmark areas included optimal enrollment, percentage of high-achieving students, that would be those that graduated in the top of their high school class, and degree-related productivity. Those areas would be course completion, graduation rate, student retention and time for degree completion.

He further reiterated to the Board of Trustees that NIU is at 23 percent funding level from the State of Illinois, and the most – that we are developing and continue to develop the most student-centered research institution in Illinois with the entrepreneurial approach. He then asked the Board of Trustees to further acknowledge that faculty and staff have been asked to do more with less and without reward and to support them in their retention. He also had some compassion in his presentation that he felt personally compelled to lead this task force, and time lines are identified with September, November and then into May of next year as the final reporting date.

The last items were action items that the Board of Trustees had to review and approve. They are listed in the order that they were presented. If you have any questions on those, I would refer you to the book that they provide because some of these areas go into great detail.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Any questions for Todd? The book that he is referring to is the -- all of this stuff is put together in a Board of Trustees meeting book. If you don't have it, we do. If you want to see it, you can come into the Faculty Senate, University Council. We would be happy to share it with you. It makes good reading, especially if you have trouble sleeping, so feel free.
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. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair no report

D. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jozef Bujarski and Laurie Elish-Piper, Co-chairs – report – Pages 6-7 (Walk-in - updated version of report presented by Todd Latham)

A. ROSENBAUM: The next item is, again, Todd is going to report briefly on the Resources, Space and Budget Committee, because Jozef Bujarski and Laurie Elish-Piper, who are the co-chairs, were not able to come to this meeting. So, Todd.

T. LATHAM: Well, I've been quite busy on behalf of the Faculty Senate, as you can see. The Committee on Resources, Space and Budgets met on September 13 with Dr. Williams and Dr. Cassidy to discuss the budget process. Dr. Williams started by explaining the process to us and clarified that all State universities operate on a base budget allocation. He shared with the committee that the fiscal year 2012 budget guidelines would include a request for a three percent increase for faculty and staff salaries, three percent for utilities, three percent for library/technology, and $1.6 million for program priority requests. I will point out that I believe it's the last two years that all of those were denied at higher levels, IBHE at the legislative level and by the Governor. So don't buy anything yet. Note that the same program priorities have been submitted for the past four years. These priorities must build upon NIU's strengths and the Great Journeys Strategic Plan, and the program must align with the Illinois public agenda. Those priorities are the preparation of teachers in STEM fields, science, technology, engineering and math, increased off-campus student enrollment, and health sciences. The committee asked Dr. Williams for budget input on budget guidelines as we go into the future. Dr. Elish-Piper noted that the members present indicated that NIU's request was appropriate based on the process and the State budget situation. These budget guidelines were presented to the Board of Trustees on September 16, so just a few short days later these were presented for approval, and they were approved at that meeting. The budget guidelines followed the approval process as I stated in the committee report.

The committee then engaged Dr. Williams in discussion on the State's cash flow problems and the budget issues and overall State funding issues. Dr. Williams reported that as of September 13th NIU has not received any payments from the State for the fiscal year. Dr. Williams then went on to inform the committee that NIU has received money from the capital budget for the plan of Stevens Hall and that building funds would likely come from State-issued bonds. There was a previous question about where that money would come from. The money for Cole Hall renovation has been received. That was one area that we asked to have clarified.

A discussion occurred regarding the roles and responsibilities of the committee. Many of us were
new. The two main responsibilities are participating with the President and Executive Vice President and the Provost in the development of long-range planning, and the second area is to advise the President and Executive Vice President and Provost regarding goals and priorities. As the meeting concluded, the committee agreed to the following: To take an active role in the Vision 2020 process which will chart the course of NIU over the next ten years, and we will continue to hold regular meetings in advance of budget decisions and/or priority settings so that the committee can have proper time to fulfill its advisory role. We have asked to further meet with Provost Alden and other administrative members as we move forward in the Vision 2020 process.

In response to the questions from the committee, Dr. Williams and Dr. Cassidy provided the following information: That NIU does not plan to institute furloughs for faculty and staff, and NIU has a commitment to research and graduate education.

A. ROSENBAUM: Any questions for Todd regarding the work of Resources, Space and Budget? Okay, Todd, and I'll remind you that the committee – that we had given that issue about the spending on athletics to Resources, Space and Budget as well, so I don't know if that was completely clear because we did it with the Senate's side but not the University Council side, so hopefully your committee is tackling that one as well.

T. LATHAM: Okay.


E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair

A. ROSENBAUM: The last item of business is we have a couple of elections. I'll turn this over to David Wade, who is the chair of our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. David.

D. WADE: Thank you, Alan. David Wade. You have in front of you two ballots, one white, one yellow. They are fairly self-explanatory. The white one, vote for two; the yellow one, vote for five of six. Yes, it's five of six. And leave them at your space. If you want to look at nominee statements for the unity and diversity, there are some in your packets. They were there last month as well.

A. ROSENBAUM: Yes. Question?

UNIDENTIFIED: Can we pick the person we don't want?

D. WADE: That would be totally inappropriate, Richard. We would appreciate if you would vote for five of six. Nobody said it was going to be easy.

A. ROSENBAUM: You are probably one of those people that want American Idol to just let you vote for who you don't want instead of voting for people you like. Okay.
IX  UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X.  NEW BUSINESS

XI.  COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII.  INFORMATION ITEMS

   A.  Alternate Policy – Page 10
   B.  Annual Report – Office of the Ombudsman
   C.  Annual Report – University Benefits Committee
   D.  Annual Report – Undergraduate Coordinating Council
   E.  Committee on Initial Teacher Certification meeting minutes, May 7, 2010
   F.  Committee on Advanced Programs for Certification in Education meeting minutes, April 5, 2010
   G.  Athletic Board meeting minutes, June 16, 2010
   H.  Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, August 23, 2010

XIII.  ADJOURNMENT

   A. ROSENBAUM: As soon as you finish that, which I don't expect will take too long, I need a motion to adjourn. John Novak. And Brigid Lusk, we have a second back there. If there is no other business, all in favor of adjournment say aye. Opposed? All right. Have a good month. We'll see you at the next meeting.

   Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.