FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
Wednesday, October 27, 2010, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

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


GUESTS: Students from CAHE 771 (class assignment) – Gadio, Glick, Keyster, Rana, Williams

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

A. ROSENBAUM: In light of the events of the past week, I think it would be appropriate for us to begin by observing a moment of meditation in honor of our missing student, Antinette “Toni” Keller.

[Following the minute of silent meditation]

I would like to read two letters that we have received. One is addressed specifically to the Faculty Senate and is from the Vice President of the Faculty Senate of Chicago State University. It says, “On behalf of the faculty at Chicago State University, I would like to express our deep condolences to all of our colleagues at NIU and the parents and family of Toni Keller for the horrific tragedy. Our prayers are with the family of Toni and the entire NIU community during this unimaginable time. We wish you and the NIU community all the strength in dealing with this senseless tragedy when the wounds of the previous one are still healing. Please convey our heartfelt condolences to the family of Toni Keller.” The second is a letter from the FAC to the IBHE of which Earl Hansen is our representative, and was addressed to President Peters. “I am writing on behalf of the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Illinois Board of Higher Education
to express our most sincere condolences to you, your campus and DeKalb communities and in particular to Toni Keller’s family for the horrific tragedy you are all enduring. Our hearts, minds and prayers are with you during this time of extraordinary hardship. As you know, FAC is the most comprehensive organization representing faculty from public and private universities as well as community colleges across Illinois so please know that as your colleagues over the entire State of Illinois and as parents, we are deeply touched and saddened by this unthinkable heartbreak. We wish you all the best as you deal with your loss and hope that the criminals behind this inhumane act will be found and brought to justice soon.” It says, “Please feel free to share this letter with the Keller family.” I will also read a letter that I intend to send to the family from the faculty of Northern Illinois University: “On behalf of the faculty at Northern Illinois University, I want to express to you our profound sadness as well as our solidarity and support as you deal with the unimaginable loss of your wonderful daughter, Toni. We frequently speak of the NIU family for that is how the faculty, staff and administration feel about this University. If we are family, then the students are our children too and in a sense, we have all lost a child this week. We want you to know that you are in our thoughts.”

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. ROSENBAUM: We have two walk-in items. The first one is Earl Hansen’s report from the FAC to the IBHE and the second one is my report on the Board of Trustees meeting. I would also like to tell you that we have some visitors with us today. There is a class from the Administration of Higher Ed and I assume this is part of a class assignment, to see how the Faculty Senate functions, so let’s function well. No showing off, but let’s do our best. I need a motion to accept the agenda with the two walk-in items.

A. LASH: made the motion to adopt the agenda as modified by the walk-in items. J.Kowalski was second.

The motion was adopted without dissent.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 29, 2010 FS MEETING (sent electronically)

J.Corwin made the motion, P.Henry was second.

J. RINTALA: corrected the statement attributed to J.Compher that the Intercollegiate Program is made up of is 17 sports, 7 men and 7 women, when it is 7 men and 10 women’s teams.

The minutes were approved with J.Rintala’s correction.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. ROSENBAUM: I asked Deb Haliczer to say a few words regarding services that are available to faculty who are trying to deal with the Toni Keller tragedy.
D. HALICZER: You know that the Counseling and Student Development Center is providing a great deal of service to our students as are the counseling centers through the Department of Psychology, the Department of Family, Consumer and Nutrition Sciences and the College of Education, Counseling, Adult and Higher Education program. Those are all available for anyone who wants them. For faculty and staff, there are services available through the Employee Assistance Program on the 7th floor of the HSC. We also have scheduled a variety of drop-in sessions for anyone who wants to come and process. We have a lot of people who still have lingering issues from February 14th and some have expressed a wish to be able to come together and talk about the meaning, the impact and how to cope with this and how to help others cope with it. So, the first one is this Friday and then we have them set up for Monday, Tuesday and Thursday next week. So, anyone who feels the need or knows someone else who can, send them over, and we are also going to some departments that are especially affected by the events and by their contact with the students. So, if you have questions or want something special set up, just give me a call. Thank you.

A. ROSENBAUM: I want to welcome Therese Clarke Arado who is the new faculty senate representative from the College of Law. We have been using our FS Blackboard Community to post things that we want to call to your attention. Recently, we have posted the salary increment memo from Ray Alden, which included some of the details on the merit component of the raise. At our last meeting when Jeff Compber spoke to us, Charles Cappell asked for some of the financial data regarding all of the MAC schools in comparison to NIU and not simply the Ohio University data, and Jeff sent that to us and we posted it on Blackboard.

D. GOLDBLUM: With respect to the Blackboard page, if it’s on there, can we assume that it’s suitable to transmit to colleagues in our department?

A. ROSENBAUM: I would say yes. If I post something that is not for release, then I’ll note that. So, I’m assuming that everything that’s given to me that I’m putting up can be discussed with your colleagues. Regarding the NCAA analyses, Jeff sent them to us very quickly, and it gave you a chance to look at how NIU compares to other schools and I think compared to most of the other schools, we’re putting less money from our general funds into collegiate athletics. We also posted the charge to the Distributive Learning Task Force and while we’re on the subject, Bev Henry and Lisa Yamagata-Lynch volunteered to be on that Distributive Learning Task Force. I think it is one of the good uses of Blackboard, that we can put these things out quickly and people who are interested can let me know before the next Senate meeting, saving us some time. I think this will be a useful tool for us and I encourage people to check Blackboard. We are sending you that email that comes with a “GUI.” I don’t know if some of your spam protectors are keeping you from getting those, but those are the announcements, anytime we post something on Blackboard. Any questions about Blackboard or if you’re having difficulty getting in, then contact Pat and she will help work it out. Jan Rintala volunteered to bring some information about graduation rates and I think she said that it’s not available yet but when it is, we will post it on Blackboard.

J. RINALTA: Yes, they delayed the release, which was supposed to be two weeks ago. It should actually be getting released while I’m sitting here in this meeting, for the most recent year
and I chose to wait until this year was available before I put the whole thing together. So, hopefully, you will have it on the website in the next day or two.

A. General Counsel Search Committee

A. ROSENBAUM: I want to update you on the General Counsel search. As you know, Ken Davidson is retiring at the end of December and they have constituted a search committee. I’m on that search committee. The committee consists of mostly vice presidents, and there is a dean. The Chair of the committee is the Dean of the College of Law. One of the members of the Board of Trustees is on the committee, as well as the Student Trustee, Robert Sorsby. The committee is hoping to hire somebody by early January. The university has employed a search firm that is in the process of recruiting candidates and we will be getting names in the next few weeks. I’m raising it here because I want to know if anyone on the senate has some thoughts on what we want as faculty in the General Counsel.

B. LUSK: In my school, we use them quite a bit. We use them for form affiliation agreements with 200 or 300 or 400 sites that they all go through the General Counsel’s Office and also we use them if we ever get into any legal difficulties with our patient care clinics. Right now Greg Brady in the office is the one who deals with those but we do certainly need to be aware of and legal issues if patients want to do silly things like sue you.

A. ROSENBAUM: This is a good point and more and more, NIU seems to be getting into healthcare-related collaborations such as the Proton Therapy Center and, of course, the Physical Therapy Department, and Nursing. The Psychology Department has training clinics, the Health Service certainly has legal issues. So, we did mention the idea that we need someone who, if not very familiar with healthcare issues, then knows how to hire people to provide consultation in that regard.

S. WILLIS: I assume that they’re looking for someone with extensive higher education experience? The only other thing I would mention is that when the on-campus interviews are being set up to make sure to have open sessions with faculty and also with presidential commissions.

A. ROSENBAUM: We’ll take note of that and your point is correct. We specified in the description of the position that we were looking for someone that has extensive academic experience. I think what they are hoping to find is somebody who is an assistant counsel somewhere who is ready to move up into a counsel position.

B. University Benefits Committee – Sonya Armstrong

A. ROSENBAUM: Sonya Armstrong is our representative to the University Benefits Committee. I don’t know if people are that familiar with the University Benefits Committee, but I think depending on the outcome of the upcoming election, we might have a lot of issues around University benefits so this may be a committee that becomes very familiar to us
S. ARMSTRONG: I just have three quick announcements. The first one is very soon there will be a survey distributed to all employees, and the survey will be trying to determine the quality-of-life kinds of issues associated with the current healthcare benefits. So, if you would, report this back to your departments that when this survey does become available, and it will be coming through Survey Monkey, please encourage everyone to take this because we will be compiling the data and providing this to the important people who need to know about the quality-of-life issues. Second, we will soon be having, or be hosting a website for the University Benefits Committee, and this will be a place where folks can go to get information about benefits. We’ve got a talking point document that we will be posting there that has information about current benefits to NIU employees. Then third, I learned, having been on this committee, that even though I’m not retired, I am eligible to be a member rather of the Annuitants Association. I did not know this. So, I’m here to tell everyone that, even if you’re not retired, you can be a member of the Annuitants Association. I understand that in this particular case, there is strength in numbers and so we definitely want to make sure that this is a powerful body. It’s easy to join and it’s only $28 per year and I brought a few sign-up forms. You can do this online. You can either do it through payroll deduction. The benefits of being a member of the Annuitants Association, aside from it being an influential body, is based on the number of people involved, you do get the Annuitants newsletter, you become a member of the listserv so you get updates, and there are other benefits.

D. HALICZER: I am the Chair of the benefits committee. Thank you Sonya, excellent report. We really do encourage everyone to join the Annuitants Association because it’s our best voice about pensions. There’s a lobbyist in Springfield who expresses the needs of higher education employees in the pension area and there are also social occasions. It may be your only time to have dinner with the President or to get together for different kinds of social events. So, it’s a neat group and a great source of information.

P. HENRY: And we want it to be as strong as possible so the more the merrier.

A. ROSENBAUM: I would reinforce that as well. Somehow our legislators have concluded that the biggest problem facing the State financially is the pension system and not the fact that they’ve not been putting the money into it. So, you can be sure as the budget balancing game continues that our retirement benefits are going to come under fire. So, we need the strongest voice that can possibly have and I think a lot of younger faculty didn’t realize that you can be a member of the Annuitants Association. Even though retirement may be far off for you, it’s probably worthwhile to of get active and protect the benefits as much as we possibly can. I think a lot of people in the past year have had problems with the benefits, because the State was very behind on payments. People are being asked to pay up front for medical and dental services. This is a hardship for a lot of our faculty and staff and so it’s very important that we pay attention to this.

C. Presidential Engagement Professorship Selection Committee

A. ROSENBAUM: The University has now established this Presidential Engagement Professorship and I think it’s very good that the administration is looking for ways to reward faculty. This goes along with the Presidential Research Professorship and the Presidential
Teaching Professorship and the Board of Trustees Professorships. The Selection Committee specifies that there be a representative from the Faculty Senate on this committee and I put out a call for volunteers on Blackboard. We’re still looking for a volunteer for the Selection Committee. Is anyone present interested?

[Bill Pitney volunteered to serve as the Faculty Senate representative to the selection committee.]

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Blue Ribbon Panel on Workload Policy

A. ROSENBAUM: Our representative on that committee, you recall, is David Wade. We elected him and then asked Provost Alden to put him on the committee, which he did. So David can now report to us on what that committee is up to. I would also like to mention that the Provost had mentioned a while ago that if we wanted additional representatives on that committee, he would appoint them. So, I’m interested in whether David thinks we need additional members on that committee and then whether the Senate is satisfied with the makeup of that committee or whether the Senate feels we need to put people on it as well. Remember if we want to put people on the committee, we have to find people that are willing to serve.

D. WADE: We have met twice. The first one was an organization meeting at which time the Provost gave us our basic charge and presented us with a template of a rather extensive and comprehensive workload policy that he was a part of developing at UNLV, his previous institution, for our review. We then scheduled another meeting, which was held at 8:00 in the morning this last Monday. We will meet again at 8:00 in the morning this Monday at which time we embarked upon an effort to revise that policy document to fit the situation at NIU. It appears to me that the makeup of the committee is essentially one-third Associate Deans, one-third Chairs and one-third Faculty. It appears to me that a consensus decision-making process is emerging. It does not appear to me, and there are other members here that are on this committee, that it is acting in anything other than the utmost good faith. There is certainly an explicit expectation that any document that emerges from the committee will be vetted by the appropriate bodies in the Shared Governing System including the Faculty Senate as well as the colleges and perhaps even the departments to weigh in on what that document will look like in the end. To be perfectly honest with you, I think it’s a productive committee. I think it’s going to do important work. I can assure you that the document that will emerge will provide plenty of flexibility for the particular circumstances of various units. So, in the counting of workload, we’ll take into account the various arrays of things that we do that count as workload, and then you’ll have an opportunity to help us in that task. We seem to be moving a pace, so I don’t expect that this will be a long process. I expect that this will emerge probably sometime early next semester if I were going to take a guess. I’m willing to answer any questions you may have.

T. FISHER: Could you just briefly state what you see as some of the key outcomes of this committee.

D. WADE: I’ll tell you, the document we’re working on is certainly in flux and I would hate to step out and offer you any specific details at this point. Like I say, we’ve really only had one
working meeting and one organizational meeting, but it has to take, it will be a semi-compensatory model. In other words, it appears that there will be a basic standard typical workload defined in some manner that will then be subject to adjustment by units depending on their particular nature. That, of course, would, the document presumes that really the hard labor here in terms of establishing workload will be done by the colleges and departments. This document will not seek to impose a rigid, formalistic, by contact hours or credit hours, system, but a basic expectation and a process or system by which the college’s and department’s efforts can be coordinated and reviewed.

**J. CORWIN:** As of right now, there are differences among the various departments and differences among the various colleges that have existed for some time, I believe the old way of looking at it at least in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences was a so-called Norton Rule where different departments through some magical interpretation had different types of workload distributions. What you’re describing doesn’t sound much different from what’s happening now.

**D. WADE:** I don’t think it is much different. To be honest with you, the point of origin of the policy is the long-standing AAUP policy. That AAUP statement, when applied to NIU, is pretty close to what we do anyway. So, I have not seen anything on the table thus far that would constitute in my mind a radical departure from anything I’ve experienced at NIU in terms of workload, but I’ve never been in LA&S.

**A. ROSENBAUM:** I think one of the problems is that not every college does it in the same way and some of the colleges, I think faculty feel that they’re not having an adequate voice in making those decisions but rather that those decisions are being imposed on them and so this might not affect LA&S in the same way that it might affect HHS, for example.

**J. CORWIN:** I guess to me, though, the question would be, is it clear from what’s been talked about that in situations where there may be inequities among the various colleges perhaps that the nature of which you’re describing essentially still seems to allow for individuals that are still in that situation to go on doing things the way they have.

**D. WADE:** Correct and what would be required, at least at this point, is that a deviation from this standard expectation would need to be justified. If the justification existed, then it would be a systematic justification; it would not be a whimsical or capricious one, we would hope, because that would be a system established by your college and your departments. But at some point, you would have to explain that inequity and justify it with, for example, we’re buying people out of course load because they’ve got grants. So, I mean, that accounts for a lot of weird-looking inequities in terms of course loads. We assume we will permit that but by the same token, when this document comes out, you will have an opportunity to say “you just missed the boat on this. You’ve got to start over.” and we’ll be more than willing to look at that too.

**D. BOUGHTON:** [attending for Kerry Freedman] I’m on the committee as well. I’m frustrated by the second meeting and it seems to me that the process is a fairly simple one. It’s beginning from a premise with an assumption of a 3-3 teaching load and that’s stated in the first page of the document. Most of the negotiation and discussion has to do with ways in which one can vary from the 3-3 load and what kind of explanation one could provide in order to do that. I raise the
question about whether we should begin from a premise of a 3-3 load, given that we are classified as a research higher institution and that if we want to be comparable to peer institutions, it might be we should consider starting from a different point. However, it became quite clear from the Chair that that’s not going to be accomplished. We are beginning with the assumption of a 3-3 load and it raises questions in my mind but we didn’t get into that discussion. I’m simply hoping that that discussion does come up again because we need to revisit that question, I think.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay, if I understand what you’re saying and I guess, Doug, you could weigh in on this as well, it sounds like you’re not feeling we need additional faculty representation from the Senate on this committee.

D. WADE: I would not advocate for that. If it is the Senate’s will, it is the Senate’s will. I would caution you, though, that we are working and it’s a bit of a catch-up the longer we wait. So, if we’re going to do it, let’s do it now so that they can be at that meeting Monday at 8:00 a.m.

A. ROSENBAUM: Well, that will discourage pretty much everyone from participating. (laughter)

D. WADE: I wanted to thank all of you for nominating me for this position too, by the way.

A. ROSENBAUM: Thank you David. We will leave the committee as is and we’ll look forward to hearing what the committee comes up with.

B. Guests in Class

A. ROSENBAUM: The next item is referred to as, “Guests in Class,” and it’s appropriate that we have guests at the Faculty Senate meeting. This is an item that was brought to my attention and I don’t know that we want to take this on as a Senate so that’s why I’m bringing it up. This has to do with whether or not students who are not registered for a particular class can be present in the class. This refers to friends who come along with students, and students that have children bringing their children to class. It involves non-human guests such as pets. Apparently, we’ve had a couple of situations on campus where faculty members have not permitted unregistered students to be in class. We had a situation which involved a student who was nursing and asked the professor for permission to bring the baby into class and was denied. This raised the question of whether we have a policy and we apparently do not. We could not find any policy that addressed this issue. The closest we come is the audit policy, and the audit policy requires the student to register to audit the class, although they do not get a grade, and have to pay for that class. The question is whether we want to be proactive and develop a policy for bringing nonregistered individuals or things into class? Ken Davidson, the General Counsel, doesn’t feel that there are legal issues involved. Ken has chosen not to weigh in on this one. He’s left it to the shared governance process to decide whether we need a policy.

T. GRIFFIN: This matter has come up a number of times during my tenure at the institution. As recently as four or five years ago, we did have such a policy. I have not had occasion to look for it since then; maybe it has gone by the wayside. The policy at that time basically stated
that the only people allowed in a class were the instructor of record, the students registered for that class who are enrolled for the class and other individuals to assist in the instruction of the courses invited by the instructor of record. I will, however, go look and see if I can find it somewhere still on the books.

D. HALICZER: Human Resource Services some years back developed a draft policy about children at work and bringing a child to class is like bringing a child to work. We have grave concerns about safety of children, the liability on the institution, disruption to work processes and so that’s not a policy that was ever finalized but I wrote a draft aimed at protecting children and giving guidance on how you deal with such situations. We have people bringing children to work and being out in the hallway all day long while students, people, visitors, all went by, and it just makes me very nervous.

A. ROSENBAUM: I always assume that anyone coming to class who is not a registered student was at the discretion of the instructor but again, we can’t find that written anywhere.

B. HENRY: I would just say that at the beginning of every semester, we are instructed to tell people who are not registered for the class to leave the classroom, making sure that only registered students are in the room. So, we receive that information every semester. I don’t know if that constitutes a policy.

A. ROSENBAUM: Where does that come from?

B. HENRY: From our Associate Dean.

A. ROSENBAUM: So is that maybe a college policy?

B. HENRY: I don’t know that I’ve ever seen it written; I’ve only received it as an email, a very direct statement to say, “Tell anyone who is in your classroom that is not enrolled to leave the room.”

R. BLECKSMITH: Yeah, I’ve seen situations where we’ve had prospective students at like open houses that were interested in Northern that come here possibly to transfer, and we’ve invited them to just go in and see a class and said, “See what you think about it.” Apparently, that would be illegal for us to do if there’s a policy that says, only students allowed in the classrooms.

A. ROSENBAUM: Unless the policy said, at the discretion of the instructor.

R. BLECKSMITH: Right, that’s how I always assumed it.

B. LUSK: One of the fondest memories from my graduate school when I was a student was I had to miss a class once because of my two young children. We didn’t have a babysitter, and I’m the mother, so I got to stay home and I told my professor that the next week. I apologized, and he said, “Don’t ever, ever, ever do that again. Bring your children to class.” So, I see it as a sort
of feminist issue actually that, at the discretion of the instructor and cognizant of safety issues, sometimes students, and we have very non-traditional students in some of our classes, sometimes they can’t come to class if they don’t bring their kids. So, I personally would always say, “If you have those issues, bring your kids. Give them something to do.” So, I think, as a woman, it’s an important issue that we should be flexible on at least.

**J. CORWIN:** I was a faculty member at university in New Orleans and I would teach an intro course periodically, and there were a lot of individuals there who really got a great deal of their education through these sort of off-campus courses, and many of them had childcare issues and quite honestly, I had a number of people that would bring their kids to class. I can’t say that the kids were riveted by my lectures; they almost invariably fell asleep, but nonetheless, it wasn’t a problem and when I hear a professor says they don’t want somebody breastfeeding in class, that might be a distraction, but ultimately, the idea that we have to have a rule for every single thing that we do because one or two things become uncomfortable quite frankly just drives me insane. Do we need a rule to cover everything when it doesn’t appear to be an issue overall?

**S. WILLIS:** I would like to mostly cite what has been said. There used to be, before I moved offices, a crayon drawing which was done by the daughter of one of my students as she sat in my astronomy class. I brought my own son to my classes when I had childcare issues, ensuring that he was not disruptive. If we do have students who have childcare issues, and surely we do, it seems to me it would be better for them to be in the classroom rather than sitting out in the hall, as Deb had mentioned. So, if I were to write a policy, here’s what it would say. It would say that classrooms are clearly open to students registered in the class and anybody else who wants to come in at the discretion of the instructor. We probably don’t need to, but I would make a specific provision for service animals. I’m not sure we need a policy, but I think if we have to have one, it ought to be pretty much everything except things that ought to be up to the instructor.

**A. ROSENBAUM:** My reaction, when I first heard of this, was that I didn’t know that we had a problem and since saying that, a number of people have suggested to me that there are professors who have had problems with this in various departments. So, perhaps it would be best if people went back to their departments and asked around and got a sense of whether or not this is an issue for a substantial enough number of faculty members that we would want to take this on. I’m not saying we should, but we could certainly look into it a little bit more by going back to our departments.

**T. FISHER:** I would second it. I mean, it makes sense to get some sentiments from the faculty, particularly like at the beginning you were saying, “let’s be proactive.” I would hate for someone to make a ruling for us.

**S. WILLIS:** Two additional thoughts. One is that I think if we do it, I think it ought to make clear that other than registered students, the presence of anyone in the classroom ought to be at the discretion of the instructor and the instructor should be able to ask persons who are not registered students in the class to leave. I have heard occasional things very indirectly and not even necessarily here, about professors not wanting to have their teaching be observed by any
chairs or other faculty and I don’t know if we would need to write an exception for that or not, but it’s something else that probably ought to be considered.

A. ROSENBAUM: Okay, well again, I agree with your first statement, but we don’t have a policy to that effect, so there is nothing that says it’s at the discretion of the faculty member; it’s just an assumption that we make.

R. FEURER: I would just suggest that this would be a good thing to place on the Blackboard discussion. I have an issue and that is, I would really like to be able to not be observed or know that there is not an NIU police officer in my classroom, which I understand they are being placed. I think it, while I’m not really happy about the idea of making a new policy on this, it might be a good way to enable discussion about the faculty’s ability of asking not to have a police officer assigned to their classroom. I don’t know if everybody is aware that police officers can be randomly assigned to classrooms right now and I would like to have the faculty be able to opt out of that and be able to have the right to opt out of that policy. So I don’t know if there would be a way of, if we should combine these issues, but I would like to start a discussion about this in conjunction with this issue.

A. ROSENBAUM: Why don’t you start a thread on the Blackboard.

R. FEURER: I didn’t know I could start one.

A. ROSENBAUM: Anyone on the Senate can start one. We left it as an open discussion board. If you have trouble, let Pat know and we’ll start one for you. We’re not tabling it, but we don’t need to reach a decision today. This will give people time to give some thought to this, ask colleagues what they think about it. We can have some discussion on our Blackboard and then we can talk about it a little bit more at the next meeting.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

E. HANSEN: What is significant was that on the 15th of October, we had a meeting and two elected officials, Ed Mahoney, Chair of the Senate Higher Education Committee and Bob Pritchard, the Representative from DeKalb County, came in and spoke to us regarding higher education and what they were trying to do, and there are some comments in here on this. We got a memo last week from one of the community colleges, and they were concerned about something they call a, “Duty to Warn,” and they were wondering what was done in regards to warning students about things. I don’t think there is a duty to warn, per se. I contacted Alan and he referred me to Vice-Provost Seaver for information regarding policies at NIU.

A. ROSENBAUM: And I think the issue is not warning students, the issue has to do with faculty either being compelled or strongly advised to notify authorities in the University if they
have suspicions about a student being a danger to him/herself or the community. So apparently there are some universities where faculty are required to notify authorities within the university if they have suspicions about a student and this is what was being discussed by the different universities. They are trying to get a sense of what the policies are and whether there are many universities that are requiring this. But certainly, in light as Earl said of what has happened here, it would not be surprising if at some point, this was either recommended or made into a policy. It has not been done yet as far as I know. I assume Gip didn’t tell you anything other than that, but there’s apparently a lot of concern in the FAC about this particular issue now, and it may become an issue for us. If it does, we certainly will address it.

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

A. ROSENBAUM: The special meeting was held on October 21st. There were two main items. The first one had to do with this bond issue that was authorized by the Board of Trustees. Any repairs to non-educational buildings, that’s anything that has to do with student recreation, housing, the Holmes Student Center, must be paid for out of bond revenue. There is an opportunity now under the Build America program where the federal government is paying 35% of the interest on these bonds. The bond has to be issued by December 31st and so they asked the board for authorization to float this bond issue. You can see in my report the things that they’re going to be doing. They include putting a new roof on the Holmes Student Center, redoing the bookstore, renovating Grant Towers, reconverting Gilbert Hall into a dormitory, roadway repairs and [Pat Henry has long been a advocate for more bike paths in the University] they’re going to resurface bike paths and build additional bike paths, as well as an intramural sports complex on the west campus behind the Convocation Center. This will be paid for in part by revenue generated from student housing fees, and they are instituting additional fees, both for students living in residence halls and NIU students, in general. It will be a sliding fee that will start at about $55 per semester and go up to about $122 per semester in the fourth year. The fees have been approved by the Student Association. One of the student representatives and the President of the Student Association spoke in front of the Board and strongly advocated for the passage of this item, stating that the students were fully in favor of the fees that were derived by a committee that included student representation. The second item, as you know, was the salary stabilization, authorization. The President asked the board to approve that. I would like to add that the Board of Trustees was extremely supportive of this item. They felt that it was the right thing to do. Both the President and the Board, I think, are taking some chances as it is possible that legislators or political candidates will criticize us for giving raises in a time of fiscal difficulties, but both the President and the Board strongly felt that the faculty and staff of the
University should be rewarded for their loyalty and for their work. It was very gratifying to hear that full support from both the President and the Board.

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 – page 3

L. ELISH-PIPER: We started out with our Dean Representative, Dean Schoenbachler from the College of Business, sharing with us information about the annual budget audit that is posted each year on the NIU website. It provides really good information for faculty and staff who might wonder about the specifics regarding the money that comes in and the money that goes out of the University. It is presented in a pretty user-friendly way, including graphs and so if anybody has questions about different aspects of the budget, the URL is provided there for you in item #1 of the report. Dean Schoenbachler also shared with us some information regarding enrollment management because she serves on that committee, and she talked with us about the fact that our overall enrollment this year is down about 1 to 2% and that as faculty and staff, we can be expected to want to take a larger role in the recruitment and retention of students since a larger percentage of our budget is now coming from student tuition and so thinking about how that can play out in our departments. We also discussed the MAP funding issue and how there’s a new wrinkle in that because a lot of the proprietary institutions and private institutions are securing the MAP funding very quickly, which means that there is less for NIU students and that could, again, impact all of us. We also talked about the issue of proprietary institutions in general having fewer rules and regulations and really cutting into a lot of the programs that NIU. We talked about the issue that was referred to us on the sustainability of intercollegiate athletics. We carefully reviewed the information that Jeff Compher sent to us, and the committee also got a little additional information that of the 17% of the operating budget that comes from direct institutional support, approximately half is used for student tuition waivers. We learned that the bulk of the remaining portion of the operating budget comes from dedicated student fees, and we found out how those dedicated student fees are passed. Alan mentioned earlier how the different student groups approve that, and that was confirmed for us by Dr. Williams. Those fee recommendations have a lot of student input and they are designated just for the use for which they are collected. A question had been brought up regarding whether in tough budget times we could shift money from one student fee account to another to cover things and the answer to that is definitely, no. We also have one lingering issue related to the sustainability of intercollegiate athletics. A question was raised regarding whether the donors to athletic funds also donate to academic funds, and we have requested that information, and we’ll report that once we have that in hand. We have a meeting scheduled in November to meet with the President and the Provost,
and our primary purpose in that meeting will be to discuss how our committee can be involved in the Vision 2020 process.

**P. HENRY:** Regarding the MAP funding, I actually remember this coming up when I was on the FAC, and I would hope it could be brought up with the FAC as to how to overcome this disadvantage that we’re at with regard to that, and I’m not sure how is it that other universities are able to get it more quickly.

**L. ELISH-PIPER:** The sense that we got is that they are more nimble and they are more business minded and so they are actively recruiting students and pushing them through the process in order to get that money more quickly whereas we tend to be more reactive. That was the information that we were provided. I don’t know if there are other issues involved.

[A. ROSENBAUM: agreed to relay P. Henry’s message to Earl Hansen.]

**A. ROSENBAUM:** Laurie, can I assume that you’re still holding off on a recommendation to the Senate regarding whether we want to do anything about intercollegiate athletics until you get the additional information?

**L. ELISH-PIPER:** I think that would be accurate, yes.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**P. HENRY:** This was brought to me by someone in my department who is wondering if there is any way in which the Faculty Senate could get some sort of discussion about the new library policies, which are actually not set by NIU, specifically regarding interlibrary loan, that it’s much more restricted now. You get three to four weeks I think with three renewals and for faculty especially, this could be a bit of an issue. She wasn’t sure if the Faculty Senate could be involved in discussing, protesting, wondering about this?

**A. ROSENBAUM:** I would guess we would need someone to bring a specific motion to us, a specific question for our consideration. You could do that for the next meeting. If we have something specific that we can put on the floor and then have a discussion around it.

**P. HENRY:** Should I email that to you?

**A. ROSENBAUM:** You could email it to me and we can put it on Blackboard so people can get a look at it before the meeting.
XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification – August 27, 2010 minutes
B. Undergraduate Coordinating Council – September 2, 2010 minutes
C. Graduate Council – September 13, 2010 minutes
D. Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education – September 13, 2010 minutes
E. University Assessment Panel – September 17, 2010 minutes
F. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification – September 17, 2010 minutes
G. Academic Planning Council – September 20, 2010 minutes

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

J.Kowalski made the motion, there were multiple seconds.

Meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.